

# TRANSCRIPT

## ROAD SAFETY COMMITTEE

### Inquiry into motorcycle safety

Melbourne—31 August 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 J. Thompson, senior manager, road safety and marketing,

Ms S. Cockfield, manager, road safety,

Mr M. Nieuwesteeg, research manager, road safety, Transport Accident Commission; and

Detective Acting Senior Sergeant P. Bellion, Victoria Police.

**The CHAIR** — On behalf of the Victorian Parliament Road Safety Committee, I would like to welcome everyone to the next session of our public hearings today. We have to give evidence before the committee today Mr John Thompson, the senior manager of the road safety and marketing section of the TAC; Ms Samantha Cockfield, manager of road safety; Mr Michael Nieuwesteeg, who is the senior research analyst, road safety; and Detective Acting Senior Sergeant, Peter Bellion, major collision investigation group, Victoria Police. I would like to invite the first speaker to introduce themselves. Speak loudly so that the sound does bounce off the walls so that the people at the back of the room can follow the process today. Thank you.

**Overheads shown.**

**Mr THOMPSON** — Thank you, Chair. John Thompson, senior manager of road safety and marketing for the Transport Accident Commission. All four of us are going to speak today. We will run through a presentation. We really welcome the opportunity to discuss this with the committee today, and with the gallery being able to listen – I think that is fantastic.

Just to begin with, I would just like to say it is pleasing to hear from VMC that they are generating some coordination around motorcycle consultation in Victoria. I think that is pleasing to hear, and the TAC welcomes that. Some sort of coordinated effort – and I am sure the committee has heard the difficulties around consultation in Victoria, around motorcycling, with the disparate number of groups, so we are pleased to hear that. I think that is important. But one of the things that does concern us is there seems to be a lack of support for one of the key messages for safety around motorcycling, which is speed. We would welcome a further discussion with the Victorian Motorcycle Council, particularly about how we can work together on a speed-related message, and I will continue to push that discussion as well. I will probably proceed up to the presentation. We are going to give you a basic run through.

I am going to provide a presentation overview now – a basic road safety context around our involvement in road safety in Victoria, what the functions and so forth of the TAC —

**The CHAIR** — John, can I invite you to speak up more strongly and project your voice down the room.

**Mr THOMPSON** — Sure. No problem, Chair — just a road safety context of the Transport Accident Commission's role and how we work in partnership with the other road safety partners: VicRoads, Victoria Police and the Department of Justice in particular. We will give you a motorcycle safety context and an overview of our business plan in particular, then we will give you a basic overview of public education for road safety issues and then we will get into the nitty-gritty of the development process for public education that the TAC is used for and refined and developed over 25 years. Then we will get into the 'Reconstruction' development process. It seems to be an important topic of discussion. We will give you – and we will leave today; we will not actually present – a number of previous campaigns as well for the committee to review.

The road safety context – the Transport Accident Commission, we invest in road safety. We invest around about \$140 million a year in road safety programs, the bulk of which goes into improving Victoria's roads. In the 2012–13 financial year the TAC will invest in the order of \$75 million in improving Victoria's roads. That is one of the most significant contributions in road infrastructure improvements from any of the CTP organisations around Australia. We also invest in trauma services, health care and disability support, and I think it is exceptionally important to understand that in the last financial year the TAC spent \$937 million on providing services and benefits to Victorians who were injured in preventable vehicle accidents, or road accidents, in Victoria. This financial year that number is over \$1 billion in services for injured Victorians.

Some of the discussion earlier today concerned me a little bit because it, in part, showed a lack of understanding of the role of the TAC. I just want to highlight three points from our act. Our role is to collect and assess statistics and data in relation to road accidents and to use that information to promote the prevention of transport accidents, which is the thing that the Transport Accident Commission, fortunately, is probably best known for. And the last one is to reduce the cost to the Victorian community of compensation for transport accidents. I will get this right with the numbers. Just a quick overview – the Victoria's Road Safety Strategy four partner organisations, which I have already mentioned. It is important to note the TAC is not a policy-making arm of this strategy, but our lead role is in prevention and the promotion of prevention and also supporting our partner agencies, like Victoria Police, with enforcement, like VicRoads, with better

infrastructure improvement programs. Hence, that SRIP, Safer Roads Infrastructure Program, is actually \$75 million this year. It is part of a \$684 million program over 10 years. It is a very significant infrastructure improvement program that we fund.

A quick overview of the Transport Accident Commission's prevention team – some 800 people work at the TAC. Most of those people work on the claims side of the business, looking after Victorians, the 38 000 ongoing clients that the Transport Accident Commission has. That is the majority team. This represents the road safety and marketing team of the Transport Accident Commission, and it covers the three pillars that I discussed before: data analysis, road safety and promotion. That is the small team, and the names that are there highlight the people who have been involved particularly with the development of this campaign.

We have a business plan, and, as part of that plan, we have a goal. Our mission and our strategic vision in that business plan are based on the safe system, which you have heard about this morning. Just to give that business plan a little bit of context – the business plan goes through quite a rigorous process in the organisation to be approved by the executive leadership team. It is then through a subcommittee of the board. We have an independent board that manages the Transport Accident Commission. That subcommittee is called MARSC. It is the Marketing and Road Safety Committee, and it reviews our business plan each year and provides endorsement to the board of the TAC. It subsequently goes through the board process and is approved at board level. The promotions program is then presented to the government as part of the advertising process within the government's processes. We present on a once-a-year basis to the advertising and communications committee for further endorsement. The four pillars of our business plan are roads, speed, vehicle and people. We will touch on those in further detail throughout our presentation. It is important to note that we have a business plan that is built around those four pillars and is addressing a range of road safety issues. We do not address every road safety issue out there; we work in partnership with VicRoads and Victoria Police in particular and the Department of Justice, which takes the lead on other issues.

The safe system vision – this pie graph was produced by Monash University, and it was basically helping us determine where our investments are made and the likelihood of return and where we would get greatest value in return for our investment. You can see the largest slice there is in infrastructure; hence, the Safer Roads Infrastructure Program, which is the \$684 million I mentioned earlier. Another larger slice there is around vehicle safety, and I will talk about our investments in that. Interestingly, speed and the behaviour around speeding – it is estimated at this time that around 26 or 27 per cent of reductions in trauma could be achieved if we focused our attention on speed and speeding behaviour.

On to roads and speed – the \$75 million this year I have mentioned. These are just some key projects that we are involved in. There is a partnership trial with the VTA in a reduced speed trial with the trucking industry. We are investing in trials for a road policing technology as well, so bringing on new speed enforcement technology and other technologies with Victoria Police. We will continue to invest in public education that targets the speed issue with all road users, not just motorcyclists, as we have done. It is probably important to note – and it came up in some of the discussions – we have run 59 speed-related campaigns in the 25-year history; only one has focused on motorcycling. We are also going to work in partnership with other organisations in the community, like Crime Stoppers Victoria, to target high-risk road users and high-level speeding.

In the vehicle space we invest in public education again to promote the benefits of safer vehicles. I am sure everyone in this room would be happy to agree that safer vehicles have led to significant reductions on our roads. The Europeans estimate that they are still gaining about a 25 per cent reduction in trauma and fatalities through gaining improved safety in their vehicles, and we are encouraged by that and will continue to promote that. That is why we invest in things like the ANCAP program for new car assessment and crash testing and also the used car safety ratings program, which is providing Victorians and other road users around the country with invaluable information. We are working on other things, such as child restraint programs and the like. And people – probably the most difficult part of the equation – working in behaviour change space on a range of issues, such as distractions, mobile phones, iPods and the like, in road use and looking at youth focus campaigns, targeting young Victorian with their risky behaviours. We try and do that through innovative ways, not through traditional advertising, but through event-based marketing and social media. We are looking at supporting Victoria Police's enforcement programs, as we have done for many years, and we will

continue to do so. Another vehicle safety issue that we are tackling here is the correct fitment of child restraints.

Motorcycling projects – beyond the advertising campaign that we have discussed today, and we touched on Ride Smart as well – we are involved in other education campaigns around protective clothing as well as risk management. We promote at the motorcycle GP protective clothing messages to a large audience. We are involved in the Motorcycle Expo, and we run a significant retailer program where we are talking to retailers as well. Ride Smart has a perception training tool, a very important tool. It has been well received by the Victorian public. It has had significant involvement from the motorcycling community. In fact, one of the speakers today was involved as a consultant on that project. And, of course, we are working in off-road motorcycling. That is subsequent to the VAGO investigations from 2010. We are broadening our approach to cover off-road motorcycling. Now we are on to the evidence base for motorcycling. I am going to hand over to Michael. Do you want to talk about this?

**Mr NIEUWESTEEG** — I am Michael Nieuwesteeg. I am the research manager at the TAC.

**The CHAIR** — Michael, again, we will encourage you to speak down the room.

**Mr NIEUWESTEEG** — I will do my best.

**The CHAIR** — You have got a large audience here.

**Mr NIEUWESTEEG** — You have seen these figures before, so I am not going to labour on them. It is just to set the context about the size of the trauma problem, and it also puts some context around the budget of our advertising campaign in the context of a \$150 million compensation bill in each of the last couple of years. We have spoken to the committee on previous occasions about the data we use. It is listed here: the source data that goes into our analysis and our monitoring and our evaluation. There are a few analytical exercises that I have noted down the bottom also. We have done a recent modelling exercise with some actuaries, and we have produced as a part of that a model that determined the risk of a motorcyclist being involved or ending up in a TAC claim. We have done a customer investigation. That is about a geodemographic profiling of TAC clients and also analysis of where motorcycle registered owners live.

Another side to our data collection is speaking with members of the public, primarily through quantitative surveys, usually over the phone but also in paper-based mail-outs and online research. This in addition to the focus groups that we run on occasion. The focus groups, which John will speak about later, are more in relation to specific campaign development. My work is more at the back end; it is before the decisions are made about what campaign we are going to do; it is just providing the overall context. Over the last five years we have put a lot more effort into our survey research. We have had a fairly extensive survey program for about 20 years, but it has grown and grown, and over the last five years we have introduced some new motorcycle-specific surveys – a tracking survey that is tied to our motorcycle advertising; it is specifically to evaluate the advertising, and we have recently completed a motorcycle monitor survey; we sent invitations to 2000 people in the mail, based on the VicRoads database, who were invited to do the survey. We will be soon publishing those results on our website.

