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1. Methodological aspects

As part of the information collection process, the Member States Amplifying Questions survey aimed at collecting the views of national road authorities on the 8 safety areas covered by the project.

In order to identify these national experts and to get their views, several entrance doors were used:

1. Through FEMA’s national associations and their national authorities network;
2. Through the European Commission and the Transport Attachés belonging to the Commission High Level Group on Road Safety;
3. Through DaCoTA’s Consortium members/contact list;
4. Through CIECA membership for Deliverable 1, with a tailored questionnaire.

National experts were offered the possibility of answering the questionnaire (depending of their area of expertise) either in written format or via a recorded phone interview.

At the end of the process, the RIDERSCAN project received 79 answers from national experts in 28 countries.

Most of the respondents had the possibility to review their answers to check proper understanding and key messages.

2. Blank questionnaire

D1: Training, testing and licencing

⇒ Amplifying questions: for Member States

1. What is the structure of the licencing scheme for powered two-wheelers in your country?
2. What are the main changes with regard to the previous structure (e.g. training courses changes, category changes, etc.)?
3. What are the improvements of the new Directive since January 2013 compared to the previous licence scheme?
4. Did you face difficulties transposing the 3rd Driving Licence Directive (for the motorcycling part) in your country (e.g. legal, technical):
a. Have you been reported difficulties/problems? From training operators? From licence learners or novice riders?

5. Any other problems/improvements to report?

6. What impact has the 3DLD changes had on the cost of the PTW licence in your country?

7. Have you witnessed a significant change in the number of licences granted since January 2013 (e.g.: gender issues, etc.)?

8. Have you witnessed significant changes with regards to the MC-training patterns since the adoption of the 3rd Driving Licence Directive?

9. As from 2018, the European Commission is expected to evaluate the implementation of the 3rd DLD and start drafting the 4DLD framework. Based on your national expertise with the 2DLD/3DLD, would you recommend some orientations to be considered for harmonization at EU level (e.g.: riding test, test vehicles, the three categories, etc.)?

⇒ Amplifying questions: for CIECA members

1. Please validate the PTW access structure in your country (check Annex 1 – CIECA workshops outcomes)?

2. What main changes has the implementation of the 3rd Driving Licence Directive brought to your country compared to the previous licencing access scheme? (e.g. training courses changes, category changes, etc.)?

3. What change(s) do you definitely consider as improvements for PTW safety?

4. Did your country face difficulties transposing the motorcycling part of the 3rd Driving Licence Directive (e.g. legal, technical):

5. Have you been reported difficulty(ies)/problem(s) with the new licencing access since its implementation in 2013? (e.g. from training operators, licence learners or novice riders?). Which one(s)?

6. Has the new system impacted the cost of gaining a PTW licence in your country?

7. Since 2013, have you witnessed significant change(s) with regards to

   a. the number of licences granted since January 2013 (e.g.: gender issues, etc.)?

   b. the MC-training/testing patterns?

8. As from 2018, the European Commission is expected to evaluate the implementation of the 3rd DLD and most likely start drafting a 4DLD framework. Based on your national expertise with the 2DLD/3DLD, would you have some recommendations, orientations
to be considered for harmonization at EU level (e.g.: riding test, test vehicles, the three categories, etc.)?

**D2: Data collection and statistics**

**Amplifying questions:**

1. What kind of data and statistics do you collect on powered two-wheelers use in your country? What kind of data and statistics are EU-harmonized?
2. In the case of a motorcycle accident (with or without fatalities):
   a) what data do you collect?
   b) do you investigate accident with fatalities ‘in-depth’? Explain
   c) which of these data do you exchange with the EU?
   d) which data would it be useful to exchange and compare with the EU?
   e) how do you communicate these statistics in your country? Do you publish them? Do you share them with other stakeholders? Do you keep them for internal use?
3. Any recommendations on the exchange of data and statistics at EU level in general and specifically for PTWs?

**D3: Infrastructure**

**Amplifying questions:**

1. Do you have PTW-specific infrastructure guidelines in your country? Yes / No / I don’t know.
   Name of the publication: + link + document if updated for DB
2. If yes
   a. Are these guidelines mandatory to implement or simply advice for road engineers?
   b. Are these recommendations/rules effectively implemented/used?
   c. Can you tell us what measures work and should be harmonized at EU level if not already? Do you have any best practices on infrastructure concerning PTWs that you would want to share at EU level?
   d. Are riders/passengers on PTWs included as vulnerable road users? Yes / No? On all roads or only the TEN-T network?
e. What is the result of the infrastructure directive for PTWs (e.g.: choice of crash barriers on the TEN-T network, special measures after rider fatalities, etc.)?

3. Are there any infrastructure problems in your country which would require EU attention as they are outside national competence?

4. Do you have any specific PTW issue related to EU standards?

5. Is there a sharing of information and best practices on infrastructure in general at European level? And on PTWs in particular?

6. Do you collect reports concerning infrastructure problems? If yes, how do you use the information collected (e.g.: black spot warning, etc.)?

7. Do you have a specific software / IT tool to integrate and collect all infrastructure issues?

**D4: Accident reporting**

 чувство

1. Do you have different police accident reports per road category? (E.g.: local, regional, TEN-T roads).

2. Do you have a specific police accident report for PTW accidents?
   a. If yes (please send a copy if possible), what are the main differences to the regular accident report?
   b. If no, do you have a section that focuses specifically on PTWs in the standard accident report form?

3. Do police accident reports take account of infrastructural problems?

4. How does it work in practice when an accident involving a PTW occurs (with regard to filling out the form)?

**D5: Research**

1. As a safety expert, what are the research topics increasing knowledge on PTW safety in your country for which you lack funding?

2. As a safety expert, what are the research topics increasing knowledge on PTW safety at EU level for which you lack EU funding?

3. Does your country conduct PTW research with other countries? Would you be interested in more common research concerning PTW safety?
4. Has your country already undertaken an in-depth accident causation study on PTW accidents?
   a. Which methodology was used (OECD like MAIDS or a national one)?
   b. What were the main conclusions? (try to get the study)
   c. How do you disseminate the findings?

**D6: Traffic management and ITS**

⇒ Amplifying questions:

1. How are PTWs integrated into intelligent traffic management in your country? Do you have a specific strategy to include PTWs in intelligent traffic management?
   a. Are PTWs included in intelligent road and bridge tolls?
   b. Are PTWs allowed to use bus lanes?
   c. Do you have a specific strategy for including PTWs in intelligent parking systems?

**D7: Awareness campaigns**

⇒ Amplifying questions:

1. Identify campaigns on PTW safety.
2. Identify PTW safety campaigns targeting other road users.
3. Analysis of these campaigns:
   a. Why do you conduct such campaigns? Why do you not conduct such campaigns?
   b. Positive points of each campaign?
   c. Negative elements of each campaign?
   d. What were the impacts of these campaigns on PTW safety?
4. Are you aware of campaigns run by governments in other countries? If yes, what do you think about it?
5. Are you aware of campaigns run by motorcycle organizations? If yes, what are your views about these self-run campaigns?
6. What are, according to your expertise, the key elements for a successful campaign? And what are, reversely, the elements of a “bad” campaign?
D8: National strategies

Amplifying questions:

1. What are the key measures identified in the NS/AP to increase PTW safety?
2. Were these measures effectively implemented?
3. What was the impact of these measures on PTW safety? How was it measured?
4. What would you recommend for your next motorcycle safety NS/AP?
5. According to your national expertise, what safety measures/actions should be taken at EU level to further increase the impact on PTW safety?
6. According to you what kind of added value would an EU strategy for PTW safety have? What safety topics should this strategy include?

D9: Motorcycling community

Depending on the interviewee and the country, these questions can be asked at the same time as a question on a particular deliverable.

