



**ASSOCIATION OF
CHIEF POLICE OFFICERS**

ACPO Motorcycle Safety Strategy 2014 – 2018

The Association of Chief Police Officers have agreed to this guidance being circulated to, and adopted by, Police Forces in England and Wales.

It is NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED/RESTRICTED under the Government Protective Marking Scheme and any referrals for advice and rationale in relation to Freedom of Information Act disclosure, should be made to the ACPO Central Referral Unit at acpo.advice@foi.pnn.police.uk.

Document information

Protective marking	NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED
Author	DCC Tim Madgwick
Force/Organisation	North Yorkshire Police
National Policing Business Area	Uniformed Operations
Contact details	(01609) 789000
Review date	April, 2018
Version	2.0

This Guidance has been produced by the National Policing Uniformed Operations Business Area and has been endorsed by Chief Constables' Council in August 2014. ACPO has agreed to this guidance being circulated to and adopted by Police Forces in England and Wales. It will be updated according to legislative and policy changes and re-published as required.

Any queries relating to this document should be directed to either the author detailed above or the ACPO Programme Support Office on 020 7084 8958/8959.

Contents

Section		Page
1	Introduction	4
2	Aims and Strategic direction	4
3	Key Groups	5
4	Education	5
5	Enforcement	6
6	Effective Partnerships	6

Appendix A	ACPO Workbook
-------------------	----------------------

1. SECTION 1: Introduction.

- 1.1 In 2013, 331 motorcyclists were killed on British roads. 4,866 more were seriously injured. Whilst 2013 has seen a slight reduction in those seriously injured, there has been a 1 per cent increase in those being killed, the first increase since 2006. Too many motorcyclists are being killed or injured on our roads.
- 1.2 This strategy builds upon, and replaces the *ACPO National Motorcycle Enforcement Strategy*, with a view to placing education at the heart of making motorcycling safer. Whilst it is accepted that there are a wide range of activities currently being undertaken by forces, and it is important that this local discretion is maintained, education should be the common thread running through all activity.
- 1.3 It is important to avoid unhelpful stereotyping when considering how to improve motorcycle safety. This applies to both motorcyclists and others. For example, studies show that many motorcyclists blame car drivers for their lack of motorcycle awareness, yet statistics reveal that a sizeable proportion of accidents involve no other vehicle. Equally, many of these accidents are not caused by excess speed or reckless behaviour per se, but rather inexperience and poor reading of the road are all too often leading to tragedy.
- 1.4 Furthermore, this is a problem affecting all areas of the UK. Again, there are preconceptions that serious motorcycle accidents happen on rural B-roads, yet a study by Transport for London shows that 1600 motorcyclists are killed per billion kilometres travelled in London; comparing this to the figure of 200 car drivers and passengers in the same measure, and it is apparent just how vulnerable urban motorcyclists are.

2. SECTION 2: Aims and Strategic Direction.

- 2.1 The aim of this strategy is to reduce the number of motorcyclists killed or injured.
- 2.2 In order to achieve this, the strategy focuses upon several key themes:
1. All enforcement activity should reflect the threat posed and therefore potential for harm;
 2. Where behaviour can be changed through education and that is a proportionate response to the behaviour, this should be the primary response;
 3. For those cases where education is inappropriate, the enforcement should be robust.
- 2.3 In essence, for minor infringements of speed limits, technical offences around construction and use etc., and where error or inexperience have clearly played a part, we should seek to reform that person's behaviour. Prosecution should be reserved for the hard-core of extreme offenders or those whose offending is repeated.
- 2.4 Furthermore, whilst education is at the heart of this strategy, it has to be appropriate. This strategy strongly promotes the use of motorcycle-specific training where available, rather than generic road safety courses. For example, the use of the Ride scheme to address a speed infringement might be more appropriate than a speed awareness course which is predominantly undertaken by car drivers.

3. SECTION 3: Key Groups.

- 3.1 Research shows that whilst the number of people motorcycling remains broadly stable, the sale of scooters and other low-powered motorcycles has fallen by as much as 15%. Whilst there has been a significant fall in the number of super sports motorcycles sold, this has been mirrored by rises in adventure sports, which although not built with the race circuit in mind, are still powerful machines. These figures would suggest that motorcyclists are using more powerful motorcycles from the outset of their riding. This is particularly apparent amongst urban commuters, who it would seem prize speed over fuel-efficiency. It is imperative that riders skill and experience matches the type of motorcycle they use.
- 3.2 Young riders (17-25 years old) are a growing section of the motorcycling community, thanks in part to schemes such as Wheels-2-Work. Whilst this strategy in no way seeks to discourage such initiatives for affordable transport, it is vital that young riders are equipped to deal with the hazards this poses; motorcycling is a progression of experience, which should in turn increase the rider's skill and ability.
- 3.3 Powered Two Wheelers (P2W) are an affordable alternative means of transport which is gaining in popularity in the UK. There is a great deal of confusion around these machines, in terms of education and enforcement. They are dealt with in more detail through the guidance at Appendix B.