Over the last four years we have averaged over 1300 motorcyclists being surveyed each year. This is just a very small example. It has a little bit of relevance to the ad. It points out the importance of arterial roads in the metropolitan area in terms of where motorcycle trauma is likely to occur. This is based on where a motorcyclist lives, the crash cause and the likely path of travel. It is based on about five years worth of TAC claims from motorcyclists. That is it for me for now.

**Mr THOMPSON** — Thanks, Michael. I am going to quickly take you through the campaign development process, and then I will hand over to Samantha, who will talk about the scenarios and so forth. What we are going to talk about is why we use public education for road safety. We are going to talk about the four Es. Some of you may have heard of the four Ps, but we use the four Es in relation to road safety and public education. We talk briefly about behaviour change campaigns and then get into the nitty-gritty of the development steps that go into a campaign like the 'Reconstruction' campaign.

Why use public education for road safety? We want to put the issue on the agenda, whether it is speeding, whether it is drink driving or mobile phone use or the potential purchase of safer vehicles or vehicle technology. We want to promote awareness to the Victorian public that these activities or these trauma events could occur to them. We want to give road users the tools and information required to help them make better decisions when they are using Victorian roads. Some other reasons in there as to sign posts, the introduction of new enforcement technologies – and if you cast your mind back, you can think of numerous ads and ad campaigns where we have promoted Victoria Police’s innovation – and, of course, reinforce the perception of the risk of detection because we know that that is an effective tool.

What are the four Es? These are the four Es of road safety public education: education, enforcement and emotion – some people call it shock, but we call it emotion – but overall we want we engagement, and we continue to strive to be engaged with the audience as we are talking to them. Why do we use these messages? Well, enforcement messages to promote and support enforcement activity because we know we can increase the effectiveness of Victoria Police’s activities through increased promotion around that. Educational campaigns like ‘Slo-Mo’ and like the ‘Reconstruction’ campaigns provide context for the issue and a rationale for changing a behaviour and a motive, helping us build the moral case to change behaviour – i.e. resonating with the Victorian community that could be there or someone they love.

Some of the common misconceptions about public education – this is from Barry Elliot, from two studies he has done in 1989 and 1992. He is probably well known to the committee; he is probably well quoted. Some of the misconceptions around public education – you just need to tell people and then they will get it and they will change their behaviour. It is wrong. It is not strong on its own. Advertising alone is critical to changing behaviour en masse – also wrong; we need to work hand in hand with the community, with our road safety partners and also with legislation and enforcement regimes. My favourite one – people are interested in our messages and about the need to change. A lot of people ignore them so we have got to find new and interesting ways to present the information, and motorcycle ‘Reconstruction’ is an example of trying to find those ways.

Some comments about behavioural change campaigns – the hardest to develop, and they are the hardest to develop because the return on investment for these campaigns takes a long time. We are talking about generational change. If you think about drink driving – the enforcement regimes around drink driving started 50 years, I understand, and, realistically, it is in the last 20 years that we have seen significant change in behaviour in relation to drink driving. So it takes quite a long time. Another couple of key points – behaviour change campaigns must be undertaken with the support of initiatives such as enforcement. We have talked about that enough already. Community support for the message is important. We need to get the community on side with our messages. We hear today about some segments of the community wanting to talk to us about that, and we are going to some results from our tracking with the motorcycle community which paints a slightly different picture. The basic public education steps – I will not go over them, but they are there. These are the steps that we take. We go through – it is furthermore enforced by our business planning processes and our governance procedures of the Transport Accident Commission, but these are the steps that we take. We will bring these to light through the example of the motorcycle ‘Reconstruction’ program.

This is the actual concept development process. You can see the stages. I will leave that for the committee to review. We are on now to ‘Reconstruction’ for motorcycles, so I will hand this over to Sam. Basically these are the key dates. You can see that it took about eight months to deliver this campaign with all the stages. It is not something that we pluck out of thin air and develop in a couple of weeks. It takes quite a long time, and there is quite a lot of consultation with a range of stakeholders in this process. I will hand over to Sam now to talk about this in more detail. Thanks, Sam.

**Ms COCKFIELD** — Samantha Cockfield, manager, road safety, TAC. What I am going to take you through is quite a bit of information, but I think it is fairly important to understand the level of detail and, I suppose, the amount of consultation with the people we actually work with to make a TV advertisement and a whole campaign. To start with we look at an internal brief. This is where the information that Michael was talking about comes to hand. For this particular campaign we were looking at both fatalities and serious injuries. We knew that 49 motorcyclists had been fatally injured last year. We knew that speed was a major contributing factor to a proportion of those crashes. We know that this largely a male issue, as is road trauma more generally. The cost to the scheme – you have heard that this is a legislative responsibility for us to

reduce costs, so we do look at the cost to our actual scheme when planning a campaign. We also, I suppose, look more generally at what the problem is in relation to the number of registered vehicles and vehicles travelled in Victoria. We look for insights. This is still in the development of our initial internal brief at this stage. We are thinking – speeding, major issue, what do we know from our ongoing tracking? This is tracking over many years. We know, like all Victorians, there are a number of people self-reporting speeding; that riders actually acknowledge they do, some or all of the time, travel over the speed limit. We know that riders, like the rest of the community, believe that they could do this more often if they believe they will not get caught. We know that motorcyclists who report being caught for speeding are also significantly lower than we see in the general community. Those who tell us that they have actually been caught – the numbers are actually lower than for the general motorist community, who are primarily car drivers. We know that the perceived risk for riders of having an accident in a 50-to-60-kilometre zone – so lower speed zones – is greater than they believe their risk is in a 100-kilometre zone. That is information that we are bringing to the table in terms of developing a brief.

Based on all this information, we develop a brief for one of our advertising agencies. In doing this process in this particular ad we thought it was very important to actually talk to Peter Bellion and Victoria Police and also Peter's colleagues in other areas of police, particularly those dealing with data. We had some very specific aims, particularly to reduce the number of speed-related fatal accidents amongst riders and pillion passengers. We wanted to improve rider understanding and awareness that they can reduce their own risk and their risk of having a crash by travelling within the posted speed limited. We also wanted to educate riders that crash outcomes can be more serious where speed is involved. Just about the concepts – John has already spoken about the fact that we have had a number of speed campaigns over our 25-year history. Two of them have been standouts. Those two ads – one called 'Slo-Mo' and another 'Reconstruction', which Peter Bellion was involved in the making of; both targeting car drivers are highly successful; both are still used today in Victoria, across Australia and internationally – were considered good starting points to talk to the rider community about speed. Our agency actually suggested that we look at them, and we thought it was a reasonable approach. So those two concepts were adapted – and we are talking about narratives here; written scripts were adapted and tested with a target audience. You can see a bit more information down there about how well the original 'Reconstruction' performed when first aired back in March 2006. Knowing that the actual scripts performed reasonably well with riders and particularly the 'Reconstruction' script that we are already talking about today, we started looking more thoroughly at the data and also started thinking about the crash scenario that we were going to depict. Again, we went to police data, but this time we had our own internal analysis. Some of Michael's team went through every single fatality file, looking at exactly what the circumstances were for 224 crashes that occurred in the five years to 2011. We are actually looking at the sketches and the descriptions, really looking for the detail of what was happening in those crashes. I suppose where we got to was that a turning vehicle was a very likely scenario in terms of what we wanted to predict. About 21 per cent of the collisions we looked at actually involved a turning vehicle. Of that 21 per cent, 80 per cent, 39 cases, it was the scenario – we ended up with 15 which was a car or truck turning with the motorcycle travelling straight through; in 5 of those excessive speed was a known factor. Of those we looked at, 14 cases actually occurred in a 60-kilometre zone.

In terms of the exact scenario, once we got to this stage we worked a little more with Peter Bellion and his team at the Major Collision Investigation Group. We also did do some work with Monash University Accident Research Centre and got a report from it to better understand what some of the scenarios and what the research and international literature might say about these types of crashes. I think now is probably a good time to let Peter have a chat to us about the scenario and his work with us.

**Det. Acting Sr Sgt** — Detective Acting Senior Sergeant Peter Bellion, Victoria Police, Major Collisions Investigation Group. Around about August last year the TAC came to me in regard to this advertisement. The initial script was in regard to a car and a motorcycle incident, similar to what is being portrayed in the advertisement. The initial speeds that were put up for the motorbike at that stage were about 75 kilometres per hour. After that initial meeting I ran some physics on that crash. We had a subsequent meeting, which was after that information being gathered through market research to motorcycle riders. As a result of that research it came back that the motorcycle fraternity agreed that they may be speeding but they didn't recognise he was actually travelling as fast as 75 kilometres per hour in a 60-kilometre zone. As a result of that I was asked to re-look at the script in regard to what would be the situation if the motorcycle speed was 68 kilometres per hour. As a result of that, I looked at stopping sight distance information for the two different speeds –

68 kilometres per hour compared to 60 kilometres per hour. Effectively, in any reconstruction that we do for a criminal prosecution or for an inquest brief we would look at typical perception and reaction responses based on research, which is 85 per cent of drivers would perceive and react in 1½ seconds or less, if they are not affected by any alcohol or drugs or fatigue, for example. That figure was used for the perception and reaction response time.