1. How would you describe your relationship with motorcycle associations in your country?
2. Do you include motorcycle representatives in topics relative to PTW safety?
   a. D1: Do you cooperate with motorcycle associations in DLD issues?
   b. D2: Do you cooperate with motorcycle associations in analysing and disseminating collected data?
   c. D3: Do you cooperate with motorcycle associations on infrastructure issues? On road design and/or road maintenance?
   d. D5: Are motorcycle associations involved in any form in the research area?
   e. D6: Do you cooperate with motorcycle associations in traffic management issues?
   f. D7: Do you cooperate with motorcycle associations on road safety awareness campaigns?
   g. D8: Do you cooperate with motorcycle associations on your national road safety strategy?
## 3. Answers Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Organisation/department</th>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Method used</th>
<th>Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Martin Winkelbauer</td>
<td>Senior Researcher at KFV (Austrian Road Safety Board)</td>
<td>D1, D3, D4, D5, D6, D7</td>
<td>27 August 2014</td>
<td>Phone interview</td>
<td>02 October 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peter Saleh</td>
<td>Senior Engineer at Austrian Institute of Technology</td>
<td>D3, D4, D5</td>
<td>15 September 2014</td>
<td>Phone interview</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wolfgang Schubert</td>
<td>Federal Ministry for Transport, Innovation and Technology; Department of Transport.</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td>31 July 2014</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>30 September 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eva Dietl</td>
<td>STATISTICS AUSTRIA, Directorate Spatial Statistics, Road Safety department</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>01 August 2014</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>14 October 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Radetzky</td>
<td>Austrian Ministry for Transport, Innovation and Technology / Department IV/ST2</td>
<td>D8</td>
<td>06 August 2014</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>10 October 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>André Tourneur</td>
<td>SPF mobilité et transports, DG Transport Routier et Sécurité Routière</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td>11 July 2014</td>
<td>Phone interview</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Peeters</td>
<td>Department of Mobility</td>
<td>D3</td>
<td>08 July 2014</td>
<td>Phone interview</td>
<td>30 September 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Werner de Dobbeeleer</td>
<td>VSV, the Flemish Foundation for Traffic Knowledge</td>
<td>D7</td>
<td>08 July 2014</td>
<td>Phone interview</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jean-François Gaillet</td>
<td>IBSR, mobility and infrastructure department</td>
<td>D6</td>
<td>24 July 2014</td>
<td>Phone interview</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jan Vandaele</td>
<td>BIVV-IBSR, responsible for campaigns</td>
<td>D7</td>
<td>16 September 2014</td>
<td>Phone interview</td>
<td>29 September 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CIECA member</td>
<td>CIECA</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td>27 January 2015</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Analysis Code</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td>Date of Completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Heike Martensen</td>
<td>Belgian Road Safety Institute (BIVV-IBSR)</td>
<td>D2, D4</td>
<td>09 July 2014</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mathieu Roynard</td>
<td>Belgian Road Safety Institute (BIVV-IBSR)</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>29 July 2014</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>Stefan Stoimenov</td>
<td>Trafficpol</td>
<td>D2, D4, D5</td>
<td>12 August 2014</td>
<td>Phone interview</td>
<td>03 October 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CIECA member</td>
<td>CIECA</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td>27 January 2015</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Velin Vuchkov</td>
<td>Road Infrastructure Agency, department &quot;Permits and safety&quot;</td>
<td>D3, D6</td>
<td>04 September 2014</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>CIECA member</td>
<td>CIECA</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td>27 January 2015</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>Jindrich Fric</td>
<td>Division of Road Safety and Traffic Engineering, Transport Research Centre</td>
<td>D1, D2, D3, D4, D5, D6, D7, D8, D9</td>
<td>21 January 2015</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CIECA member</td>
<td>CIECA</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td>27 January 2015</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>CIECA member</td>
<td>CIECA</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td>12 February 2015</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>CIECA member</td>
<td>CIECA</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td>20 January 2015</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Elina Uusitalo</td>
<td>TRAFI, department Permits and Approvals</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td>11 August 2014</td>
<td>Phone interview</td>
<td>01 December 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CIECA member</td>
<td>CIECA</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td>13 February 2015</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Riikka Rajamäki</td>
<td>Trafi</td>
<td>D2, D3, D4, D6</td>
<td>22 July 2014</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inkeri Parkkari</td>
<td>Finnish Transport Safety Agency (Trafi)</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>27 August 2014</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sami Mynttinen</td>
<td>Finnish Transport Safety Agency</td>
<td>D8</td>
<td>18 June 2014</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Pascal Dunikowski</td>
<td>Délégation à la Sécurité et à la Circulation Routières : Chargé de mission 2RM National - Secrétaire de la commission 2R/2RM du Conseil National de Sécurité Routière</td>
<td>D1, D2, D3, D4, D5, D6, D7, D8</td>
<td>01 July 2014</td>
<td>Phone interview</td>
<td>02 October 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organization/Department</td>
<td>Codes</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Communication Method</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Thierry Serre</td>
<td>IFSTTAR, Département Transport Santé Sécurité</td>
<td>D2, D4, D5</td>
<td>22 August 2014</td>
<td>Phone interview</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CIECA member</td>
<td>CIECA</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td>12 February 2015</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BASSt</td>
<td>Federal Highway Research Institute (BASt)</td>
<td>D1, D2, D3, D4, D5, D6, D7, D8, D9</td>
<td>29 July 2014</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CIECA member (Jörg Biedinger)</td>
<td>CIECA</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td>09 January 2015</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Stratos Georgiopoulos</td>
<td>Ministry of Infrastructure, Transport and Networks</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td>06 October 2014</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>George Yannis</td>
<td>National Technical University of Athens, Department of Transportation Planning and Engineering</td>
<td>D2, D3, D4, D5, D6, D7, D8, D9</td>
<td>06 October 2014</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>CIECA member</td>
<td>CIECA</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td>17 February 2015</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eva Csapó</td>
<td>Hungarian Central Statistical Office (HCSO), Services and Foreign Trade Statistics Department, Transport unit</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>31 July 2014</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ferenc Pausz</td>
<td>GRSP Hungary Association</td>
<td>D4, D7</td>
<td>14 August 2014</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Forbers Vigors</td>
<td>National Roads Authority</td>
<td>D2, D3, D4, D5, D6</td>
<td>31 July 2014</td>
<td>Phone interview</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yaw Bimpeh</td>
<td>Road Safety Authority</td>
<td>D2, D4</td>
<td>25 August 2014</td>
<td>Phone interview</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pat Travers</td>
<td>Road Safety Authority, Chief Driver Tester</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td>01 September 2014</td>
<td>Phone interview</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Lucia Pennisi</td>
<td>Italian Automobil Club, statistical department</td>
<td>D2, D4</td>
<td>01 August 2014</td>
<td>Phone interview</td>
<td>30 September 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marco Broccoli</td>
<td>ISTAT</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>05 September 2014</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position/Institution</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>Luca Persia</td>
<td>Centre for Transport and Logistics (CTL), &quot;Sapienza&quot; University of Rome</td>
<td>D5, 28 August 2014, Written</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aldis Lama</td>
<td>Road Traffic Safety Directorate</td>
<td>D2, D4, D5, D8, D9, 12 August 2014, Phone interview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maris Zalaiskalns</td>
<td>Latvian State roads</td>
<td>D3, 09 July 2014, Written</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boriss Jelisejevs</td>
<td>Head of TIC, Latvian state roads (NRA)</td>
<td>D6, D7, 25 August 2014, Written</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>CIECA member</td>
<td>CIECA</td>
<td>D1, 27 January 2015, Written</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alain Disiviscour</td>
<td>Chargé de direction au Ministère du Développement durable et des Infrastructures, Département des Transports, Direction de la Circulation et de la Sécurité routières</td>
<td>D5, D7, D8, D9, 31 July 2014, Phone interview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thierry Weber</td>
<td>Police Grand-Ducale, Direction des Opérations et de la Prévention</td>
<td>D4, 08 July 2014, Phone interview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Serge Muller</td>
<td>Société Nationale de Circulation Automobile (SNCA)</td>
<td>D1, 23 July 2014, Written</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marie-Jo Airoldi</td>
<td>Statec (statistical institute)</td>
<td>D2, 14 July 2014, Written</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paul Mangen</td>
<td>Ministère du Développement durable et des Infrastructures, administration des ponts et chaussées</td>
<td>D3, D6, 24 July 2014, Written</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>CIECA member</td>
<td>CIECA</td>
<td>D1, 12 January 2014, Written</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Robbert Verweij</td>
<td>Department of Road Safety, Ministry of Infrastructure and Environment</td>
<td>D1, D2, D3, D4, D5, D6, D7, D8, D9, 28 August 2014, Phone interview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saskia de Craen</td>
<td>SWOV Institute for Road Safety Research</td>
<td>D1, D2, D4, D5, D7, 28 August 2014, Phone interview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Chapters</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Lasse Haslie</td>
<td>Norwegian Public Roads Administration</td>
<td>D1, D3, D5, D6, D7, D8, D9</td>
<td>16 October 2014</td>
<td>Phone interview</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Katarzyna Kwiecień</td>
<td>General Directorate of National Roads and Motorways</td>
<td>D3</td>
<td>04 September 2014</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CIECA member</td>
<td>CIECA</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Written</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>CIECA member</td>
<td>CIECA</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td>18 February 2015</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>Christian Andries</td>
<td>Ministry of Home Affairs – General Inspectorate of Romanian Police – Road Traffic Directorate</td>
<td>D7</td>
<td>07 August 2014</td>
<td>Phone interview</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gino-Theodor Bosman</td>
<td>Ministry of Internal Affairs, Driving Licencing and Vehicles Registration Directorate</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td>25 August 2014</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>15 October 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Valentin IONITA</td>
<td>Romanian Traffic Police Directorate</td>
<td>D2, D4</td>
<td>02 September 2014</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>Petra Groschová</td>
<td>Ministry of Transport, Construction and Regional Development, Department of Road Safety</td>
<td>D7, D8</td>
<td>25 August 2014</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>Tina Bizjak, Andraz Murkovic</td>
<td>Slovenian Traffic Safety Agency, Department for development and coordination of road safety</td>
<td>D1, D2, D3, D4, D5, D6, D7, D8</td>
<td>03 December 2014</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Marta Carrera</td>
<td>Directorate General for Traffic (DGT), Ministry of Interior</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td>29 January 2015</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Álvaro Gómez</td>
<td>Directorate General for Traffic (DGT), Ministry of Interior</td>
<td>D2, D4, D8</td>
<td>29 January 2015</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ana Blanco</td>
<td>Directorate General for Traffic (DGT), Ministry of Interior</td>
<td>D3, D6</td>
<td>29 January 2015</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pilar Zori</td>
<td>Directorate General for Traffic (DGT), Ministry of Interior</td>
<td>D4</td>
<td>29 January 2015</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Deliverables</td>
<td>Date ofContact</td>
<td>Method of Contact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Fermina Sánchez</td>
<td>Directorate General for Traffic (DGT), Ministry of Interior</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>29 January 2015</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Matteo Rizzi</td>
<td>Folksam (insurance company), Road Safety Research department</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>14 July 2014</td>
<td>Phone interview</td>
<td>06 October 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Olof Stenlund</td>
<td>Swedish Transport Agency</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td>06 August 2014</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>06 October 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Johan Strandroth</td>
<td>The Swedish Transport Administration (Trafikverket)</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>15 July 2014</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roger Johansson</td>
<td>The Swedish Transport Administration (Trafikverket)</td>
<td>D3, D7</td>
<td>21 August 2014</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jörgen Persson</td>
<td>The Swedish Transport Administration (Trafikverket)</td>
<td>D6, D8</td>
<td>21 August 2014</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>CIECA member</td>
<td>CIECA</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td>16 January 2014</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>Catriona Henderson</td>
<td>Road User Licence, Insurance and Safety</td>
<td>D1, D2, D3, D4, D5, D6, D8</td>
<td>03 July 2014</td>
<td>Phone interview</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chris Parr</td>
<td>Driver and Safety Standards Agency, Assistant Chief Driving Examiner, Operations Motorcycle team</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td>28 August 2014</td>
<td>Phone interview</td>
<td>30 September 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tim Lennon</td>
<td>Department for Transport</td>
<td>D7</td>
<td>23 October 2014</td>
<td>Phone interview</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CIECA member</td>
<td>CIECA</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td>05 February 2015 (Northern Ireland) 13 February 2015</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victoria Judd</td>
<td>Department for Transport ; Marketing Campaigns Manager</td>
<td>D7</td>
<td>17 September 2014</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For 7 countries, we did not receive any answer or just a partial answer from CIECA members for Deliverable 1 only.