4. SECTION 4: Education.

- 4.1.1 There are already some excellent, well-established education programmes targeted at motorcyclists. This strategy fully endorses these and recommends their use as best practice.
- 4.2.1 **BikeSafe** is one such programme. Widely adopted by most forces, this programme focuses upon the rider and gives them an opportunity to have their current skill level assessed by experienced police motorcyclists. It is specifically aimed at bridging the gap from the motorcycle test into post-test training. Whilst the programme has had much success, it is imperative that this momentum is maintained and increased.
- 4.2.2 This strategy recommends that all forces adopt BikeSafe, working in collaboration with regional partners if necessary. Furthermore, opportunities for its use could be extended; this strategy recommends that riders involved in collisions, where no prosecution is to be pursued against them, that the rider should be offered a free BikeSafe course. The national BikeSafe Coordinator is available to assist forces in developing in this area.
- 4.3.1 The **Rider Intervention Developing Experience Course (RIDE)** finds its origins in the National Driver Improvement Scheme (NDIS), which began in 1991. Since that date motorcyclists have been dealt with for errant behaviour either by way of prosecution or diversion to a Driver Improvement Course. However, during the evolution of the NDIS it became apparent that the programme did not properly address the bespoke needs of the motorcycling community.
- 4.3.2 The RIDE Scheme has been designed as an intervention for those motorcyclists whose behaviour has brought them to the attention of the Police. This Scheme is designed to address the behaviour of those motorcyclists whose riding could be described as thrill or sensation seeking and also those who by the very nature of their riding could be defined as anti-social or careless, thereby attracting a criminal prosecution. It can also be used for those motorcyclists who have demonstrated careless riding leading to a collision.

4.3.3 The RIDE course invites offenders to question their own assumptions about their ability and competency to ride a motorcycle and to alert them to the vulnerability that reckless, careless or anti social riding can attract. The aim of the course is to prevent riders from re-offending or worse, becoming a casualty.

4.3.4 This strategy fully endorses RIDE, and encourages its use by all forces.

5. SECTION 5: Enforcement.

5.1 The enforcement of traffic legislation by the police should be guided by the principles of proportionality in applying the law and securing compliance.

5.2 There will inevitably be occasions where offending behaviour is beyond the scope of education. This will generally fall into two categories:

1. Defects or modifications to motorcycles or safety equipment which either present a danger or are designed to impede a prosecution; or,
2. Offending behaviour which is so serious as to warrant no response but prosecution

5.3 In the case of the first category, emphasis should still be placed upon putting the matter right, and so wherever possible the Vehicle Defect Rectification Scheme (VDRS) should be used.

5.4 Offending which falls into the latter category represents the behaviour of those who present the greatest danger to both themselves and others. Enforcement should be proportionate to the risks to individuals, property and the degree of seriousness of the offence.

This strategy sets out certain principles to guide forces in their enforcement campaign:

- Enforcement should be intelligence-led and targeted to ensure maximum impact; It is important to use intelligence to indicate the optimum times to organise campaigns and deployment strategies. Targeting needs to take full advantage of a wide range of information sources to properly inform, focus and prioritise enforcement activities. Enforcement should link to annual campaigns (See Section 6: Effective Partnerships); To assist with this it is recommended to link annual enforcement and education campaigns with the Department for Transport 'THINK' calendar of events.
- Enforcement targeting these high-risk individuals should make use of the full range of the tactical options available to officers.

5.5 This strategy does not propose disposals for specific offences, this will be left for local discretion. Clearly incidents involving death or serious injury and those involving dangerous driving would be examples where prosecution would be warranted. This strategy recommends the use of ACPO speed enforcement guidelines where excess speed is a factor.

6. SECTION 6: Effective Partnerships.

6.1 Given the scale of tackling this issue, it is essential that forces collaborate with each other, and also work in partnership with other groups.

6.2 Raising Awareness:

Given the importance of education, it is vital that all opportunities are exploited to publicise our aims, give advice and promote motorcycling safety. These messages will be enhanced through the use of the national motorcycle safety campaigns, plus also local collaboration with road safety partnerships. It is the intention of this strategy to work with the Department for Transport's THINK!

campaigns, plus also collaborate with other agencies and organisations such as the Motor Cycle Industry Association. BikeSafe will have an expanding role in this area.