In terms of braking distances calculated, a braking deceleration level of 0.7g was used. The reason behind that figure being used was – from the experience of attending fatal crashes of this type scenario, where typically the motorcycle has ploughed either into the middle of the turning car or the front of the turning car or the back of the turning car, depending on the relative speeds and time and distance relationships – the evidence that has led up to that scene was typically there was a straight wheel skid mark, observation of the motorbike involved would be that there would be a flat spot on the rear tyre, indicating that there had been skidding from the rear wheel, and we also had evidence typically of the front tyre having evidence of build up of heat transfer around its circumference, which would indicate there has been a fair bit of front braking input. In those situations we had actually gone out and done instrumented brake testing for the various cases in the past, where we would put Vericom brake test computers on motorcycles and had our special solo riders do emergency braking experiments at the various crash sites we were investigating. As a result of those tests in that type of scenario, we found that the deceleration rates of the motorcycle on a dry bituminous road surface was somewhere between 0.7g through to 0.8g. We used the 0.7g because it is possible that it could have been as low as that.

In some instances, obviously if a rider is very well trained and has the opportunity to do emergency braking day in, day out, yes, they can decelerate at a higher rate, but the reality of the fatal crashes and the serious injury crashes that I go to is that that does not happen from the evidence on the road, hence the deceleration rates that we used in the ad. Ultimately, the time and distance relationships were looked at for the turning scenario and the comparison between the initial start speeds and what the end result was, and basically the difference was that, at the end of the day, a 68 initial speed, looking at the perception-reaction response and braking distances, ultimately led to an impact speed of about 30 kilometres per hour, compared to a situation where the collision could be avoided. The ultimate thing that comes into it – from my civil engineering background – in terms of these intersection crashes, whether it be a car versus car, car versus motorcycle, car pulling out and getting hit by a truck, is the critical aspect in the intersection crash is to look at the site triangle and look at what is called stopping sight distance. Stopping sight distance is the total distance required for a driver to first see something, then react to that situation and then brake the vehicle to stop to avoid it or slow down sufficiently to allow the vehicle to get around. There are guidelines that cover those stopping sight distances for different speed zones. One of the things that was put up this morning – what if the bike was doing 68 kilometres per hour in a 70-kilometre zone. In a 70-kilometre zone you have actually got a larger amount of stopping sight distance than you have in a 60 zone compared to a 50 zone. The critical thing is what speed you are actually travelling at in that speed zone. Then, if you are doing the right thing, you have got the stopping sight distance built into road environment that allows you to avoid the hazard if you are doing the right thing, if you are travelling at the speed limit or less. The other problem obviously with crashes is if you got perception and reaction delays. That is where people are either affected by alcohol, affected by drugs or distracted or fatigued or doing something else inside the car. The critical cause of crashes, if it is not speed, is a thing that causes perception and reaction delays. This advertisement was basically – look at that key issue of what the difference would be if you just reduced the speed of your motorbike back to a lawful speed in terms of outcome and to educate the rider as to what can happen to them and why it is so important to travel within the posted speed limits in accordance with the road rules.

**Ms COCKFIELD** — I might take up from there. Having worked with Peter and Victoria Police on a more exact scenario, we took our ‘Reconstruction’ script into focus group research. This is the process we go through for all the TAC advertisements and campaigns. Four focus groups were conducted. The target audience – and I spoke before about males being a key focus for us – were 21-to-30-year-old males and 31-to-45-year-old males. All had a licence, either probationary or full licence, although the full licence was the majority of the group. All must have openly committed that they were commuting riders – i.e. rode twice a week. There were no scooter riders recruited for the groups. Their residential addresses were from a mix of inner suburban and outer fringe suburbs. They represented both blue collar and white collar occupations and lifestyles, and none were to be employed in the advertising/marketing industries, which is fairly common!

The aim of doing this research was to evaluate two concepts – a ‘Reconstruction’ script and the ‘Slo-Mo’

script, which was still in the mix at this stage, and to understand how they communicated the key messages to riders and measure those concepts in terms of cut through, what their motivational appeal was to riders and, I suppose most importantly, personal relevance – and that is, could this be me in this scenario? The specific objectives we wanted to meet in our undertaking the focus group testing was we wanted to have a broad understanding of the riding behaviour of respondents so that their subsequent comments could be put into some context. Most often we do that by actually having written responses as soon as somebody has seen or heard a concept. We then have discussion after they have actually had their written responses recorded. We recorded these responses in relation to their spontaneous reaction – so what was their first reaction to the ad, what was their main message take out, what sort of thoughts and feelings did this ad evoke for them, what level of involvement and attention did they have to the ad, was it of personal relevance and was it likely to impact on their current speeding behaviour?

**The CHAIR** — Sam, one question I would like to ask is: how many motorcyclists on your focus group program had speeding infringements or were recidivist offenders?

**Ms COCKFIELD** — I do not know about recidivists having more than one speeding offence. My understanding was that speeding would have been part of the initial brief. Can we take that notice on —

**The CHAIR** — Question on notice.

**Ms COCKFIELD** — Question on notice, sorry, yes. John?

**Mr THOMPSON** — I do not believe we asked if they had a speeding fine in our recruitment. I do not believe that. Could someone confirm that? I absolutely can confirm that we did not ask if they were speeding drivers.

**The CHAIR** — And if there were none, a corollary of that would be that this group would appear to be the target of these commercials, and the question this raises: why not include them?

**Ms COCKFIELD** — It does not mean that there was nobody in the focus group who had had infringements. They were not excluded. It was a general representative group. I suppose it is reasonable to say that of any general representative there would have been a number of people who had had speeding infringement notices because a fair proportion of the community has had speeding infringement notices.

**Mr THOMPSON** — And sometimes, Chair, it is difficult to get people in your recruitment sense to admit that they break the law or have broken the law in the past because there is some element of embarrassment with that too, so it does present as a challenge sometimes when you are recruiting for things like that.

**Mr LANGUILLER** — And, through the Chair, a supplementary – did you at any stage consult or include off-road riders?

**Ms COCKFIELD** — No. This campaign was primarily targeting people who use suburban roads in and around Melbourne, particularly people who use them regularly, such as commuting riders. So the target group for this campaign was not off-road riders.

**The CHAIR** — Thank you. Please continue.

**Ms COCKFIELD** — So we compared one concept with another, trying to ascertain the stronger of these two concepts, ‘Slo-Mo’ and ‘Reconstruction’, in terms of communicating how speed impacts on crash risk and injury severity – that is, both in terms of having a crash and in terms of injury outcome – explaining the effect speed has on braking distance and reaction time, reinforcing the need to comply with speed limits. Groups were shown, given we had them, existing TVCs developed for car drivers on which these two scripts were developed, and each group was actually provided with a recorded narrative, basically an auditory device. After listening to each narrative twice, as I said, we asked respondents to provide a written response, and then we asked a range of questions in a discussion group-type forum, a facilitated forum. They are the sorts of questions we have asked. In terms of reactions to the bike ‘Reconstruction’ concept, an initial reaction was one of shock and was seen very much as hard-hitting and hitting home. The concept and the scenario were

seen as realistic. The fact that the rider broke his neck and died was particularly impactful with those groups. The central message, very importantly for us, was stay within the speed limit and that small change in speed and differences in speed can make a difference. The types of comments that were recorded were, 'You would never think that 8 kilometres an hour could make that much difference'. The message is: 'If you speed, you're dead; it's clear'.

The riders recognised that the concept emphasised bringing responsibility back to motorcycle riders and instilling in them the fact that they do have some control out of outcomes in terms of what happens on the road. The riders felt that the concept would capture their imagination, primarily because of the graphic imagery, and it was thought that the messages were clear and important and that the visuals would really draw people in. To be honest, the quote we have got here is something we hear quite often – 'You really need to shock people to really show people the reality to get them to take notice'.

**The CHAIR** — Samantha, Mr Languiller has a question.

**Ms COCKFIELD** — Yes. Sure.

**Mr LANGUILLER** — Samantha, I noted with interest you said that the construction of the ad – the commentary was it needed to be realistic. It related to the construction of an ad around a 60-kilometre zone – correct?

**Ms COCKFIELD** — Yes.

**Mr LANGUILLER** — And there was an 8-kilometre excessive legal speed?

**Ms COCKFIELD** — Yes.

**Mr LANGUILLER** — As distinct from inappropriate speed – the circumstances of the day; if it rains, the rider might well be doing 60 kilometres; it's legal but it's inappropriate, it is not safe. Correct? Would you agree with that?

**Ms COCKFIELD** — Yes. This ad was actually about speeding.

**Mr LANGUILLER** — Okay. Are you able to disclose where it is that you actually did that film, that footage?

**Ms COCKFIELD** — I do not think we have got any issue with that.

**Mr THOMPSON** — No. The street we used was in Huntingdale. The name of the street was —

**Mr LANGUILLER** — And you relate it to a 60-kilometre road; that was the purpose of it?

**Mr THOMPSON** — Yes. That is correct.

**Mr LANGUILLER** — Are you able to confirm that you actually filmed in a 60-kilometre street zone?

**Mr THOMPSON** — I will take that on notice.

**Ms COCKFIELD** — I can answer that because we went through quite a process to identify the streets. The streets used were actually a 50-kilometre zone.

**Mr LANGUILLER** — A 50-kilometre zone?

**Ms COCKFIELD** — Yes.

**Mr LANGUILLER** — But you are doing an ad for a 60-kilometre zone. Don't you think – you are talking about being realistic – don't you have to be bona fide about it?

**Ms COCKFIELD** — The location we wanted – we would have liked to have used a 60-kilometre zone; the reality of filming is that we have to find areas where we can close off roads safely. In this particular ad a number of locations were identified to make the ad, all of them considered representative of what could be a 60-kilometre zone or could be made to look like 60-kilometre zone. A number of them were in this local government area. Our scouting company works quite often with local government areas. They work with this local government area. This was the only area that we could actually use at this time. It ticked a lot of boxes for us in terms of a semi-industrial area, the sort of area that mixed traffic could be in, where it could have been a truck and it could have been a passenger car. Certainly we went to a lot of effort to ensure that it was representative of a 60-kilometre zone, and it had previously been a 60-kilometre zone, prior to rezoning.

**The CHAIR** — Does that have any effect on the site triangles – the difference in road speeds and roads?

**Det. Acting Sr Sgt BELLION** — Essentially, prior to the default built-up area speed limit going from 60 back to 50 a number of years ago that road was a 60-kilometre speed zone and constructed in what would have been for 60-kilometre stopping sight distances.