These countries are Croatia, Denmark, Estonia, Lithuania, Malta, Portugal and Switzerland. Though experts were re-contacted, for diverse reasons they were not able to answer our questionnaire.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Deliverable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>Ana Knez</td>
<td>Permanent Representation of Croatia</td>
<td>To identify key experts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Søren Troels Berg</td>
<td>Sikker Trafik</td>
<td>To identify key experts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sven Krarup Nielsen</td>
<td>The Danish Road Directorate</td>
<td>To identify key experts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aziza Bjorholm-Petersen</td>
<td>Ministry for Transport</td>
<td>To identify key experts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stig Hemdorff</td>
<td>The Danish Road Directorate</td>
<td>To identify key experts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Sander SALMU</td>
<td>Ministry of Economic Affairs and Communication</td>
<td>To identify key experts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Karlis Goldstein</td>
<td>Ministry of Foreign Affairs</td>
<td>To identify key experts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sirje Lilleorg</td>
<td>Road administration</td>
<td>To identify key experts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dago Antov</td>
<td>Stratum</td>
<td>To identify key experts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>Vidmantas Pumpitus</td>
<td>Ministry of transport and communications</td>
<td>To identify key experts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nerijus Kaucikas</td>
<td>Permanent Representation of Lithuania</td>
<td>To identify key experts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gintaras Alikandrovicici</td>
<td>Ministry of Interior</td>
<td>To identify key experts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>Daniel Azzopardi</td>
<td>Permanent Representation of Malta</td>
<td>To identify key experts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Audrey Testaferrata Denoto</td>
<td>Ministry for Infrastructure, Transport and Communications</td>
<td>To identify key experts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David Sutton</td>
<td>Malta Transport Authority</td>
<td>To identify key experts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>Fátima Abreu</td>
<td>Instituto da Mobilidade e dos Transportes</td>
<td>D1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maria Clemente</td>
<td>Autoridade Nacional de Segurança Rodoviária</td>
<td>D2, D7 and D8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jorge Freire</td>
<td>Instituto da Mobilidade e dos Transportes</td>
<td>D3 and D6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gabriel Mendes</td>
<td>Guarda Nacional Republicana</td>
<td>D4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>João Dias</td>
<td>IDMEC - Instituto de Engenharia Mecânica</td>
<td>D5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Rudolf Dieterle</td>
<td>Federal Roads Office (FEDRO)</td>
<td>To identify key experts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Christoph Jahn</td>
<td>Federal Roads Office (FEDRO)</td>
<td>To identify key experts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roland Allenbach</td>
<td>Swiss Council for Accident Prevention</td>
<td>To identify key experts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philippe Bapst</td>
<td>Federal Roads Office (FEDRO)</td>
<td>To identify key experts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>Stefan Siegrist</td>
<td>Swiss Council for Accident Prevention</td>
<td>To identify key experts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Summary of country answers

AUSTRIA

(AT) D1: Training, testing and licencing

Respondent:
Wolfgang Schubert  Federal Ministry for Transport, Innovation and Technology; Department of Transport
Martin Winkelbauer  Senior Researcher at KFV (Austrian Road Safety Board)

Licence scheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AM</th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum age</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24 (direct access) or 2 years of A2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and testing</td>
<td>6 h of theory + 6h of practice on a private road + 2h of practice in traffic + theoretical exam with a medical certificate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirement for the graduate licence</td>
<td></td>
<td>A1 licence for at least 2 years + 2 options: Training option (7-lesson training courses) OR testing option (practical driving test)</td>
<td>A2 licence for at least 2 years + 2 options: Training option (7-lesson training courses) OR testing option (practical driving test)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Change of structure
The 3DLD brought some changes compared to the previous structure. First, the AM category is completely new; there was previously just a national document (Mopedausweis). From a practical perspective, nothing changed. The same rules for training and testing apply and even the test questions have remained the same.
The category A1 did not exist in Austria either. Before 19.1.2013, the progressive access could be reached only by 2 years of possession of A-restricted.

And the minimum age for the A-licence was 21 years, instead of 24 now.

Austria applied the IRT manual on adapting the Austrian training model for riders during 3DLD adoption.

**Improvements**

According to Austrian experts, the 3DLD brought improvements in the licence scheme. The new higher minimum age of 24 years for the A licence is better than the previous minimum age of 21. Austria also applied the IRT manual.

Moreover, the new system of progressive access with tests or training is also an improvement.

Finally, there were doubts regarding road safety because of introducing the A1 licence at the age of 16. This led to the introduction of an additional course on risk competence for those driving instructors wanting to teach A1 candidates. The idea is to deal with risk as a constitutive element of riding but to keep it to a reasonable level in mastering it. Instructors have to pass this one-day-course. Although use of the method is only mandatory for 16 year-old applicants, it also benefits other applicants.

Furthermore advanced training under the system of multiphase training (after obtaining the A-licence) was introduced

**Inconveniences**

Nevertheless, according to Austrian experts, there are also general inconveniences associated with the 3DLD. The licencing structure set forth in the Directive especially regarding three wheeled vehicles is very complicated; there are many different harmonized entitlements and national ones, many different minimum ages (e.g. 21 years for 3-wheelers instead of 20 for two wheelers). The transfer of 3-wheelers from category B to category A caused major problems.

The list of codes is very unpractical, as we now have to add a restricted A-licence to the old B-licence to achieve the previous 3-wheel entitlement. This caused (and causes) many problems in the administrative procedure and many licence holders did not understand this, thinking they now had a full A-licence. It would have been much easier to introduce extended category B codes instead of restrictive category A codes!
Implementation difficulties

The implementation of the 3DLD also brought with it a number of difficulties. First, the regulation in category A2 about the power (a motorbike engine may not be derived from a vehicle of more than double the power) is a problem: Austria has implemented it although this cannot be easily controlled by the police. The problem is that e.g. Germany has not introduced this regulation and there is an unclear situation in Europe. There are some bikes that may be ridden with a category A2 licence in Germany but not in Austria.

Moreover, following the creation of the category AM, many administrative regulations had to be introduced, especially regarding driving school legislation, administrative procedures, the need for a medical check and first aid certificate, exchanging a licence, etc.

Finally, changes in the contents of the theoretical course were necessary. The theoretical course consists of a basic part (for all categories, consisting of general rules of the road) and a category-related part. The old basic part had already a very strong focus on category B, as this was usually the first category applied for by new candidates. Through the introduction of category A1 with its age limit of 16 this has changed (now A1 may be the first category obtained), with the result that the basic course had to be reduced to the real basic rules.

With the 3DLD, the number of driving lessons was not changed, so the cost for the candidate in pre-testing education could be maintained at the same level. Additional costs result only from the new perfection drive (advanced training costing about 100 €) after having obtained the licence. But the perfection drive was the result of the multi-phase driver training update. And the latter was executed due to the fact that we could cut car accidents by one third, though we were hardly able to find any effect on category A.

Looking at the figures, it is not easy to prove any impact on the number of licences granted. Because of the major changes following the 3DLD, the statistical program is not yet fully adapted, meaning that the statistics for 2013 are not yet available. 3 or 4 years are necessary to run an evaluation study.

The 4DLD

As regards the 4DLD, the Department of Transport recommends not making any more changes in the licencing structure to avoid further complications! The only thing needing to be done is to solve the problem of the power regulation for category A2. It should be deleted or replaced by a more practical provision.

With regard to the 4DLD, KFV (Martin Winkelbauer) recommends the EU-wide implementation of: the multiphase driver training model found in Austria; a probationary licence system; a
penalty points system in line with the results of BESTPOINT; a group ride as an element of post-licence training; track training in line with the recommendations from the SUPREME project (which mainly targets the avoidance of overconfidence); a particular hazard perception training as an element of a multiphase training similar to that implemented in Austria. Implementing the risk competence models for instructors in Europe might also be a good idea.

(AT) D2: Data collection and statistics

Respondent:
Eva Dietl
STATISTICS AUSTRIA, Directorate Spatial Statistics, Road Safety department

Data collected
In Austria, the government collects these data for PTWs:
- Number of new registrations
- The vehicle stock on 31.12.20XX
- Number of short-term registrations by make and model, engine type, engine size, engine power (kilowatt), mass, regional characteristics (provinces/Lands, districts, municipalities).
- Number of accidents with injury
- Definition of an accident with injury = EU harmonized
- Definition of fatalities = EU harmonized

Statistics Austria compiles data about road traffic injury accidents, including motorcycle accidents. No statistics are kept on accidents solely involving property damage. A road traffic accident with personal injury has three definition components: it occurs on a public road, at least one person is injured or killed and at least one moving vehicle is involved.

Fatalities: fatalities are people who die within 30 days of the road accident occurring as a direct result thereof.

Statistics on road traffic accidents – Characteristics: Accident data: Accident location: federal province/Land, district, municipality, area type, road type, geographic coordinates (WGS84), road number, road kilometre (if available).
Type of accident, presumptive main accident cause, characterization (description) of the scene of accident, road condition, lighting condition, road surface, weather conditions, accident with animals involved.

Data concerning vehicles involved: International / national licence plate (only district), year of first registration, engine power (kilowatt), mileage, gross vehicle mass, accident circumstances, presumptive main accident perpetrator, driving direction.

Data concerning people involved: Road user type (driver, passenger, pedestrian), age and gender, severity of injury, nationality, first issue date of driving licence, no driving licence, possible breathalyser result, driving impairment(s), other adverse effects, crash-helmet use.

Statistics Austria does not investigate accidents with fatalities in-depth. However, many accidents are investigated in-depth by an expert witness on behalf of the state attorney. This data is (with a handful of exceptions) not available for statistical analysis.

Statistics Austria provides the Austrian Ministry for Transport, Innovation and Technology and the Austrian Ministry of the interior, the Länder governments, the road safety institutions and the EU (CARE data base) with all data records including all characteristics for each reporting year.

Statistics Austria publishes biannual and annual data on road accidents via the Internet as well as in press releases. Summary data on motorcycle accidents and injured/killed motorcyclists are included. Additional evaluations can be ordered.

Data exchanged

At present, the only regulation concerning road traffic accident statistics is Council Decision 93/704/EC of 30 November 1993 on the creation of a Community database on road accidents. Each member state is allowed to collect data on road accidents at its discretion. There are no requirements regarding the amount and content of the data to be collected.

According to Statistics Austria, it would be useful to exchange comparable data at EU level: the size of PTW stock, the number of PTW-accidents with personal injury, the number of PTW-riders killed (e.g. by age), etc.

(AT) D3: Infrastructure

Respondent:
Martin Winkelbauer Senior Researcher at KFV (Austrian Road Safety Board)
Peter Saleh Senior Engineer at Austrian Institute of Technology
Infrastructure guidelines

In Austria there is a common set of guidelines and directives for planning and road safety. Within this set of guidelines, there is one for the improvement of motorcycling safety published by the FSV (Austrian Association for Research on Road - Rail - Transport). This specific document addresses road infrastructure, but also road marking, obstacles, curve design, etc. It recommends removing crash barriers whenever possible. It is a technical document, applying to both EU roads and Austrian roads. It focuses on both road safety and infrastructure measures, meaning that it is a wide-ranging document. It does not go into human factors, but focuses more on the road itself (active, passive safety, crash barriers, etc.). Though a separate document, it is included in the overall set of road guidelines.

FSV guidelines are mandatory for autobahns, i.e. more or less for the TEN-T network, but not for the other roads. Considering that PTW riders do not often use autobahns, it only constitutes advice for the roads used by bikers.