6.3 Planning and Design:

Whilst the strategy acknowledges that local authorities face significant financial challenges which will limit the opportunities for major changes to the road network, it also recommends that police engage fully with planning and traffic management functions to ensure that considerations are in place for motorcyclists.

6.4 Personal Protective Equipment and training:

6.4.1 BikeSafe is a model to engage riders with further training, however it is important that this is in addition to engaging with training providers such as the Institute of Advanced Motorists and Royal Society for the Prevention of Accidents, and also local providers of the Enhanced Rider Scheme (ERS).

6.4.2 Other, less formal, methods should also be used. This strategy fully supports the iBiker mobile application. This app, which features former World Superbike Champion James Toseland and funded by the Department for Transport, helps riders plan routes effectively. It will highlight "the most risky roads and routes in the UK" to bikers, provides a social media function and links to both BikeSafe and ERS.

6.4.3 Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) is a vital part of improving road safety. A recent study by Transport for London revealed that significant number of deaths and serious injuries were caused by poor fitting helmets. Many riders have been reluctant in the past to wear body armour, citing how uncomfortable it is. Recently, manufacturers have made significant progress to address this. This strategy supports the Safety Helmet Assessment and Rating Programme (SHARP) and forces should ensure that a focus on PPE is an integral part of all motorcycle safety activity.

WORKBOOK FOR THE CREATION OF ACPO GUIDANCE/PRACTICE ADVICE

This workbook, with all sections completed, must be included in the final document as an Appendix and submitted, through the Head of the Business Area, to the Programme Support Office for quality assurance prior to submission to Cabinet for approval as ACPO Doctrine.

ACPO EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE (DIVERSITY AUDIT) AS AGREED WITH THE CRE

1. Identify all aims of the guidance/advice

1.1	Identify the aims and projected outcomes of the guidance/advice:
1.2	Which individuals and organisations are likely to have an interest in or likely to be affected by the proposal?

2. Consider the evidence

2.1	What relevant quantitative data has been considered?	
	Age	
	Disability	
	Gender	
	Race	
	Religion / Belief	
	Sexual Orientation	
2.2	What relevant qualitative information has been considered?	
	Age	
	Disability	
	Gender	
	Race	
	Religion / Belief	
	Sexual Orientation	
2.3	What gaps in data/information were identified?	
	Age	
	Disability	
	Gender	
	Race	
	Religion / Belief	
	Sexual Orientation	
2.4	What consideration has been given to commissioning research?	
	Age	
	Disability	

Gender	
Race	
Religion / Belief	
Sexual Orientation	

3. Assess likely impact

3.1 From the analysis of data and information has any potential for differential/adverse impact been identified?
Age
Disability
Gender
Race
Religion / Belief
Sexual Orientation
3.2 If yes explain any intentional impact:
Age
Disability
Gender
Race
Religion / Belief
Sexual Orientation
3.3 If yes explain what impact was discovered which you feel is justifiable in order to achieve the overall proposal aims. Please provide examples:
Age
Disability
Gender
Race
Religion / Belief
Sexual Orientation
3.4 Are there any other factors that might help to explain differential/adverse impact?
Age
Disability
Gender
Race
Religion / Belief
Sexual Orientation

4. Consider alternatives

4.1 Summarise what changes have been made to the proposal to remove or reduce the potential for differential/adverse impact:
4.2 Summarise changes to the proposal to remove or reduce the potential for differential/adverse impact that were considered but not implemented and explain why this was the case:
4.3 If potential for differential/adverse impact remains explain why

implementation is justifiable in order to meet the wider proposal aims:

5. Consult formally

5.1 Has the proposal been subject to consultation? If no, please state why not. If yes, state which individuals and organisations were consulted and what form the consultation took:
Age
Disability
Gender
Race
Religion / Belief
Sexual Orientation
5.2 What was the outcome of the consultation?
Age
Disability
Gender
Race
Religion / Belief
Sexual Orientation
5.3 Has the proposal been reviewed and/or amended in light of the outcomes of consultation?
5.4 Have the results of the consultation been fed back to the consultees?

6. Decide whether to adopt the proposal

6.1 Provide a statement outlining the findings of the impact assessment process. If the proposal has been identified as having a possibility to adversely impact upon diverse communities, the statement should include justification for the implementation:

7. Make Monitoring Arrangements

7.1 What consideration has been given to piloting the proposal?
7.2 What monitoring will be implemented at a national level by the proposal owning agency and/or other national agency?
7.3 Is this proposal intended to be implemented by local agencies that have a statutory duty to impact assess policies? If so, what monitoring requirements are you placing on that agency?

8. Publish Assessment Results

8.1 What form will the publication of the impact assessment take?