**Mr ELSBURY** — Just in relation then to the utility that was actually parked in the field of vision, would that utility have been parked as part of a 50-kilometre speed zone or a 60-kilometre speed zone, because I would imagine that at 60 kilometres that utility probably was in the wrong spot?

**Det. Acting Sr Sgt BELLION** — I do not know if we had control over the parking of the utility for the ad, but in terms of locations of signage relative to an intersection, that signage would be dependent on what the speed zone was currently. So for a 60-kilometre zone you would normally find that the no standing sign would be further away from the intersection; for 50 it might be more —

**Mr ELSBURY** — So, considering the road was 50 at the time of filming, he has parked perfectly legally in an area where it is a 50-kilometre speed zone, where he would have had to come further down the road anyway; he probably would not be able to park there anyway. There were two driveways, and there would have been a much larger field of vision.

**Det. Acting Sr Sgt BELLION** — For an advertisement, what you are saying is possible, yes.

**Mr ELSBURY** — Okay.

**Mr LANGUILLER** — Can I, through the Chair, just put to you a follow-up and with utmost respect. In advertising, in marketing, being upfront, being bona fide, being transparent is critical. Did it not concern you that you were actually filming in a 50-kilometre zone for an ad effectively targeting an audience, and you asked the people, you consulted them about their reaction for a 60-kilometre zone?

**Ms COCKFIELD** — We, in terms of filming any ad, have to put safety first. We have to be able to film in a location that can be locked down and ensure that everybody in that zone, in that area, is safe. That is exactly what we had to do in this scenario. John has had a long history in terms of making advertisements in other areas as well, so it may actually be better to comment on it generally in his field.

**Mr THOMPSON** — Just in relation to the question about the sight distance from the vehicle. If the committee is comfortable, if we could take that away and speak with the production company, because there will be a record of the distance from the intersection to where the vehicle was parked. We could check that information and bring that back to the committee to confirm any of those concerns. One of the things that we try in the development of our campaigns is to make them as realistic as possible. In the situation where we are filming, as Samantha has explained, we have to work with the constraints of permits to ensure that we do this safely. So we have to be able to get roads that we can close down. In this particular case, where we were involving two stunt drivers and vehicles colliding, we needed to have the road locked down. It is not possible all the time to get the perfect road, but in this particular scenario, as Sam has explained, we have addressed and dressed the road to reflect a 60-kilometre zone.

**Mr LANGUILLER** — So you did look for a 60-kilometre street?

**Mr THOMPSON** — Absolutely.

**Mr LANGUILLER** — And you could not get one?

**Mr THOMPSON** — We could not get one at the time. It is often difficult.

**Det. Acting Sr Sgt BELLION** — Through the Chair, in terms of the permits and that, that all has to be organised through the film and TV unit of the corporate media department of Victoria Police. So the members from there organise those permits for TAC in regard to what is a safe location to do the ad, and they are dictated by that.

**Mr THOMPSON** — Just to close off on the location of the utility, I am confident that it is parked within a 60-kilometre zone. The dressing of that site was in significant development stages all the way through, so I am confident it will be parked within the 60-kilometre environment.

**Mr PERERA** — Just through the Chair, did you explore the possibility of using 50 kilometres – this is about ‘over’ speeding. If it was a real 50-kilometre zone, what stopped you, rather than in the advertisement using 60 kilometres and 68 ‘over’ speeding —

**Mr THOMPSON** — We considered a whole range of road environments and speed environments and particularly scenarios. We chose this one as the one that was most appropriate. As Peter mentioned, we talked about higher speeds being depicted, we consulted with the motorcycling community about that. They felt that was not reflective of their behaviour, that their behaviour was more in keeping with what we presented. We did discuss all sorts of speed limits, and we also looked at the data of where the accidents and the trauma are occurring. We felt that this was most appropriate. If you remember a slide that Samantha showed earlier that showed that 14 of the 39 accidents or fatalities occurred in a 60-kilometre zone, so we were trying to reflect the common-type accident. In our environment we feel we are in the zone of where we should be talking in relation to motorcycle safety.

**Det. Acting Sr Sgt BELLION** — Perhaps if I could add to that, through the Chair, in terms of speed zoning and crash rates, the two speed zones that are overrepresented in fatalities around the state of Victoria are your 60-kilometre-per-hour metropolitan speed limit and your 100-kilometre-per-hour rural speed limit. Effectively, between those two speed zones it accounts for about two-thirds of road trauma in this state, roughly 19 per cent in the 60-kilometre environment and 45 per cent in a 100-kilometre environment.

**The CHAIR** — Peter, just in relation to that particular issue, in terms of the attribution of fault in relation to speed, would there be evidence to suggest that speed and fault on behalf of the motorcyclist is of a higher proportion in terms of accident causation in country areas and motorist error is of the higher proportion in urban settings?

**Det. Acting Sr Sgt BELLION** — If you go back to the fatal study that we did in 2002–03, it was about 20 per cent of the fatalities occurred in the urban environment at an intersection, similar to the scenario depicted in the ad. In those situations obviously the speeds were less, the average speed of the at-fault rider was less compared to the speeds in the rural environment, which were obviously greater, and the average speed of the at-fault rider in that situation was higher. Most of the rural environment ones tended to be loss-of-control events on left-hand curves. It was about 20 per cent in that urban environment in the metropolitan area.

**The CHAIR** — Just referring to that report, I just note among the 11 riders who were not at fault, 10 individuals, 91 per cent, were not speeding at the time leading up to the collision, and a similar number tested negative to the presence of a psychoactive agent.

**Det. Acting Sr Sgt BELLION** — That is correct, in that fatal study back in 2002–03.

**The CHAIR** — Yes. Albeit it is of a smaller sample of riders, so to speaker, so it may be difficult to draw strong conclusions, but my proposition that I might put is whether the advertisement focuses upon the speed

of the motorcyclist in this particular commercial, where some of the evidence from the earlier study might suggest that it was not the motorcyclist who was at fault in terms of the cause of the accident.

**Det. Acting Sr Sgt BELLION** — That is correct. There are obviously cases that come across my desk throughout the year where speed is a factor on the motorbike. Just in regard to failing-to-give-way scenarios – we have just talked about that briefly – reference material in regard to whether a charge of failing to give way in a scenario is similar to what is portrayed in the ad would obviously depend on a number of factors in a real-life scenario. One thing that is depicted in the ad scenario is that the motorcycle is out of the line of sight of the car driver as the car starts to move off from the stop line control. The simple message of the ad is to encourage motorcyclists to slow down in the urban environment for their own safety. Obviously I am aware of the SMIDSY issues, the ‘Sorry, mate, I didn’t see’, because when you speak to car drivers in these situations that is the common response – ‘Sorry, I didn’t see them’. Then you start looking into the factors involved. In a real-life scenario evidence would be obtained from an analysis of the physical evidence that is located at the crash scene as well as evidence from the parties involved. Invariably, the motorcyclist is not able to tell you anything because of the extent of the injuries or that he has succumbed to his injuries. It is not a pleasant day for us having to be there and going to tell his relatives or her relatives what has happened. We will look at witness testimony. We will look at – there might be CCTV footage around. After, obviously, all that investigation you prepare a brief of evidence for the coroner or for the courts. In terms of looking at prosecution, you have got to look at case law decisions and what is available to us. We have got various texts that we look at. We have got Word documents that have been supplied from our road policing investigation course, and that case law is looked at in terms of whether you make a prosecution for a charge of failure to give way or not. In some instances – for example, in the case of *R v De Montero*; that was a case where a motorcycle was travelling at excessively high speeds and killed a passenger in a turning car. In that situation it went through the higher courts, up to the County Court level, in regard to culpable driving causing death and dangerous driving causing death offences. So there is a whole realm of possibilities for these situations of a motorbike and a turning car, and it depends on the actual data from that specific crash.

**Mr CHAIR** — Yes. One further question – in the context of the commercial that we have been analysing today, would you have recommended a prosecution brief for the driver of the motor vehicle to be charged for failing to give way?

**Det. Acting Sr Sgt BELLION** — Certainly you would put in a brief in regard to that charge, failing to give way. Then the ultimate decision would be on, given it is a fatality, the officer in charge of the major collision investigation group to decide whether that prosecution should be launched or not. He may then take the advice from somebody from the Director of Public Prosecutions, some legal advice in regard to that, to see whether that would go ahead or not. So there are a number of avenues. You might speak to the people at the road policing investigators course; look up the text in regard to – for example, the Lombard, Marquis and Walsh-Buckley text; we have got one which is titled *Motor and Traffic Law Victoria*, and look at the case law decisions in there to see whether you are likely to be successful or not. One of the things that we have to look at in terms of whether you are going to be successful or not is, if you are not, in this day and age, if you lose a case at court, those costs come back onto Victoria Police. They are all factors that have to be looked at in terms of whether you prosecute or not prosecute.

**Mr CHAIR** — Yes. But just coming back to the facts of the case – a motorist failed to give way to the right. The ‘Reconstruction’ focuses more or less exclusively on the rider approaching speed —

**Det. Acting Sr Sgt BELLION** — If it can be established that the motorcycle was out of the line of sight of the car driver when they made their decision to go, it would be unlikely.

**Mr CHAIR** — Right.

**Ms COCKFIELD** — Okay. I will try and move fairly quickly. I am continuing on talking about what actually came out of the concept testing. We have established that the key messages that came out were in line with people understanding that they needed to slow down and speeding was an issue for them in terms of crash risk and in terms of injury outcome. First here we are being quite honest about what comes out of focus testing. We are actually letting you know that not everything is positive but also the sorts of areas we explore. This issue, that the TAC and holistically the road safety fraternity is anti-bike, we are aware of. It was

explored quite explicitly in the development of these concepts. Despite the protest that, yes, in these scenarios it is always the driver who is at fault, they did not see the ad as an anti-bike ad. There was a broad acceptance that a TVC needed to focus on motorcycle riders' behaviours. These last two dot points are what our agency, the market research agency – these are sort of quotes of what they said, which was that riders will always criticise the drivers in these scenarios, but at the same time they acknowledge and fully understand that the rider is the one who comes off second best in a collision. It does not really matter who is at fault, in the end we are the ones who are dead. Their summary was that, begrudgingly, they support the TAC initiative and that they hope the final campaign is successful in making both riders and drivers more aware of the issue.