For the directive guidelines, there is a problem of feedback from Austrian road authorities. There is a political issue about the value of the directive, as the PTW issue is not as important as other road user issues. This means that a lot of effort is needed to motivate engineers to use it. The checklists for road safety audits and road safety inspections were adopted in accordance with these guidelines. Auditor and inspector training was also adopted. However, enforcement could be improved.

In some points, Austrian measures are harmonized because there were implemented under the road safety directive. Austria has extended the European directives to include road inspections and road audits, allowing these guidelines to be included in the common road safety inspection procedures. But a link to accident causation is missing. There is a chapter talking about accidents and assessing their causes, but a connection to accident study and knowledge on accidents would be interesting.

Others questions

In Austria, PTW riders/passengers are legally speaking considered as vulnerable road users on all roads, as they are included in the Austrian road safety programme.

One of the good results of the infrastructure directive for PTWs in Austria is that the training of road safety inspectors includes 3-4 hours of sessions with PTW specialists. One inconvenience however is that the infrastructure directive focuses on main roads only, whereas in Austria, most PTW safety issues involve secondary roads.
Need for EU action

According to Austrian experts, the EU could act on infrastructure:

- The problem of inspections of secondary roads should be addressed at EU level. It was just addressed by the Pilot4Safety project.
- Crash barrier tests should include PTWs.

Moreover, according to Austrian experts the EU should address two standards for PTWs:

- Road surface: there are specific parameters to evaluate the road quality (friction, evenness) for PTWs, but up to now account is only taken of cars.
- Industry standards should focus on the same issues: crash barriers, etc.

Certain EU projects focused on sharing information and best practices on infrastructure. According to Austrian experts, we need platforms to collect the ideas, though they need to take account of each country’s specific features. As such, the idea of exchanging safety measures is good, but not the way best practices are exchanged at the moment.

Reporting on infrastructure problems

Black spot monitoring exists in Austria. Contracts exist with most of the regional administrations which pay to identify black spots once a year. Information on black spots is collected through analysing police-reported accidents. When black spots are identified, the regional administrations are by law required to take appropriate measures. They can either solve the problem by themselves, or normally invite all relevant stakeholders (administration, expert witnesses, police, local government, research, etc) for a local discussion of the problem with the relevant stakeholders, reaching a decision on what measures have to be taken. Often, this is backed up by an extensive analysis (traffic volumes, crash types, other characteristics, technical measurement, and respective proposals for measures).

In most cases, black spot management hardly covers any PTW black spots as there are not enough accidents for the legal definition of a blackspot. The solution could be to have a specific PTW-related blackspot definition better integrating motorcycle issues.

There is no specific tool to collect this infrastructure information. Software is used (kiss mapping), but it is not the official system. This is a relevant research point for the future: intelligent mapping.
(AT) D4: Accident reporting

Respondent:
Martin Winkelbauer  Senior Researcher at KFV (Austrian Road Safety Board)
Peter Saleh  Senior Engineer at Austrian Institute of Technology

In Austria, there is only one accident report (for all road categories and all vehicles), in an electronic form collected by the police software. Since 2012, the location of the accident is determined by a GPS system.

There is no section on PTWs as such. But because it is now an electronic form, when a police officer checks the box “PTW”, there are some specific questions about PTWs. This system is currently being tested.

The ministry is interested in the engine size (and not just the engine power), whether it is a combustion or electric vehicle, whether a helmet was worn, and also information on the licence held (if we look at the profile of motorcyclists, the elements linked to the licence are important): for how long has he been he riding? What is his experience? Is he a novice rider? Is he a young rider? Etc.

The police accident report does not take infrastructural problems into account. So if there is an infrastructure request (for example on road friction), the information is collected afterwards. And it is not the same minister (the police comes under the Ministry of the Interior, while the other information is collected under the Ministry of Transport). Moreover, these data are not publicly available.

In the case of an accident with injury, the police are required to go to the site and collect information, one section of which goes to the state attorney. They have to finish collecting the statistical part of the questionnaire before entering the information for the state attorney. It’s called accident data management (UDM).

There is a police report with some basic facts on the area: type of road, road condition, weather, road design (curve, straight line). The cause of the accident can be assessed later. The new electronic form contains one question on the cause of the accident, requiring an educated guess on the part of the responsible police officer, without any scientific assessment. There is a project running aimed at identifying the reason for a black spot, assessing the risk. But it is being done by the police.

Moreover, the Austrian standards institute also documents accidents, publishing a report at the end of the year.
**Respondent:**

Martin Winkelbauer  Senior Researcher at KFV (Austrian Road Safety Board)

Peter Saleh  Senior Engineer at Austrian Institute of Technology

**Need for research at national level**

- Exposure data: need to know more about that in general, and in Austria. For example, we only know that 9% of riders ride the whole year round. But that is almost all we know.

- Research on infrastructure: identify local problems. It’s more or less black spot management.

- Alcohol: Austria has (most likely) a high incidence of alcohol infringements. In Austria, fatalities are not tested for alcohol except when the state attorney explicitly orders such. Hence, most of the single vehicle accidents, according to certain other studies mainly caused by DUI, are not listed as alcohol-related. International studies differ somewhat on this issue. Some say that alcohol is not a problem for PTWs, while other state the opposite. From an Austrian survey, we know that riders also drink, and many of them as frequent as when they drive their cars, though they tend to drink less when riding their PTW. So probably, alcohol requires additional scientific attention.

- Increased use of ABS.

- Speeding.

- Roll angles.

- Helmets: investigation on face protection.

**Need for research at EU level**

- In-depth and accident causation: look into the details of accidents: simulation, vehicle dynamics to see which state of the road has which effect on the braking system, on the tires, on rider behaviour, what are the reactions of different vehicles on the same section of road, at the same speed? Etc. It would allow progress to be made towards predictive modelling instead of just black spot management. Though we have sufficient infrastructure and vehicle data, we lack certain character and behaviour data for assessing the human factor.
Future of riding: technical solutions and ITS to see how measures affect accident statistics: what are the real benefits and effects? In previous studies, we observed that technical solutions could have negative effects (side effects) on riding: going beyond your limit, not feeling the road, being too used to car ITS when a rider switches back to his PTW. Though there are fewer PTW accidents, the share of fatal accidents is increasing. The problem is not just a technical one, but also a psychological one.

Vehicle-related research: Austria is probably too small to conduct such research. We could nevertheless do more, but it will mean having local results. Vehicle-related research should be done at EU level as otherwise we will only have local results.

European standards on protective gear. We need to know more about what kind of protective clothing is really necessary to be able to provide clear and objective recommendations on which kind of protective equipment is required for which purpose (which equipment, materials, etc.)

Comparison of rider behaviour at EU level.

In general Austria conducts PTW research with other countries within the Horizon 2020 programme, but also bilateral studies with certain other countries.

In-depth study

In Austria, there will be a national in-depth study. The IDAF already did this in the past, but just at a local level. For a European in-depth database, see iGLAD.

The IDAF project (In-Depth Analysis of Fatalities) analysed all fatal accidents in 2006 and 2007, of which 212 involved PTW riders. We used court files (mostly including a reconstruction by an expert witness). 54% were caused by excessive speed, of which 25% were over the legal and 29% over the physical limit (i.e. inappropriate speed).

2 particular scenarios appeared:

- Minor right-hand curves: a rider looks to the front of a truck or another vehicle to check the possibility of overtaking it on its right side. Perception error. Crash when overtaking.

- Fatal test rides. Friends meet, one of them with a motorcycle. Others want to try it out. Not used to the vehicle. Mostly no or poor safety equipment (sometimes even without a helmet).

The conclusions were published by press releases, fact sheets on our website, papers at international conferences and journals.
(AT) D6: Traffic management and ITS

Respondent:
Martin Winkelbauer Senior Researcher at KFV (Austrian Road Safety Board)

In Austria, PTWs are not really integrated into ITS development, as there is nothing in particular for them.

There are tolls for autobahn use (vignettes) which are less expensive for PTWs.

In general, bus lanes are open to public transport buses (not for private tourist buses), for taxis and the transport of people with particular needs (formerly called handicapped). It is very common to allow bicycles to use bus lanes. In rare cases, PTWs are also allowed. Conditions: no inductive loops for bus prioritisation at traffic lights, no zebra crossings without traffic lights and no oncoming left-turn vehicles.

There are ITS for showing the number of free parking spaces for buses and cars, but none for PTWs. There is an IT system for collecting parking fees, but there are no parking fees for PTWs, not even at Vienna Airport, which in terms of parking fees for cars is the most expensive in the whole world.

(AT) D7: Awareness campaigns

Respondent:
Martin Winkelbauer Senior Researcher at KFV (Austrian Road Safety Board)

Campaigns on PTW safety
In Austria, there was only one campaign on PTW safety in recent years: “Respect”: http://www.bmvit.gv.at/verkehr/strasse/publikationen/sicherheit/respect.html

In early 2012, there were a lot of motorcycle accidents due to very warm weather in January and the early end of winter. The ministry took the chance to launch a press campaign. All relevant stakeholders met to design a leaflet with different contents:

- Difference between a car and PTW (with reference to the current problem of the new “easy rider” generation, i.e. both returning riders and new riders from 35 to 55)
- Protective gear
- Types of riders, practically more a short guide on which vehicle to chose
− Safe riding techniques
− Typical accident scenarios (using Bernd Spiegel's pictures)
− Advertising for PTW vacations, i.e. advice for longer trips
− Passenger behaviour
− The legal system of access (the system of staged licencing)
− Other legal obligations and news
− Contacts
− A €20 bonus for a safety training course

The campaign was well done and brought together all the different experts: the ministry, the automobile clubs, the dealers' association, the police (i.e. their PTW training experts), driving schools and the KFV.

Other campaigns

KFV is aware of other campaigns, for example from Germany. They did good campaigns for example on ABS (“Besser Bremsen” = better braking) and we supported it. Another example was the “Think” campaign in the UK.

Key elements for a campaign

Good elements: they applied the CAST elements.

(AT) D8: National strategies

Respondent:
Robert Radetzky  
Austrian Ministry for Transport, Innovation and Technology / Department IV/ST2

Key measures of the NS/AP

Austrian Road Safety Programme:  

− Dealing with accident-prone road sections
  ◦ Treatment priority for accident-prone sections of roads and junctions
Use of new roadside restraint systems and removal of objects at the side of the road.

Avoidance of changes in grip on the road surface.

Road sweeping plans at the start of the motorcycle season with priority given to the removal of grit.

More under-ride protection/barriers for safety restraints on roads with high volumes of motorcycle traffic.

Clear road and roadway markings based on the “self-explaining road” principle.

- Passive safety devices
  - Creation of incentives, e.g. tax advantages, for motorcycles with ABS

- Protective clothing
  - Use of helmet and helmet straps – raising awareness and enforcement
  - Rising awareness for protective clothing
  - Creating awareness for “garishly”

- Education and training
  - Development of measures to improve the road safety of „returned motorcyclists“
  - Redefinition of the staged driving licence system
  - Enhancement of 2nd phase driver education for motorcyclists.
  - Investigation of insurance premium incentives for participation in a road safety training course.
  - Extracurricular moped workshops for young moped riders
  - Education for young people on the risks associated with tampering.

- Raising awareness
  - Informing car drivers of the danger of accidents with motorcyclists
  - Working with focus groups and cooperation activities with associations and interest groups.

Measures are part of the Austrian Road Safety Programme and are implemented step by step. The measures are structured as: a starting package; short term; medium-term; long-term measures.
Initial implementation. During 2012 the measures dealing with accident-prone road sections were finished. The evaluation of these measures is planned for 2014. The next NS/AP will be a revision of the current road safety programme.

Need for EU action

- Regulations of obligatory equipment like ABS, airbags, safety belts in new vehicles.
- Investigation of possibilities for the obligatory use of driving simulators in PTW driving licence education.
- Measures to prevent tampering of new mopeds
- Special training and education for older bikers (39+) starting to ride motor-bikes.

(AT) D9: Motorcycling community

There are quite a lot of biking clubs and also other associations which include motorcycles (e.g. classic vehicles among which there are also motorcycles and mopeds). However, there is no national association of these clubs, i.e. no one who could be a FEMA member. There are two large motorist clubs (OAMTC is currently, in relation to the Austrian population, the world’s largest motorist club) and has a section for motorcycles.

The national ACEM member (ARGE2rad) to a certain extent takes over the role of a national representation of riders.

During elections, the “Red Bikers” issue press releases and act on behalf of riders interests. But this group is quite close to the socialist party. Hence, their honest interest is probably not exclusively in representing riders’ interests
BELGIUM

(BE) D1: Training, testing and licencing

Respondent:
André Tourneur, SPF mobilité et transports, DG Transport Routier et Sécurité Routière
CIECA member

Licence scheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AM</th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A (direct access) or 2 years of A2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum age</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Based on the GDE matrix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and testing</td>
<td>Based on the GDE matrix: Theory test + practical test</td>
<td>Based on the GDE matrix</td>
<td>Based on the GDE matrix</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirement for the graduate licence</td>
<td>A1 licence for at least 2 years + 4h of training (check of the level, evaluation of competence, correction of riding errors, adaption to the new motorcycle size. The idea is not to learn again how to ride, but it is an update for the motorcycle category. There is</td>
<td></td>
<td>A2 licence for at least 2 years + 4h of training + Exam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
no precise curriculum; it will depend on the level of the student)
+ Exam on private road (evaluation of the technical level on the new motorcycle)
+ Exam in traffic (evaluation of the attitude and behaviour)

Change of structure

Compared to the previous structure, there are now more mandatory training hours: from 6h to 9h
+ a mandatory test on a private road before gaining a provisional licence. There is now a mandatory “contrat pédagogique” (pedagogical contract) between the driving school and the student, describing what is going to be learnt, why, how and when.

Improvements

According to the Belgian government, the new number of mandatory hours of training before gaining the provisional licence is more in line with reality and represents an improvement. Moreover, the pedagogical contract is a good idea because it makes a student accountable.

According to the CIECA member, the progressive access to the A2 or A licence is an improvement.

Inconveniences

Nevertheless, there are also inconveniences arising from the 3DLD. The testing on a private road is ridiculous in its current form.

Moreover, a persistent problem is that trike riders need an A licence to drive internationally. This is quite illogical, because the driving and learning process for a trike and for a motorcycle are different. To have a motorcycle licence for a trike is absurd, and training will not correspond to the vehicle type. A solution would be to implement mandatory and specific additional training for the B licence. It would be easier and more appropriate. It would be a recommendation for 4DLD.
Implementation difficulties

3DLD implementation also brought about a number of difficulties because of the too low level of instructor training. Instructors had trouble compiling a personalized curriculum for each student.

There were also problems with students caught between the two systems. But this was due to their lack of organization. The issue was however solved by itself on expiry of the provisional licence (1 year max.).

There were also problems with certain motorcycles which had to switch from the A2 category to the A category because of their restriction, meaning that those who had an A- licence (= A2) were no longer able to ride their motorcycle. But this problem was later resolved.

Though the cost of the new licence has increased, no complaints have been reported. This increased cost is due to the mandatory training being increased from 8h to 12h. In reality, however, people were already taking 12 hours of training as 8h were not sufficient. So the legal obligation is now closer to reality. In theory, we can add around 200 € for each level (12h at 50 €/h of training instead of 8h). But in practice, as 80% of people were already taking their 12 h of training, there has been virtually no increase. If you pass all licence levels, the cost of the final licence will have increased by €480 (for two levels up past 200 € for training + 40 € for the first level examination, x2). But some driving schools are offering discounts when students take a staged exam. Legally, in theory, the licence now costs €1100 (€500 before). But this is a legal and theoretical point of view, whereas in reality, people were already taking extra training hours, so the price remains approximately the same, i.e. the legislation caught up with reality. Especially since many people are just keeping their A2 licence without going to the A licence.

At present, it is not possible to assess the number of licences granted. No assessment has been done after implementing the Directive, and as such assessment is a Region responsibility, it is not sure whether there will be any assessment at national level.

The 4DLD

- The trike problem needs to be fixed soon: switching from an A-licence to a specific and mandatory additional training for the B licence. It would be easier and more appropriate.
- Minimum standards for the training of students, instructors and inspectors.
- Better coordination between the European Commission departments for technical approval and for the 4DLD. At the same time, greater involvement of stakeholders in the development of legislation, especially those with practical expertise on the subject.
**BE** D2: Data collection and statistics

**Respondent:**
Heike Martensen  
Belgian Road Safety Institute (BIVV-IBSR)

**Data collected**

There are two kinds of data collected in Belgium on vehicle use (not PTW-specific), though they are not EU-harmonized:

- The first is the number of PTW kilometres ridden (not mopeds). These data are collected by the regions and consolidated for Belgium by the Ministry of Transport. They are available at: [http://statbel.fgov.be/fr/statistiques/chiffres/circulation_et_transport/circulation/distances/](http://statbel.fgov.be/fr/statistiques/chiffres/circulation_et_transport/circulation/distances/)

- The second kind of data are those of the BELDAM study, a mobility questionnaire-based survey conducted in 2009 and 2010. The report (in French) is downloadable from: [http://www.beldam.be/](http://www.beldam.be/)

In the case of accident with at least one person injured, a police officer must fill in a statistical form and a police report. Both are filled in electronically and for all accidents with an injured person (with a vehicle but not specifically a PTW).

In Belgium, there is currently no dedicated in-depth research team. However police officers in 1 or 2 zones are doing more or less “in-depth” investigation. Moreover, the justice department may always ask a technical expert to investigate an accident.


The police reports and the technical expert reports are only available to the justice department (and the police).
Data exchanged

The data entered into the statistical form are sent to the CARE database, while the police reports and any expert reports are not available for external use.

Once an “in-depth” team starts working in Belgium, the collected data will need to be exchanged with other in-depth EU teams.

(BE) D3: Infrastructure

Respondent:
Robert Peeters       Department of Mobility

Infrastructure guidelines

There are PTW-specific infrastructure guidelines for Flanders.

- Internal agency policy documents: instructions for local agencies
  - Dienstorder markering: on horizontal road markings
  - Dienstorder vangplanken: on crash barrier extensions
  - Dienstorder LINAWV2004/5.pdf van 8 april 2004
- Veiligheid motorrijders (PTW safety)
  - Annex 1: Table I: PTW (and other two-wheelers) safety compared to conventional metal crash barriers
  - Annex 2: Cross section and ground plan

These guidelines are recommended as best practices, with nothing “legally” enforced. However, internally, Flemish authorities follow a policy of applying the recommendations as much as possible. Local authorities have wide-ranging autonomy and they only have to apply general
principles. In everyday practice they will usually consult a local engineering firm for road construction. The mandatory documents are effectively implemented at a regional level – the other two documents are however mostly used solely as guidelines, and not really at a local level.

Others questions

Strictly speaking, a PTW is a motor vehicle and therefore a rider is not seen as a vulnerable road user. The distinction is for environmentally-friendly and low-footprint transport. Yet from a legal perspective, PTW riders are also considered as vulnerable road users. There is no distinction made in the type of roads they use. They are considered as vulnerable road users with the objective of decreasing the number of accidents involved (fatalities or severely injured riders). Various measures are used to encourage paying more attention to the road, improving education and promoting awareness.

The Flemish road authorities do not yet have enough experience with regard to the infrastructure directive in relation to PTWs to arrive at any conclusions. Lack of transmission from the Commission to the regional level. Actions to take in the near future:

- Crash barrier extensions in difficult / dangerous bends
- Avoiding using hazardous horizontal signalization (thermoplast, etc…) or pavement material
- Avoiding hazardous constructions (also an improvement for other users)

Need for EU actions

- The use of safety gear/protective clothing
- Authorization to filter through a traffic jam. Belgium allows it, but some countries (France, Germany) are more reluctant about it.
- A uniform policy towards (or prohibition of) the use of bus lanes, road verges, hard shoulders, etc. There is too little statistical data available to tell which infrastructural measurements would work.
- If there is a harmonization in the use of infrastructure, road construction will have to take legal practice into account (leave more space on the roadside for motorcycles, etc.).
- The combination of EN 1317-5 and EN 1317-8 is not always that clear, especially because the EN 1317-5 part has not yet been adapted to the new CPD (continuing professional development).
There is no real sharing of information and best practices on infrastructure, except that the Flemish Road Authorities are contributing to a CEDR-study called SAVeRS, developing a guide to choose appropriate road restraint systems. (http://www.saversproject.com/en/index.php)

Report on infrastructure problems

In Belgium, there are a number of general infrastructure problems, but nothing specific to PTWs. The condition of a road as well of its markings is monitored on a regular basis. Also police accident reports are monitored. On this basis, road safety inspections are conducted and a list of black spots drawn up for inclusion in the regional safety plan.

There are different reporting systems using new technologies, but used by different actors for different publics (http://www.meldpuntwegen.be/; Geo-reporting system (ADA); Geoloket; WERF.

(BE) D4: Accident reporting

Respondent:
Heike Martensen Belgian Road Safety Institute (BIVV-IBSR)

There is only one police accident report in Belgium (all roads and all vehicles). In practice, there could be differences as the accidents on highways are registered by the federal police and all other accidents by the local police.