On the basis of all the information we gained there we actually went off and made the ad. Before we finalise any ad we put it into what is called offline testing. So I suppose we would say the ad is about 90 per cent finished here – particularly the finessing, the niceties of the ad have not been put in – but we put it in to make sure that we are going in the right direction before it goes out to market. Again, the same focus groups, the same targets were used, and the criteria for those groups remained identical to the initial groups; they were not the same people. Consensus from the group's discussion was that riders need, for safety reasons, to move on from the blame game and to take more personal responsibility for their actions and, again, regardless of who is at fault, that riders can come out of any incident worse than a motorist. We actually did two lots of offline testing, partially because some of the things like indicators could not be clearly seen in the first offline, so we strengthened some of the issues that we found. Most of them were sort of technicalities, so we put it into a second round of testing. This is from the first round – the initial reactions by younger riders, the younger focus group, were not strong. They exhibited a belief of being victimised and attacking motorists, blaming them for whatever goes wrong – i.e. it is the motorist's fault. Older riders in these groups seem to have developed a greater sense of maturity and were more inclined to acknowledge that blaming others is wasted. However, we talked about written questionnaires being undertaken at the start of every focus group, and 90 per cent were agreeing that they needed to rethink their speed. Younger riders certainly took out the message that less speed equals less trauma for them. In the group discussion we see that all the messages around slowing down are taken out.

A second round of market research – this time with a slightly more finessed ad addressing some of the issues around not being able to see indicators et cetera. These are some of the further comments and, I suppose, a slightly clearer take-out, acknowledging that the physics side makes you think about it a bit harder.

**The CHAIR** — We might adjourn proceedings.

### **Short adjournment**

#### **Resumed.**

**Ms COCKFIELD** — I think, again, the key take-outs were fairly positive from our point of view – that they were interested in the physics; that showing it from the motorcyclist's point of view was very important – it is a less direct message – but the riders who are actually in these groups did believe that it was telling drivers to look out for them as well; they believed it was aimed at all road users, not just themselves; they believed you could not argue with the ad, interestingly! When the question of fault was raised, the response was, 'Does it really matter? He died. That was the outcome'. This is the outcome we really wanted – 'It makes you think – the bike was a fair way back'; 'It shows that speed played a part', 'It shows we do have a role to play', 'It makes me feel guilty', 'It makes me admit that I did the wrong thing'. That is where we wanted to end up. We wanted the riders to believe that they had a role to play, that they could make a difference to an outcome in terms of their own level of risk of having a crash.

**The CHAIR** — Thank you.

**Ms COCKFIELD** — Michael Nieuwesteeg will come up and talk a bit about the evaluation and monitoring of the campaign following its airing.

**Mr NIEUWESTEEG** — Okay. The evaluation of our advertising is undertaken by a research company, Sweeney Research, which looks after our advertising tracking or advertising research for all of our advertising, including motorcycle advertising. For the sake of the motorcycle campaign, when you do a

general population survey you do not get sufficient numbers of motorcyclists to do an evaluation, so we had a separate survey. Two hundred and fifty-four surveys were contacted while the ad was being aired and for a week or two afterwards. These were active riders who we had recruited from the VicRoads database.

### **Overheads shown.**

**Mr NIEUWESTEEG** — I will just take you through some slides that show the key findings. They are noted here in summary. I will just go through them one by one. They might be a bit hard to see actually so I will leave it there. The campaign achieved high levels of awareness – 89 per cent; that is the highest we have seen since we have had these kinds of surveys. So people saw the ad. These are motorcyclists actually. At the same time we were running this we were also running a survey with the general population where 86 per cent saw the ad. The recall levels are high across the board. All segments of the community appear to be seeing the ad. We asked people what is the main message of the ad, and overwhelmingly the main message is: ‘Slow down, do not speed, speeding is dangerous’ – 58 per cent. And then 12 per cent – ‘You need to be careful when riding a motorcycle or scooter; think, be aware of conditions, be alert’.

Finally we asked, ‘Is the ad talking to people like yourself?’, so it is a measure of relevance. We got a result there of 74 per cent of motorcyclists who saw the ad saying that it was talking to people like themselves. That is high across all the segments, so there is no significant difference. Then we asked whether they talked about the ad with their family and friends. This is, to us, an important measure that gives us a sense of, not only what is relevant but ‘Did you do something about it?’. Forty-seven per cent said they talked about the ad. That is a high result compared with our other advertising campaigns. When we looked at the drivers of the general motoring population, 30 per cent said they talked about the ad to others. There is a big difference there between males and females. The female motorcycles – 72 per cent talked about the ad to someone else; and 44 per cent of the male motorcyclists talked about the ad to someone else.

We asked why people think the ad is talking to them or not. The main mention for why it is talking to them is, ‘It’s talking to me, my age group’, ‘It applies to all riders, ‘I can relate to it’, ‘I’ve been in that situation’, ‘Drivers don’t see you on the bike’, ‘They don’t look out for you’, ‘You are at risk when you ride a motorcycle’. Why viewers do not think the ad is talking to them – 26 per cent of motorcyclists who saw the ad said it is not talking to them. The main mention there is, ‘I don’t agree with advertising’, ‘I’m older now; I ride more safely’, ‘It should be aimed at vehicle drivers’, ‘Ads always show the rider is at fault – that is 11 per cent of the 26 per cent – then a whole lot of things like ‘I don’t speed; it doesn’t apply to me’, ‘I don’t ride on the road’, ‘I’m a safe rider’. Finally, perhaps the most important measure is – we asked, ‘As a result of seeing the ad did you change your behaviour in any way?’, and 24 per cent said yes, they did change their behaviour in some way. When we compare that to the general motoring population, 29 per cent of general motorists said they changed their behaviour. The main way they changed their behaviour was – this is the motorcyclists – ‘More careful at all times’: 63 per cent of the 24 per cent. The next most common mention was “Slow down” then “ride more carefully”, and makes me think of the consequences of my actions’. I suppose that is evaluated as about as good as we could have hoped.

**Mr TILLEY** — Can I just ask you about that Sweeney sample of 254. Is the TAC prepared us with an exact detail of those questions that were asked? I appreciate what the outcomes are, but the exact questions and the way that the telephone poll interview was conducted.

**Mr NIEUWESTEEG** — I have a report to —

**Mr TILLEY** — No, not a report.

**Mr NIEUWESTEEG** — The report —

**Mr TILLEY** — No, hang on, the exact questions that were asked to that sample?

**Mr NIEUWESTEEG** — I am happy to provide them. I will do that on Monday.

**Mr TILLEY** — Okay. Terrific.

**Mr THOMPSON** — Just on that, when we do publish the report, and we publish our reports specifically on motorcycling on our Spokes website, at the bottom of all the pages it actually lists the specific questions. So our tracking surveys and so forth that are on Spokes, which Michael mentioned earlier – and you can see actually in the slides there; you can see the questions at the bottom. The report incorporates the questions that will be made publicly available.

**Mr TILLEY** — Are you able to tell us – when the telephone poll was conducted was it a choice between 1 and 5 or 1 and 10? How do you rate this? Was it conducted in that fashion?

**Mr NIEUWESTEEG** — No, not for these questions. There are some questions where we might use that kind of a scale but not in this case.

**Mr TILLEY** — All right.

**Mr THOMPSON** — That concludes our presentation. We have a number of TAC motorcycling campaigns at the end of the presentation, but we will leave that for the committee's information. I am happy to answer questions.

**The CHAIR** — Thanks very much, John. Yes, we have got a number of questions that we will work our way through. Commencing – the TAC is renowned for his advertising campaigns. However, the committee has been told that overwhelmingly motorcyclists dislike the focus on speed that is apparent in most of your recent advertising campaigns. How do you reconcile the views of these motorcyclists with those in the broader community?

**Mr THOMPSON** — I mentioned earlier that there were 59 campaigns that the TAC has run in 25 years on speeding, and this was the very first that we had focused on directly talking to motorcyclists. I was not around 25 years ago or 20 years ago when the very first speeding campaigns were released, but I could imagine that the community response would be very different to what it is today when you are talking to general motorists about speeding. It is probably even more important to note that the two campaigns that we looked at to make mirror images of were motorist campaigns – the 'Slo-Mo' campaign and the previous 'Reconstruction' campaign that Peter featured in in 2006. They were both targeting car drivers in those scenarios in 2002 and in 2006, and we did not get a backlash then from the motoring community because they had been brought along the journey. This particular campaign is the first time we are speaking motorcyclists about their speeding behaviour. We are bringing them along the journey. It is part of a journey we hope they can take with us. We are understanding of the response at this stage. Is there anything you want to contribute to that?

**Ms COCKFIELD** — I agree. When we introduce new issues, and I was at the tail end of the drink drive, bloody idiot slogan – it was highly concerning to a small proportion of the community. We now accept that as the vernacular, and in fact I think Victoria has a large degree of ownership and is quite proud of that slogan and where it has gone around the world. We know it is hard. It is long term; behavioural change is long term. Speeding and speed is a very big issue for us. You have seen where we think we can make gains, and John presented a slide earlier, but we know that the community is not at the same place that we are as road safety professionals, and that is not just in Victoria, it is Australia-wide and it is an international issue. It is our job to introduce and educate the community, including riders, about what the issues are and actually take them on the journey and hopefully have a Victoria where everybody does believe speeding is unacceptable.

**Mr THOMPSON** — Just to add a little bit further – a more recent example of where we have brought a new issue to light through public education is drug driving. I do not think anyone in this room would argue that drug driving is wrong. However, when we brought the issue of being affected by marijuana and driving to the community there was significant debate. We got a lot of correspondence in through the door at the TAC that said, 'I should be allowed to smoke marijuana and drive. There should be some allowance in that'. You know, when we bring issues to light with the community we do get a backlash. People disagree; that is part of being in, I suppose, the democracy that we live in. It happens when we bring new issues to the table, absolutely.