There are certain questions concerning cycle paths for cyclists and moped riders, but there is no specific part for PTWs.

For each accident registered by the police, a form has to be filled in on which the national statistics are based. This form contains the following information on infrastructure:

- Road surface (dry, wet, puddles, sleet, snow, clean, dirty (sand, grit, leaves); unknown – 2 selections possible)
- Area (built up area; rural area)
- Other local characteristics (roadworks affecting the road surface; bridge, viaduct; tunnel; railway crossing; roundabout; none – 2 selections possible).
- Accident factors – road / road conditions (bad surface conditions of the road or cycle path (tracks, sleet, mud, flooding); deficient signalization; defective or insufficient lighting;
roadworks; congestion, traffic jam, accident; steep descent (7%+); sharp turn; bad visibility (road contours, fixed obstacle, stationary vehicle).

The police reports vary a lot in detail and quality. Sometimes an accident expert provides very detailed measurements of all vehicles, the road and the surroundings, presenting a full accident reconstruction; in other cases there is barely a sketch of the accident scene and very little information. Generally speaking, the minimum is a detailed sketch of the scene, including possible damage or other obstacles in the road or on its surface. Moreover pictures of the accident scene are taken and included. The quality varies but for the most part the pictures allow the state of the road to be judged. For single-vehicle accidents it is often explicitly noted whether there were any road problems that could have caused the accident. For collisions with other road users this is rarely mentioned in the files.

**(BE) D5: Research**

**Respondent:**
Mathieu Roynard  
Belgian Road Safety Institute (BIVV-IBSR)

**Previous research done**

- The BIVV-IBSR has conducted a few studies and roadside surveys on PTW safety over the last 5 years (recommendations to take PTWs into account in road infrastructure measures, a study on crash causes, and a study on the use of safety equipment, speed measures).
- MOTAC: Motorcycle Accident Causation study – published in 2013. In-depth analysis of 200 police reports of motorcycle accidents with severe or fatal injuries. Factsheet available in English.
- Roadside survey on the use of individual safety equipment by PTW riders in the Brussels-Capital Region – published in 2013. This measure was done one year after a new regulation for PTWs came into force on 1 September 2011, stipulating mandatory use of individual safety equipment for PTW users.
- National roadside survey on PTW speed conducted in June 2014, publication planned for late 2014. Measurement conducted with laser speed guns in various types of road and traffic conditions.
– PTW infrastructure guidelines.

Need for research at national level
– PTW accidentology (in-depth investigations)
– Assessment of injuries linked with crash types (linking crash data and hospital data)
– Safety equipment (regulation, assessment)
– Implementation of passive & active safety systems
– Improving behaviour
– Enhancing conspicuousness, etc.

Need for research at EU level
Same answer as for the Belgian level, though we need to take into account that each country has its own characteristics regarding PTWs (stock of vehicles, infrastructure, and type of traffic and driver behaviour).

Belgium frequently participates in EU road safety projects but not specifically in PTW research. Nevertheless, it is really interested in more common research concerning PTW safety.

In-depth study
No in-depth studies have been conducted in Belgium. According to Belgian regulations, researchers are not allowed to conduct investigations at the scene of an accident. Nevertheless, the goal of the BIVV-IBSR is to create in the very near future an in-depth team. One of the first topics could be PTW safety according to the stakeholders and project opportunities.

(BE) D6: Traffic management and ITS

**Respondent:**
Jean-François Gaillet IBSR, mobility and infrastructure department

Intelligent systems in place in Belgium include the system of incident detection, counting loops, surveillance cameras, monitoring systems, real-time traffic information, weather conditions monitoring with winter maintenance. These are fairly traditional systems. Automatic recognition
number-plates, radar sections and weight in motion systems are now being deployed. A road charging system for trucks is also being deployed in Belgium.

Belgium has just one toll system: for a tunnel in the Flemish Region. Nothing is planned for motorcycles in current systems, and they pay the same price as a car. There are often two categories, one for HGVs and one for the rest (cars, motorbikes). In Wallonia, there are two roads where traffic is monitored and motorcycles are not distinguished from cars.

In theory, the Highway Code allows PTWs to use bus lanes. But it is up to the local road administration to allow it in practice or not. And it should add a signpost stating which users can take this lane. However, in practice this possibility is never used. Moreover, the management of these lanes is really conventional: there are no variable signs, no variable lights, etc. The only thing allowed is the possibility to use hard shoulder in the case of congestion. But this is not specific to PTWs but for all vehicles.

In Belgium, most parking systems are managed by private companies under a concession scheme. They monitor the number of parking places available and inform users of car park availability (mainly for inside parking). To our knowledge, they offer specific parking places for PTWs but do not specifically inform users about PTW place availability.

(BE) D7: Awareness campaigns

Respondent:
Werner de Dobbeleer VSV, the Flemish Foundation for Traffic Knowledge

Campaigns on PTW safety
Ready to Ride (started in 2012) by VSV. The idea is to propose defensive riding courses (it was proved that defensive riding courses provide safety advantages for riders). The campaign targets riders and their relatives, making them aware of the advantage of taking a defensive riding course. We address relatives because they are a very important peer group for the riders and can persuade them to take these courses. The insurance can pay for part of the training.

The positive point of the campaign is that it’s a targeted low-cost campaign with a clear message. A negative element is the weak return in term of sales, with the price of such a course (€150) being the main obstacle. Where reductions are offered (in the case of government subsidies), we can observe a clear boom in the volume of sales.

It is very difficult to establish a direct relation between accidents, the campaign and safety improvements. The Ready to Ride website leads to 150 additional riding courses being taken each year. Too little in terms of safety, but riding courses do have a positive effect on
individuals. And maybe riders who see the campaign will book a course at a driving school directly, without going through the website. However, we generally observe a good increase in visits to the website after a campaign.

Other campaigns

Though not a VSV campaign, the BIVV is conducting a campaign at federal level targeting cars drivers – “Garder un regard sur l’autre” – using billboards and a YouTube video to raise awareness to motorcyclists on the road.

MAG Belgium conducts small but good campaigns: start-up weekend in March or April: an action to evaluate riding skills open to all users (not only members). It is a good idea for the beginning of the riding season. But attendance varies with the weather. They have a limited budget and lack experience in running a really professional campaign.

In France, there is very good safety campaign on protective gear. It is a good campaign because it is a concrete demonstration of what it costs to ride without the best equipment. Because it is trustworthy (realistic, probable and convincing), there is a clear message (no doubt) and it is true.

In the UK: the Think! campaign. Very instructive on risky situations, showing exactly how PTW accidents happen. Because it is really realistic, it is very convincing for PTW users.

Key elements for a campaign

In general, avoid bad adverts: when they are too negative, they are less convincing for users. We should not show the result of an accident (death, etc.). It is more convincing if you show which behaviour should be preferred to avoid an accident.

*    *     *

Jan Vandaele BIVV-IBSR, responsible for campaigns

Campaigns on PTW safety

*Go for zero*: an umbrella road safety campaign: *Keep an eye on each other* (2012-2013) and *Anticipate the danger*. The *Go for zero* campaign targets both car drivers and PTW riders and the need to pay attention to each other on the road.
The positive points of this campaign:

- The biggest difficulty with any motorcycle campaign is reaching the target. So a good point of the campaign involves working with motorcycle associations. For example, the gardez un oeil campaign was done in collaboration with the motorcycle council, part of FEBIAC, an umbrella organisation for PTW associations.
- The campaigns were done in collaboration with the regional authorities.
- Another positive point is to focus on both car drivers and PTW riders.
- For the dissemination of the campaign, you have to pay attention to how you reach motorcyclists: POS materials (Point of Sale) with motorcycle specialists, MC press.

The negative points of this campaign:

- The biggest difficulty with any motorcycle campaign is reaching the target.
- Fragmentation of the motorcyclist community: there are a lot of biking organizations with different philosophies: hard vs. soft core. Nevertheless, we are trying to get them all on board. And there are also different kinds of riders depending on their use of motorcycles. But they all share the same risk on the road.

To measure the impact of a campaign, you need to measure different things: changes in behaviour, changes in mentality. In general, we can observe a change in behaviour. But it is difficult to observe any change in safety statistics because of the growing number of motorcyclists in Belgium. Nevertheless the number of PTW accidents is decreasing.

Other campaigns

IBSR held a conference last year with the participation of other European countries on awareness campaigns, though it was not focused specifically on motorcycles. In general, they are not covered in foreign campaigns. But the organiser remembered a UK awareness-raising video “David’s story”, shocking clip video about a motorcyclist killed on the road.

IBSR always conducts campaigns in close collaboration with biking associations, using them as a channel to reach motorcyclists. Otherwise, there is no specific media targeting motorcyclists. They also have their own campaigns, though dependent on the regions or the community. But there is no coordination between them, leading to a lack of continuity.

Key elements for a campaign

The elements of a good campaign are to get together all stakeholders, to target the right media and to focus the campaign on providing solutions, pointing out potential dangers and how to ride
safely, and offering concrete advice: how to change behaviour or providing examples of dangerous situations and how to behave.

You have to pay attention not to stigmatize riders, as any such message will not be accepted and it won’t work. So you have to choose a message that the motorcycling community can support. Don’t target any specific extreme behaviour as this will not be the “normal” behaviour of most riders.
(BG) D1: Training, testing and licencing

**Respondent:**
CIECA member CIECA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BULGARIA</th>
<th>AM</th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum age</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24 (direct access) or 2 years of A2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and testing</td>
<td>Theory test + Practical test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirement for the graduate licence</td>
<td></td>
<td>A1 licence for at least 2 years + Training + Practical test (test of skills and behaviour)</td>
<td>A2 licence for at least 2 years + Training + Practical test (test of skills and behaviour)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(BG) D2: Data collection and statistics

**Respondent:**
Stefan Stoimenov Trafficpol

**Data collected**
Bulgaria is not collecting data for motorcycles separate from other vehicles. Within the motorcycle section in the database, there is no division according to engine size, while this is the case in CADAS. The adaptation of their data collection in line with the CADAS system is in preparation.

The “in-depth” investigation of accidents with injuries or fatalities is in conformity with the Penalty Code. A Traffic Accident Report with 70 variables has to be filled in. The data for motorcycles are no different to those for other accidents. In certain cases a scientific organization will conduct studies on road accidents, sending their conclusions to the government.
These data are not available to the public, and are only used by the traffic safety department, though may also be shared with insurance companies. The idea is to make this data accessible to further organizations.