**The CHAIR** — John, thank you. Mr Languiller.

**Mr LANGUILLER** — Thank you. Can I first indicate that, as you would aware, our committee went to Sweden, London, France, Belgium and Holland, and we met with, arguably, the best in the world. Can I put on record that we received nothing but complimentary reports about the TAC, and I think it would be the view of our committee that fundamentally it is good – 99-plus; you do a terrific job. But we may well have differences in terms how you have managed this ad, and I think this is an example of that. If anything, I would hope and I think the committee would hope that we drive this inquiry so that you and we and the rider fraternity can build better bridges and communication and partnerships. I put to you the following, and I ask you the following question: you have explained the process involved in the development of motorcycle safety advertisements; do you have any suggestions as to how it could be improved in the future?

**Mr THOMPSON** — One of the issues that we have already raised today and I mentioned is that it is pleasing to hear that the VMC are becoming a more focused organisation that is going to represent the wide community of motorcyclists. I think that is pleasing. I have spoken with Peter outside today and reiterated that if this question came up, I would give this answer. Through the process whenever we are talking to the motorcycle community we often get the comment, ‘Don’t talk to him, talk to me. Don’t talk to that person, talk to someone else’. We get a lot of disparate views, and they are not always unified. So if there is an opportunity through this exercise, if this campaign has brought about the issue that gets the motorcycle lobby and the motorcycle community more unified, then I think that is a positive.

**Mr LANGUILLER** — With respect, John, I have to interrupt you here. In what way is this fraternity different to any other fraternity of road users? In what way are they different? Would you not get the same thing with other road users?

**Mr THOMPSON** — No, we do not.

**Mr LANGUILLER** — Why would you want to expect that they be unified?

**Mr THOMPSON** — There are significant differences between this road-using community and other road-using communities. There is a significant recreational component to motorcycle riding, and that is very different and we have to appreciate that and understand that. That is certainly one issue. We welcome the opportunity to work with the motorcycling community. Rob Smith has been involved with our most recent Ride Smart product. He has been given every opportunity to consult on that product and has been involved. He found – in his own words when we talked about it – it difficult to commit the time to it. This is one of the issues that we have with voluntary community groups. As I showed you before, I have a very small team at the TAC. We do our absolute best to communicate and consult with the broad disparate motorcycling community. If we can get more coordination in that community, I think it will help improve that.

**Mr TILLEY** — I suppose with the conversation we have been having today we have been probably seeing some challenges in relation to credibility. We have seen the ‘Reconstruction’ ad; we have seen the particular section of our user groups on our network that have demonstrated their concerns for that messaging, as they understand it. I suggest that we will probably have to go on for a little while in relation to this. First up I want to make sure that you completely understand that I am not making any assertions whatsoever in relation to those who are working at the TAC, Victoria Police, VicRoads or any other stakeholders, particularly Detective Acting Senior Sergeant Peter Bellion. I know the many years of study, turning out at night in those hours and seeing what happens and the carnage that happens on our roads, so not for one moment is this taking anything away from the hard work and effort and the things you have had to put up with over many, many years, and your team. Certainly what I need to probably go to is this final product that has been put out to the Victorian viewing public and what at the end of day it demonstrates and the credibility. Where I am leading to is probably firstly, Peter, that since this product and since the survey and so forth and since the last set you were asked a question in relation to whether the TAC particularly consulted with the VMC in relation to this ad, and in its evidence it said that it was not consulted in relation to this particular ‘Reconstruction’ ad. Since that time, also, have you or anybody – and this is probably to you, Peter – been aware of any public statements being made that the VMC endorsed the ‘Reconstruction’ ad at all?

**Det. Acting Sr Sgt BELLION** — In regard to that, back in September of last year there was a meeting conducted at the Victoria Police Centre. Present at that meeting was myself, Superintendent Bob Stork and

Deputy Commissioner Kieran Walshe. Also present was Mr Peter Baulch and Stuart Strickland and another lady who is in the room – excuse, I cannot remember her name. Most of that was in regard to – I will just go to some notes in regard to that situation. The purpose of that meeting was in regard to motorcycle accident investigation. There was also a discussion in regard to certain police operations that had been conducted where motorcycle enforcement education had taken place as well as discussion in regard to motorcycle registration labels. During that meeting Mr Strickland showed me a CD he had obtained in regard to motorcycle accident investigation. I requested whether it was possible to be provided with a copy of this in order to see whether the techniques incorporated on it could be implemented by Victoria Police in training for motorcycle accident investigation. Towards the end of that meeting I advised members of the VMC present in regard to the proposed ‘Reconstruction’ advertisement. It was still at stage in its infancy; there was no script shown. That was going to educate in regard to the speed factor associated with a car turning and a motorcycle speeding in a 60-kilometre metro speed environment, giving a very basic precise of the scenario. I cannot recall the precise conversation. However, it was generally along the lines that that would be good idea, and it was towards the end of the meeting as people were going. The actual proposed script for the advertisement was not shown to the members of the Victorian Motorcycle Council present as it was not endorsed. It was only discussed towards the end of the meeting. At this stage the script was in the infancy of development. So that is in response to that.

There has been some other discussions in regard to whether that was discussed at a forum in South Australia, in regard to that aspect and in regard to a letter that I had received in relation to that, which had come through Maurice Blackburn; in relation to what was contained in that letter at that motorcycle forum in Adelaide on 29 May 2012. Prior to that forum commencing I spoke with Mr Neville Gray of the MRA, as he was discussing the motorcycle ‘Reconstruction’ ad. This private discussion was before most of the forum attendees arrived. I communicated to Mr Gray in regard to the discussion I had with Mr Baulch and Mr Strickland at the end of the meeting held on 14 September 2011. I discussed with Mr Gray various aspects of motorcycle emergency braking, as found from physical evidence located at fatal crash scenes. I discussed with Mr Gray that I had heard Mr Baulch on the 3AW Neil Mitchell program criticising the physics of the advertisement. I discussed with Mr Gray that I had heard Mr Baulch say on Mitchell’s program the motorcycling ad would have ABS/integrated braking disconnected. I discussed with Mr Gray that the motorcycle in the ad is a 2008 Yamaha YZF-R1 that did not have ABS/integrated braking available as an option. I discussed with Mr Gray the differences between maximum effective braking, as reported in various test results, compared with actual emergency braking, as exhibited in fatal or life-threatening injury motorcycle crashes that I have attended. I discussed with Mr Gray that Mr Baulch in talking with Neil Mitchell had not spoken about the distance that would be travelled during perception/reaction response time prior to braking, which needs to be added to the braking distance.

**Mr TILLEY** — Thanks for that. I think it clears up some – yes. All right. I want to talk a little bit about the website as well, which sort of relates to this ‘Reconstruction’ ad. I do not know whether you would recall – this is for anybody if you recall the website here; I do not know whether we have got any other additional copies; if I am able to make them available to you, if we can. I have got a snapshot of the website taken from 21 August this year at 3 p.m. If we go probably over to page – it is probably the following page; sorry about that – the section, ‘Travelling at or below the speed limit’.

**Mr THOMPSON** — This is the section here – page 8, the middle of the page?

**Mr TILLEY** — Page 8, roughly about the middle of the page, yes, John.

**Mr THOMPSON** — Yes. Okay.

**Mr TILLEY** — Where it reads:

*Travelling at or below the speed limit - Speeding increases the risk of a crash and being killed or serious injured. The faster the travel speed, the less time there is to react, and the longer it will take to brake or take evasive action. Evidence also suggests that excessive speed by motorcyclists may reduce their ability to be seen by other road users, making collisions and injuries more likely.*

I just want to go to the reference in relation to that statement on the website. Are you familiar with the

reference there, back to a paperback in 2001 – *Finding fault in motorcycle crashes in Hawaii – environmental, temporal, spatial and human factors?*

**Ms COCKFIELD** — I do not think I could talk about it at any length, no.

**Mr TILLEY** — The reason I am discussing that with you is that it is a matter of credibility. Here we have the end product that we are demonstrating to Victorians. We are sending a message to a user group – motorcyclists, car users – yet at the end of the day it is the credibility. On one part we have the police. What is wrong with the police telling the truth? After all, they are the police. We have a representative from Victoria Police in an advertisement demonstrating to all Victorians the importance of road safety in the state of Victoria, yet we have some difficulties here today, and we have discussed the credibility of the end product that has been put out through this particular campaign. The research behind this particular campaign refers to a paperback which is probably 11 years old in relation to motorcycle crashes in Hawaii. If you just look at the topography of Hawaii, for example – I have not been there, but I suggest that its road infrastructure is probably a little bit different to Victoria's. The road conditions are a little bit different. The fleet itself is probably, no doubt, different.

**Ms COCKFIELD** — Certainly others may wish to speak about this, but in terms of studies and in terms of the information gathered, change does not happen in short periods of time. Physics does not change. Even though I know we do actually quote another study, which is quite a bit older than that, at the end of the day the physics in crashes do not change. We often do not need to re-do work and reinvent the wheel because we are in Victoria. This is why we often do rely studies that we feel have actually undertaken the work and make the point. A lot of the work we rely in the speeding area has not come out of Victoria, but I do not think it makes it any less credible, and I do not think much changes in what we would consider relatively short periods of time – you know, in a decade or so. Michael?

**Mr NIEUWESTEEG** — Because we are managing a research budget of around \$2 million a year we have got to make that cover all sorts of road safety issues. If a question has been answered, I think it is not necessarily the best use of money to go and re-answer that question for a different context, when there are other questions that have not been answered anywhere in the world that we are working on. It is a matter of making do with what resources we have got and trying to position that as best we can.

**Mr TILLEY** — Is it fair to say that we are in this situation where we have a credibility issue with a campaign by the TAC and the end product? We are struggling with that today. So it goes down to the very point of the research and the background that is being used and making the point that, in previous evidence that we have heard during this inquiry, Victoria has enormous difficulties, challenges and problems when it comes to data collection – not only the TAC, not only VicRoads, but hospitals, the police, and at the end of the day it is what we are trying to message to Victorian users and at the end of day trying to keep our safe state.

**Mr THOMPSON** — And we develop our campaigns and we develop our responses to these problems that we are faced with based on the best available information, and we invest, as Michael said, in research and in improving our understanding of the available data. We are working every day on trying to improve that data collection and understanding of data. There is work being done by the TAC and our partner agencies on that very issue right now.

**Mr TILLEY** — We have heard – and probably this in relation to the quality of work – that a significant number of Victorians and tourists and people who come to Victoria are killed on our roads. The quality that we heard – that the standard for a brief of evidence or an inquest brief for whatever court of appropriate jurisdiction or wherever it is heading, with the work that has gone into this ad and the message that we try to educate Victorians, how close would that standard be in comparison?

**Mr THOMPSON** — It is a little bit too confusing —

**Det. Acting Sr Sgt BELLION** — Yes. What is the question?

**Mr TILLEY** — I mean, the standard that is expected of a brief of evidence for a court of appropriate

jurisdiction or an inquest brief for the coroner – and we had spoke earlier during this evidence that that standard is significantly high. Why would we do it any differently to Victorian taxpayers, Victorian road users, in relation to that standard?

**Det. Acting Sr Sgt BELLION** — What the TAC is trying to do here in this ad is educate motorcycle riders to slow down a little bit in the metropolitan urban environment. When you see what can happen to them, there is good reason. It is for their safety. I personally wish I had never ever got involved in it, with the heartache that something is caused from behind me. Anyway I did it for their safety, and over the period of time that that ad was on it showed there was a reduction in trauma of motorcyclists in this state. I can live with that because that is what it was all about – saving lives and saving injuries. I will give it a break for a minute. I will get my thoughts together.

**The CHAIR** — We have got another question from Mr Languiller.

**Mr LANGUILLER** — On the subject, it is not disputed here by anyone in this room that we have got to do things in the name of safety and saving lives, and the thing that processes and the mechanisms which lead to (#indistinct) are you familiar with the case of the Supreme Court of Victoria, Walton v Paxton, 11 and 12 October, 8 December 1967?

**Mr THOMPSON** — We are familiar with it. Peter is probably best to answer that question.

**Det. Acting Sr Sgt BELLION** — A simple explanation of that was shown in Rob Salvatore's presentation.

**Mr LANGUILLER** — Can you confirm for the committee that this is the case which was used as the basis for the construction of the ad?

**Det. Acting Sr Sgt BELLION** — No, it was not used for the basis of the construction of the ad; it was used in regard to a question that came up in regard to whether the driver be likely to be prosecuted for failure to give way after the ad was filmed.

**Mr LANGUILLER** — It is my understanding that this was used in WA in 1971. It is also my understanding that it was used once and once only. Is that correct?

**Det. Acting Sr Sgt BELLION** — I cannot answer that, but that case is referenced in the text that I explained to you before, which is one of the texts that Victoria Police look at in terms of making decisions on whether to prosecute or not prosecute in regard to traffic incidents in this state. And it is one of the texts that we refer to.

**Mr LANGUILLER** — I am not legally trained; I am not lawyer, but as a layman it does surprise me that we are using a case that is dating back to 1967, which was only used in a court of law as a precedent once in 1971. Is that common among —

**Det Acting Sr Sgt BELLION** — Case law is case law. Some of the case law is in regard to a number of other things. It can go back for a lot longer period of time. The fact is that it is there and it is case law, and it is referenced in the legal text that we refer to.

**Mr LANGUILLER** — Okay. Thank you.

**Mr ELSBURY** — As we have said, there have been – or as we have found out today – we have found out that there were 59 advertising campaigns on speed, this being the first one focused on speeding of motorcyclists. You have run some very good campaigns in the past for motorcycle safety. I mean, 'Put yourself in their shoes', swapping over the driver with the motorcyclist in getting an in-head view of all the threats that are coming at a motorcyclist. Some would say you need an element of paranoia being on a bike to be able to survive. I know; I have been there; a truck tried to kill me! You have also done the 'reduce the risk' – so putting on the equipment, being perceptive of what the other drivers are up to. Admittedly, at the end of that particular advertisement you kill off another motorcyclist, but we will not go into that today. In this

advertisement did you make a conscious decision not to mention the fact that the driver did not give way as part of this advertisement? I mean, it could have just been easy to have a few words added into the script that said 'This guy is on the road. This bloke didn't give way, and if we take it back, this is what has happened before. If we change this aspect the bloke still doesn't give way but you can still get around him'.

**Mr THOMPSON** — Yes. It is a good point in relation to the communications. We tested all of these things, as we explained. The single purpose of the ad was to explain the small increase in speed can lead to a risk. We were trying to keep the idea single-focused around speeding, hence why we did not deliberately discuss the driver pulling out and then getting confused in the discussion of who is at fault. As you can see from the research, the riders themselves who were consulted in the research did not see fault as a big issue in their interpretation of the communication in that they saw it was important to understand the context; they understood the risks, and they understood what we were trying to communicate, which was speed.

**Mr ELSBURY** — But I mean your researchers also found that 26 per cent did not feel that it cut through with them.

**Mr THOMPSON** — But that is consistent with many of our campaigns because a lot of people – and there is a vast majority of people out there using our roads who it will not talk to because (a) they do not speed, they ride safely or they drive safely. So some of our communication – and it would be unreasonable of any of us to expect that every piece of communication talks 100 per cent to 100 per cent of people. We expect that there are some people who it is not going to be for.

**Mr PERERA** — You mentioned before that when the TV ad was on the air you were measuring the effectiveness of the campaign. My question is: how do you measure the effectiveness of your safety campaign in terms of the actual reduction of road trauma? How do you improve that road behaviour? You have done a number of campaigns, not just this campaign, so how do you —

**Mr THOMPSON** — With any particular campaign that we are running, this one or others, we will measure people's recall. The ability to remember the message first – that is a fairly standard advertising metric for campaign performance, so that is that, but in terms of linking it to behaviour, we measure self-reported behaviour. To give you an example, the 'Wipe Off 5' campaign – when that commenced here in Victoria in 2001 we asked Victorians whether they sped. We asked them on a scale, 'Do you speed all of the time? Do you speed some of the time? Do you speed most of the time?' – or never; you know, there was a scale. When we started that campaign in 2001, 25 per cent of the population reported back to the Transport Accident Commission that they speed all or most of the time. Okay. So we have measured that. And as we talked about, long-term behaviour change – we have measured that for the last decade, and now in current testing we get around about 8 to 10 per cent of the population saying they speed all or most of the time, and the 'never speed' has increased. So we are able to measure behaviour; admittedly self-reported. But then we also look and monitor trends. We monitor road fatalities, we monitor serious injuries, we look at enforcement numbers, we measure mean travel speeds through VicRoads studies and so forth. So we have got a vast array of data that we can rely on to give indicators. The key thing is that I am not going to put my hand on my heart and say, 'That campaign saved that many lives'. That is not impossible. You cannot do that because, as I said earlier, we work in partnership – we have got Victoria Police out there doing its bit, we have got VicRoads doing its bit, improving the infrastructure and managing the road system, and we have got DOJ providing laws and managing the speed camera program, for example. It is a genuine partnership; we work together. We do not say that the advertising component has saved X number of lives on its own. I cannot say that, and I would never say that.

**The CHAIR** — Thank you. I have got a couple of questions in relation to focus groups.

**Mr THOMPSON** — Sure.

**The CHAIR** — Have any suggested focus group participants ever been rejected by the TAC and, if so, on what basis?

**Mr THOMPSON** — Not to my knowledge.

**Ms COCKFIELD** — It is probably worth just quickly talking about —

**Mr THOMPSON** — What do you mean by ‘rejected’? Yes.

**Ms COCKFIELD** — Yes.

**Mr THOMPSON** — Not to my —

**Mr NIEUWESTEEG** — If I can try —

**Mr THOMPSON** — Yes. Okay.

**Mr NIEUWESTEEG** — For every attempt at doing some research we establish who our target is. There will be a phone call; there will be a recruitment agency that will manage it. There will be a phone call usually, trying to ascertain whether someone meets the criteria; that someone fits in the target group. I am not sure where the question is really coming from, but if someone approaches us and says, ‘Can I be in the research?’, that is going to give us an unrepresentative bit of research. If someone says, ‘Can I bring my mate along?’, we are probably going to say no because they have not been recruited in the same way as everyone else has; this person has an unequal chance of being involved in the research. So that can happen, and that is, I think, for legitimate reasons.

**The CHAIR** — Would a question be put to prospective participants as to whether they belong to a motorcycle group?

**Mr NIEUWESTEEG** — I have not seen any such criteria applied, though I am sure the answer is no.

**Mr LANGUILLER** — The question relates as to whether any motorcycle safety levy funds were used in the production of this advertisement, and, if so, are you able to say how much?

**Mr THOMPSON** — No, zero, no.

**Mr LANGUILLER** — No?

**Mr THOMPSON** — No. The TAC funds its own motorcycle safety programs out of the funds that the TAC generates. The motorcycle levy funds go to VicRoads mainly.

**Mr LANGUILLER** — Thank you.

**The CHAIR** — Just going briefly back to my previous question. Would any members of the focus groups be also members of a group such as the VMC?

**Mr NIEUWESTEEG** — If they were selected in the same way everyone else was, they could be. We have actually in some research that Sweeney did for us – a couple of years ago we asked participants in the sample whether they were involved in motorcycle group of sorts, and we asked them to nominate. I do not have the results with me now, but we can provide those to you, if you are interested.