**Data exchanged**

Bulgaria sent its data to the EU for the period 2007-2009. But in 2010 the structure of the collection database in Bulgaria was changed, with the result that the country could no longer send the required information in the required CADAS structure (format of the CARE database). They are currently in the process of creating a new system to collect data, which will be able to transfer data by software directly into the CADaS files.

**(BG) D3: Infrastructure**

**Respondent:**
Velin Vuchkov  Road Infrastructure Agency, department "Licences and safety"

**Infrastructure guidelines**

There are no PTW-specific infrastructure guidelines in Bulgaria.

**Need for EU actions**

- Harmonisation of the existing infrastructure with EU requirements and practices in terms of two-wheel road vehicles.

**(BG) D4: Accident reporting**

**Respondent:**
Stefan Stoimenov  Trafficpol

There is only one police accident report (all road categories, all vehicles).

There is no special section for infrastructure as such, but the investigator has to collect any information related to the accident cause, meaning that he will investigate the infrastructure. But it all depends on his evaluation of the situation. He also has to fill in another report, the
registration card (used for statistics only), and in this report there are questions on the infrastructure (bridge, etc.).

When an accident call is received by the police, the first task is to secure the scene. Once this has been done, the traffic unit (a unit within the police) arrives on the spot to fill in the accident report and the registration card that will be used for statistics. It can call in the more specialized investigation unit to collect information for a court case, though only in the case of injuries or fatalities.

(BG) D5: Research

Respondent:
Stefan Stoimenov Trafficpol

Previous research done
In Bulgaria, no in-depth study has yet been conducted.

Need for research at national level
According to the Bulgarian expert, they do not feel there is any need to investigate PTW accidents due to the low number of PTW accidents.

(BG) D6: Traffic management and ITS

Respondent:
Velin Vuchkov Road Infrastructure Agency, department "Licences and safety"

There is no intelligent traffic management in Bulgaria. PTWs are not included in intelligent road and bridge tolls and are not allowed to use bus lanes. There is no specific strategy to include PTWs in intelligent parking systems.
(CZ) 1: Training, testing and licencing

**Respondent:**

Jindrich Fric  
Division of Road Safety and Traffic Engineering, Transport Research Centre  
CIECA member  
CIECA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Licence scheme</th>
<th>CZECH REPUBLIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum age</td>
<td>AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and testing</td>
<td>Theory test + Practical test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirement for the graduate licence</td>
<td>A1 licence for at least 2 years + Practical test</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AM</th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum age</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24 (direct access) or 2 years of A2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and testing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirement for the graduate licence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A1 licence for at least 2 years + Practical test</td>
<td>A2 licence for at least 2 years + Practical test</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Change of structure**

The 3DLD increased the minimum age for the A-licence.

**Improvements**

According to the Czech expert, the new minimum age of 24 for the A-licence is an improvement. The introduction of the 3DLD also provided the opportunity to give specifications for motorcycle group A and its subgroups.

According to the CIECA member, the more sophisticated practical test with manoeuvring tests on training areas is an improvement.

**Implementation difficulties**

The Czech Republic is currently introducing new licences in exchange for old ones, and the overall statistics there are not known yet. What can be stated is that the total number of "motorbikers" compared to previous years (i.e. since 2000) increases every year.
The 4DLD
The Czech expert recommends increased driving test harmonization for all EU countries, with an exact description of the test.

The CIECA member recommends introducing a special driving licence category for trikes and quads (for example A3) and maybe even a special category for electric vehicles due to differences in their control.

(CZ) D2: Data collection and statistics

Respondent:
Jindrich Fric
Division of Road Safety and Traffic Engineering, Transport Research Centre

Data collected

- Accident data for statistical surveys in EU countries (IRTAD).
- Motorcycle capacity (for statistics).
- Number of accidents (for statistics)
- Complete accident data (from the police)
- Blackspots: locations of frequent traffic accidents. PTWs are subject to safety inspections by the police and the owner of road. Consequently, adjustments are made, such as increasing road friction, etc.

HADN and CZIDAS are in-depth traffic accident analyses conducted in the Czech Republic.

Data exchanged

The Czech accident database collected by the Ministry of Interior and the police is exchanged with the IRTAD database.

The Czech expert recommends using and comparing this IRTAD database.

And he also recommends using the analysis of the most common causes of PTW accidents to improve driver training and add driving risk factors into the mandatory part of training (cutting back the number of hours allocated for technical maintenance).
(CZ) D3: Infrastructure

Respondent:
Jindrich Fric Division of Road Safety and Traffic Engineering, Transport Research Centre

Infrastructure guidelines
There are no PTW-specific infrastructure guidelines in the Czech Republic.

Others questions
In the Czech Republic, PTW riders and passengers are included in the vulnerable group alongside pedestrians, children, cyclists and the elderly.

Need for EU actions
The Czech expert recommends the harmonisation of infrastructure standards related to PTWs.

Reporting on infrastructure problems
There is no systematic reporting of infrastructure problems in Czech Republic.

(CZ) D4: Accident reporting

Respondent:
Jindrich Fric Division of Road Safety and Traffic Engineering, Transport Research Centre

There is only one police accident report in the Czech Republic (all road categories and all vehicles).

The police make a detailed record of the location of the accident, including a report of infrastructural problems.
**CZ** D5: Research

**Respondent:**
Jindrich Fric  
Division of Road Safety and Traffic Engineering, Transport Research Centre

Need for research at national level
- Long-term analysis of rider behaviour in traffic

In-depth study
The Czech Republic conducted an in-depth study within the EU 2-BE-SAFE project.

**CZ** D6: Traffic management and ITS

**Respondent:**
Jindrich Fric  
Division of Road Safety and Traffic Engineering, Transport Research Centre

PTWs are not included in ITS in the Czech Republic.
Tolls are not collected in the Czech Republic. The fee for the motorway vignette replaces tolls.
PTWs are not allowed to use bus lanes reserved only for buses or taxis.
And there is no intelligent PTW parking system.

**CZ** D8: National strategies

**Respondent:**
Jindrich Fric  
Division of Road Safety and Traffic Engineering, Transport Research Centre

Key measures of the NS/AP
- To improve the quality of infrastructure.
- Indirect indicators: the use of motorcycle helmets and seats (100%), respect of speed limits and observance of a safe distance.
– Implementation of safety audits on regional roads too.
– Blackspot management.

The Czech expert recommends also working on high-quality training in a driving school as part of the next road safety plan.

Need for EU action
– To focus road safety management tools more on PTWs.

(CZ) D9: Motorcycling community

Respondent:
Jindrich Fric Division of Road Safety and Traffic Engineering, Transport Research Centre

The Transport Research Centre cooperates with motorcycle associations on DLD issues and on the road safety plan.
DENMARK

(DK) D1: Training, testing and licencing

Respondent:
CIECA member CIECA

Licence scheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AM</th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum age</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24 (direct access) or 2 years of A2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and testing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Training + Theory test + Practical test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 lessons of 45 minutes (theory, driving on a closed test area, driving in traffic) + 8h of first aid courses + theoretical test + practical test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirement for the graduate licence</td>
<td>A1 licence for at least 2 years + Practical test</td>
<td>A2 licence for at least 2 years + Practical test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Change of structure

According to the CIECA member, the most significant change was to the categories of motorcycles, including new age requirements.

Improvements

According to the CIECA member, the gradual acquisition of rights to the various sizes of motorcycles.
Implementation difficulties

According to the CIECA member, there had been problems with the transfer of rights for the gradual acquisition prior to the implementation of the third driving licence directive. This is mainly due to the size limit for small motorcycles before and after 2013.

There were no significant differences in the issuance of a motorcycle licence before and after the implementation of the third driving licence directive. The content of driver training for motorcycles remained the same in Denmark.
ESTONIA

(EE) D1: Training, testing and licencing

Respondent:
CIECA member CIECA

Licence scheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AM</th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum age</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24 (direct access) or 2 years of A2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and testing</td>
<td>Theory test + practical test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate licence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A1 licence for at least 2 years + Practical test</td>
<td>A2 licence for at least 2 years + Practical test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirement for the graduate licence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Change of structure
According to the Estonian CIECA member, the main change was to the A category, now split in two: A2 and A, with the result that there are now new minimum age requirements (ages 18; 20 and 24): Also changed are the progressive access from A2 to A and the test vehicle requirements.

Improvements
According to the Estonian CIECA member, the training system for A2 and A based on a new curriculum which entered into force at the end of 2014 is an improvement.

Inconveniences
Transposition impacted training providers most, especially with regard to the technical aspects of category A2 and A vehicles (power rating/capacity of the engine) used in driver training as well as driver testing (for the practical driving test). Changes in test vehicle requirements faced training providers with the problem of having to buy new motorcycles meeting the test vehicle requirements, even though Member States were given a transitional period.
Implementation difficulties

The transposition period caused some inconvenience for certain category A licence applicants due to the new 3DLD requirements transposed into national law (24 years of age for category A applicants). This saw many 21 year-old applicants passing their training and starting the application process, yet the latter (to take the practical driving test) remained unfinished because of the new national legislation (Traffic Act) with its new requirements transposed from the EU driving licence directive. As a result, those applicants (aged 21) received a category A2 licence instead of the category A one initially applied for.

Buying new motorcycles was a cost for training providers.

The number of category A2 applicants has increased while the number of category A ones has decreased.

The 4DLD

One recommendation that could be considered for harmonizing the DLD with regard to motorcycles:

What kind of extra skills and behaviour, special manoeuvres could/should be assessed by a driving examiner in the practical driving test when the candidate is applying for a category A licence using progressive access (A2-A). In other words, what is the main difference between assessing a category A applicant’s skills and behaviour via direct or stage-by-stage access. The added value should be clearer and more guidelines are needed for the assessment of a category A candidate’s skills and behaviour via stage-by-stage access (A1-A2; A2-A).

The same question applies to the training option.
FINLAND

(FI) D1: Training, testing and licencing

Respondent:
CIECA member CIECA
Elina Uusitalo Finnish Transport Safety Agency (Trafi), department Licences and Approvals

Licence scheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FINLAND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirement for the graduate licence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are two different categories of AM licence (one for two wheelers and one for quads and >25km/h and <45km/h): a Finnish characteristic. Basically the first PTW licence in which young people are interested is the AM120, a licence type working well in Finland. The AM121 is for the four-wheel version of the moped and was separated from the AM class in 2013.

Change of structure

There were not so many changes compared to the previous scheme. The main change is in the mandatory training and testing between each grade of licence (according to CIECA too).
**Improvements**

The system encourages students to get more training. It is difficult to know yet whether this will have an impact on safety.

According to the CIECA member, more training with different kinds of motorcycles and a follow-up by one’s instructor is an improvement.