**Mr THOMPSON** — I can answer that. It is about 21 per cent of that survey. So if you are looking back in our presentation, Chair, where we referred to a motorcycle tracking study that has about 1700 motorcyclists – we asked a question: are they a member of a motorcycle club? The reason we asked that is to understand how effective using motorcycle clubs as a communication channel may be. That is why we wanted to understand that. We asked that question for two years during that study period. So there were over 3000 motorcyclists we asked, and about a 78–79 per cent said, ‘No, not a member of a motorcycle club’; about 21–22 per cent, ‘Yes, I am a member of a motorcycle club’. As Michael explained, it is broken down into, ‘I am a member of the MRA’, ‘I am a member Ulysses’, ‘I am a member of the Williamstown off-road motorcycling club’ – in very small numbers, 1 and 2 per cent out of that 20 per cent. That was the purpose of that question, but it has never, to my knowledge, been the purpose of a recruitment question. More recently we have done some studies where I have certainly offered some people who are in this room to be involved some initial concept – some

exploratory research, I should say, not concept research, and, pleasingly, they have taken that up. So we have had a couple of riders who I have had conversations with about that be involved; that is good.

**Mr TILLEY** — You spoke about stakeholders and groups that you consult with, including VicRoads and Victoria Police amongst others. Is RACV one of them?

**Mr THOMPSON** — That we consult with?

**Mr TILLEY** — Yes.

**Mr THOMPSON** — We do work with RACV on projects from time to time, but we do not seek its input in the development of our campaigns.

**Mr TILLEY** — All right. What about the Victorian Motorcycle Action Group, VMAG – recently; probably over the last —

**Mr THOMPSON** — The VicRoads Motorcycle Advisory Group? We sit on that. We have a representative. Sam is our representative on that.

**Mr TILLEY** — The ‘Reconstruction’ ad – did you consult with VMAG?

**Mr THOMPSON** — I do not believe we consulted with them to inputting them into the campaign. We certainly made them aware we were making a campaign.

**Mr TILLEY** — So you did not invite any conversation in relation to the design or —

**Mr THOMPSON** — It is VicRoads advisory group, and we advise VicRoads on our activities. One of the things that we previously did with VMAC was each year present our business plan. We have not done that with VMAG as yet. We are organising an invitation to do that. It is not our committee. We do not run it; we are a participant in it, but we are more than happy to present our business plan and discuss any of the projects we do and are involved in, and if we can get useful input through that process, we would welcome it.

**Mr PERERA** — Information on your website about the campaign states there is case law that states you cannot give way to something you cannot see, which we have seen you have presented in your presentation, so what are the exact details of the case law, the technical side of it.

**Mr THOMPSON** — It relates back to the case law. It is the same question.

**Mr PERERA** — It has been covered?

**Mr THOMPSON** — Yes.

**Mr ELSBURY** — In relation to some of the international campaigns that we have been exposed to, there is a very large focus on driver awareness of motorcyclists, of threat perception for drivers of motorcyclists and sharing the road with other road users. Do you agree that if there is a problem with this particular advertisement it is that it reaffirms a prejudice amongst drivers that motorcyclists are at fault for what happens on the roads?

**Mr THOMPSON** — There are a few things in your question. We never find in the research we do – and we talk to motorists – prejudice about motorcyclists. We do not — it does not come up.

**Comment from the floor.**

**The CHAIR** — Order, please.

**Mr THOMPSON** — In relation to campaigns that the TAC has been involved in, in terms of getting

motorists to look out for riders, I think it is important to note and should go on record that we ran the 'Put yourself in their shoes' campaign for six weeks this year already and that we have supported – we actually project managed a VMAC initially and now I suppose a MAG introduction of the 'Look Again' campaign from the UK. In fact the TAC paid for the media for that campaign to run. So we have done significant work already and continue to do significant work in talking to motorists about looking out for motorcyclists, but I reiterate the point that we do not see in our research and we do not hear when we talk to general motorists this perception of some sort of undue relationship between cars and motorcycles. We do not see that.

**The CHAIR** — Thank you. Just going back to the role of focus groups. I know Ms Cockfield had addressed a number of issues regarding focus groups and their composition and also the process of the development of the advertisement, but were any changes made to the ad as a result of the focus group comments in addition to the one about the initial adjusted from 75 kilometres per hour being the suggested speed, and it has dropped back to 68. What other focus group input commentary changed the outline of the advertisement?

**Mr THOMPSON** — I cannot speak for those particular focus groups; I was actually not at them, but I can talk in general terms about what sorts of things come out of focus groups. We often change wording in scripts. We make alterations to help make the campaign more understandable, easier to digest. We might change a particular scene. One of the things that we looked for with this particular campaign was a shot of the driver actually looking, and we did not have one. So that was one of the things that we did not have in the production of the campaign. Through that process we looked for and we got a better scene showing the driver actually looking. That is one of the issues with constructing a motorcycle or a vehicle accident. Some of the things that were presented by Rob Salvatore today, just showing particularly the compression of the front forks and those sorts of things – I think we need to understand that we did not actually crash that bike, as depicted in that scene; we had a stunt rider do something different. So that compression of the front brake would have been – that scene is actually a constructed scene, digitally constructed, so we would overlay a number of images over the top to create that picture. So in reality it is not a piece of reality, if that makes some sense. As that bike was hitting the car the stunt rider would have been preparing to leave the bike. He would have had his hands off the brakes, hence why the compression of the forks, the front brakes, was probably not clear in that shot. It is just one of the issues that we had counter when providing safety for our stunt crew.

**The CHAIR** — Thank you.

**Ms COCKFIELD** — I was going to say that a lot of what we are looking for is that sort of detail – 'Could this be me?', 'Do I believe it?', 'Is the scenario realistic?'. That is why we have focus groups. We have the target market in there. We have criteria which say you must be an active rider – you cannot just have a licence; you actually have to tell us that you are riding regularly. They did pick up things. One of the things I do remember quite clearly is they just kept on talking about how they could not see the indicator, and we are thinking we could see it because we were at the shoot and we know it was on. We just had to actually enhance the indicator. There are little things that we are never going to pick up that the focus group will pick up, and there are lines that we think are quite clear which are not as clear to the target market. So we are always clarifying and making sure that the ad is actually going to achieve what we set out to achieve. Hence, in this particular ad we actually did do two rounds of offline testing to make sure we got it right.

**Mr LANGUILLER** — Just a brief question, if I could take you back to your PowerPoint presentation. You showed us the structure of your road safety group at the TAC. Is there a motorcycle expert rider in that group?

**Mr THOMPSON** — There are at least two licensed people —

**Ms COCKFIELD** — There are four.

**Mr THOMPSON** — There are four people with motorcycle licences.

## **Comment from the floor.**

**The CHAIR** — Order. Throughout our review of this matter there is perhaps a reflected view that the TAC has at times not been taking the whole motorcycle community with it in its development. That might be a view that is reflected in this room. Do you have any thoughts as to how that might be further addressed into the future, noting your earlier comments today as well – that you have had some discussions with some of the members of the groups here today?

**Mr THOMPSON** — We welcome dialogue with the motorcycle community. I do not think anyone in my team would argue that. There have been some issues over that journey, Chair. We are happy to continue having dialogue with the motorcycle community. We are very pleased to hear that they are going to be more coordinated, because I do have a very small team and it is important that we have a resource allocation to that community. I am happy to have continued conversations. I have with spoken with Peter today myself and continue to offer to have dialogue with Peter, and I think that is positive.

**Mr CHAIR** — Thank you. I note that the concept planning for this particular commercial commenced in about June 2011. The question has been raised – why a decision was made to proceed with this sort of advertisement when a study, the nature of the parliamentary inquiry, was earlier initiated and why there was this interim focus on motorcycle safety matters when the results of the inquiry had not come to the fore and will not be available until December?

**Mr THOMPSON** — I suppose the best way to answer that is that we have got an existing program in place, that we have set about a course of a motorcycle safety program that we started in 2008. If you look in our PowerPoint presentation – we have done five campaigns, three of them have been in the last four years, focused on motorcycle safety. Michael explained that we have increased our investment in research. We are seriously concerned about motorcycle safety, and we have a program in place. Delivering a program that we are already committed to was important to our structure, our business plan and our board, which we report to. The inquiry, we felt, would only add further value to our future campaigns.

**Ms COCKFIELD** — I think possibly having a slightly longer history of coming to these hearings and involvement, we have always taken them seriously but have also always continued on with our programs. We believe they are evidence based. We use a good evidence base to develop the programs and believe the same evidence base will basically come to the hearings, but we have always, I think, taken full note of recommendations coming out of the committee and, I would think, have acted. I can think of some key recommendations and other things, like barrier systems et cetera, which we have picked up and really run with once the committee has recommended them. For us, your work is incredibly important. We will actually be certainly looking at your recommendations and obviously taking full heed of them. But we cannot stop our programs. We cannot stop trying to save lives, reducing trauma and reducing cost because something is happening, which we believe we are on the right track to as well.

**Mr CHAIR** — Thank you. Colleagues, any other questions or comments? All right. By way of summary, I would like to thank the representatives of the TAC campaign for coming along today – Mr Thompson, Ms Cockfield, Detective Acting Senior Sergeant Peter Bellion and Michael Nieuwesteeg. I would like to pick up one comment too that was made earlier on. I think Detective Acting Senior Sergeant Peter Bellion made a remark, a throw-away line, that this issue has caused him a lot of heartache. Just from my point of view – and I think I would reflect the view of many people, not only in the Victorian community but further afield, that we are very grateful for your expertise that has been contributed to accident investigation. The skill that you have acquired over a long period of engagement and your background as an engineer in applying the physics to analysis is much valued. The focus upon saving lives and reducing injuries is a very important focus, so I echo those thoughts and those views that are shared by my colleagues. I think we treat this as a continuing dialogue and debate. I thank those members of the wider Victorian community who have given of their time to attend here today as well. The reproduction of sound is not very strong in this room. The microphones here are just for Hansard, and it will be a matter I will take up with the presiding officers, as I think whenever there is a public hearing that takes place it is important that members of the community who give of their time to attend here can hear comfortably what is taking place. I do thank you for your forbearance and your contribution. I would like to thank the executive staff of the committee for their preparation for today and for the work that has been undertaken. Thank you for your attendance.

**Committee adjourned.**