**Inconveniences**

It is now more difficult and expensive to gain the full licence, because you need to take more training and testing to get the higher licence.

The statistics show that fewer people are acquiring an A licence (full capacity) now and that this is possibly due to the new licence scheme.

**Implementation difficulties**

One implementation difficulty for a lot of driving schools is due to the 3 categories with 3 testing phases for each category. This means that they have to invest in the right motorcycles for the testing, an additional cost for them.

The price has doubled since the 3DLD, leading to many complaints. This is due to progressive access (also in the view of the CIECA members). The idea to have more training is good for safety, but the cost has doubled and Finland is receiving a lot of complaints about this.

Some problems about the restriction of motorcycles have been reported in Finland, with riders having the wrong engine size for their category of licence.

There was a very slight decrease between 2012 and 2013, but maybe too low to reach any conclusion (from 11% to 10.8%). It is difficult to know the reason why, as it could be attributable to the change of licence scheme or to the economic crisis. According to the CIECA member, there are not so many progressive access learners as before, and not so many A2 licence holders as before.

**The 4DLD**

- Before making any changes with regard to the next directive, maybe more research should be conducted on accident rates, and an impact assessment made of the 3DLD. First, we have to know what the 3DLD benefits are at European level before moving towards the 4DLD.
- To have more specialised training for each category.
(FI) D2: Data collection and statistics

Respondent:
Riikka Rajamäki Finnish Transport Safety Agency (Trafi)

Data collected

- Number of registered vehicles and those actually in use, first registrations, the number of driving licences. All this separate for motorcycles and mopeds.
- In the case of an accident, different data are gathered:
  - Official statistics are based on police-reported accidents (fatalities, injuries, material damage)
  - Police data combined with road network data by the road administration
  - Fatal accident investigation team data
  - Insurance data on accidents
  - Fire and rescue service data (used mainly as a supplementary data source, providing some information on slight and serious injuries)
  - Hospital data (used in some projects to find out accident seriousness)

It would be interesting to have statistics on PTW mileage to calculate accident rates. Nearly all fatal accidents are inspected. Certain cases with a large time gap (several days or weeks) between the accident and the death may be left out.

Official statistics are published annually, and there are also a small info sheets on motorcycle and moped accidents which are updated about twice a year. The fatal accident investigation unit publishes its statistical report annually, sometimes even with a special report on PTWs. Insurance company statistics are also published annually. All this data is also available for researchers, though must be applied for.

Data exchanged

Finland exchanges mainly official statistics and data with the CARE database. The country also contributes to the IRTAD database.

It is always interesting to exchange data at an EU level, but there may already be enough data combinations in the CARE database. It is difficult, sometimes impossible, to match different codes, with a lot of information being lost in the process. But knowledge on effective traffic safety measures should be exchanged more.
**Respondent:**
Riikka Rajamäki            Finnish Transport Safety Agency (Trafi)

**Infrastructure guidelines**
In Finland, there are specific infrastructure guidelines for mopeds. These are simply advice for road engineers. It is still quite a new recommendation, coming into use in many municipalities this year.

**Others questions**
Moped riders and their passengers are sometimes included in the vulnerable road user category. But in Finland, this term is used solely for pedestrians, bicycles and mopeds.

The infrastructure directive for PTWs did not lead to any change in the Finnish guidelines for crash barriers or other road infrastructure elements, and fatal accident investigation also remained the same. The only change will be that planned roads and existing roads and roadworks will be checked more often to see whether they meet the standards.

**Need for EU actions**
In most countries mopeds are not allowed on bicycle tracks, so the Finnish guidelines are not very interesting for other countries. In Finland traffic volumes are so low that this causes problems – a rather different situation to that found in Central and Southern Europe. Nevertheless, exchanging knowledge with similar countries, such as Nordic ones and other low-population countries, is always interesting.

**Reporting on infrastructure problems**
If the fatal accident investigation team or a road audit notices infrastructure problems, like a hole in the elk fence, the information goes to the road district or contractor and they fix it asap.

Pavement and road marking conditions are subject to annual checks.

Bridge conditions are inspected at regular intervals. If damage can’t be fixed, this may lead to lower speed limits or weight limits.

The biggest infrastructure problems, like too few middle barriers, require political decision-making to release the money needed and are summarized by the ministry at regular intervals.
These different reports are linked to each other. Black spot warning is not used. We consider black spots as somewhat problematic, because they can lead to drivers choosing far more dangerous unpaved detours.

(FL) D4: Accident reporting

Respondent:
Riikka Rajamäki Finnish Transport Safety Agency (Trafi)

There is only one police accident report in Finland (all road categories and all vehicles). And there is no specific section for PTWs.

The police accident report does not take infrastructural problems into account.

The forms are computerized and the police have a connection to Trafi’s vehicle database. Accident location coordinates come from a police car’s GPS. The form filling is of course secondary, rescue and securing the site have priority.

(FL) D5: Research

Respondent:
Inkeri Parkkari Finnish Transport Safety Agency (Trafi)

Need for research at national level

- How are the skills taught during training (e.g. manoeuvring skills, braking skills, noticing risky situations) at driving schools taken up and how do the skills work in real traffic situations?
- How to best benefit from automated traffic control in the case of PTWs
- How can we make use of and take into account automated traffic controls with regard to PTWs?

Need for research at EU level

- International comparisons using in-depth accident investigation data.
- Benefits of ESC (Electronic Stability Control) systems in PTWs
Finland does not have any common research with other EU countries, but could be interested.

In-depth study
In Finland all fatal road traffic accidents are investigated by Road Accident Investigation Teams. The work is coordinated at the Finnish Motor Insurers’ Centre. The methodology used is VALT Method 2003.

(FI) D6: Traffic management and ITS

Respondent:
Riikka Rajamäki Finnish Transport Safety Agency (Trafi)

In Finland congestion is rather rare, tending only to regularly occur in the Helsinki region. Nowadays intelligent traffic management consists mainly of traffic situation monitoring, variable speed limits, warnings via radio and variable message signs, traffic-light management, and speed and bus lane cameras. This applies similarly to all drivers, including motorcyclists and moped riders. Speed cameras are not very effective in detecting motorcyclists, because in Finland there has to be a recognizable picture of the vehicle driver and number-plate for a fine. Motorcyclists wear helmets and only have a rear number-plate.

There are no road or bridge tolls in Finland.

PTWs are not allowed to use bus lanes.

There aren’t any national or municipal strategies for intelligent parking in Finland. There are no area-wide intelligent parking solutions, being limited to private car-parks. PTW traffic is strongly seasonal in Finland, and in summer there is less car traffic in big cities, and therefore fewer parking problems.

(FI) D8: National strategies

Respondent:
Sami Mynttinen Finnish Transport Safety Agency (Trafi)
Key measures of the NS/AP

There is a national road safety action plan every 4 years in Finland, but in this plan there are no measures targeting PTW safety. However the Finnish expert recommends including PTW safety measures within the new road safety action plan.

Need for EU action

- Intelligent traffic solutions. For example ones which influence a driver’s behaviour through constant feedback. For the novice motorists this would be especially beneficial, for example when the feedback of a motorist’s behaviour is given to the parents.
(FR) D1: Training, testing and licencing

Respondent:
CIECA member CIECA
Pascal Dunikowski Délégation à la Sécurité et à la Circulation Routières ; Chargé de mission 2RM National - Secrétaire de la commission 2R/2RM du Conseil National de Sécurité Routière

Licence scheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AM</th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum age</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24 (direct access) or 2 years of A2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and testing</td>
<td>Theory test + Training (5h)</td>
<td>Theory test (oral) + Training (manoeuvring on ground) + Practical test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirement for the graduate licence</td>
<td>A1 licence for at least 2 years + 7h of training</td>
<td>A1 licence for at least 2 years + 7h of training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Change of structure

There is no big change due to the 3DLD, except for the direct access to the A licence from 24 onwards. Before the 3DLD, the A licence was accessible from 18 but with a limited licence. And the unrestricted A licence was available from 20 with no exam. France also took advantage of the new directive to legally impose the wearing of protective clothing during the exam.

According to the CIECA member, the 3DLD has introduced a new way to gain an A category licence, i.e. via the A2 category after 7 hours training. Access to the A category is more progressive.

Improvements

- Elimination of the timed part of the test.
– Consolidation of the progressive part of the licence (but maybe too theoretical because of the too easy restriction between A2 and A).

– According to the CIECA member: the 7 hours training between the A2 category and the A category licences, and direct access to the A category only at the age of 24.

Implementation difficulties

The only problem posed by the 3DLD was a clash with French law: the problem of restricted motorcycles for the A2 licence (model restricted to 25kw or 34hp instead of 70kw motorcycles). But this problem is now under resolution.

Due to the new limitation for A2, it is now too easy for motorcycle manufacturers to restrict and de-restrict motorcycles, and has led to an escalation in de-restricting motorcycles in France, especially with the best-selling motorcycles.

According to the CIECA member, the cost of training for getting the A category of driving licence directly has not changed. Only the 7 hours training constitute a supplementary cost.

In 2013, approximately 100 000 A licences were issued: 40 000 A2 licences and 60 000 A licences. This means that a lot of people wait until they are 24 (but a lot of them are reborn riders) and skip the graduate licence. There was a slight drop in licence numbers in 2013 but this was not due to the 3DLD but probably due to the licence inspectors strike. But the 3DLD has had no impact on the number of licences issued or an impact too small to be noticed.

As regards women access, the problem of the lack of adaptability of motorcycles for women is not new and thus not due to the 3DLD. But there was a hope that, since the 3DLD allowing automatic motorcycles for driving tests, this would increase the number of women taking the exam. But it did not come about due to the model of the automatic motorcycle (too heavy, not really adapted for women).

The 4DLD

– The introduction of an “AA licence” = “Automatic A licence”. The idea would be to create an automatic licence: the possibility to create a category of light vehicle, not too powerful, easy to ride, cheap, an urban and city automatic motorcycle, to bring a new category of users to motorcycles from their 18th birthday with an easier exam. It could be a parallel licence to the A2 licence.

– According to the CIECA member: to abolish direct access to the A category licence and oblige people to stay xx years in the A2 category before taking training for the A category.
(FR) D2: Data collection and statistics

Respondent:
Thierry Serre IFSTTAR, Département Transport Santé Sécurité
Pascal Dunikowski Délégation à la Sécurité et à la Circulation Routières ; Chargé de mission 2RM National - Secrétaire de la commission 2R/2RM du Conseil National de Sécurité Routière

Data collected
In France, there has been a large improvement in the data collected on PTW crashes and fatalities since 2009, with improved knowledge through new scientific studies and a better use of data collected (improvement in details: distinction between moped, 125cc, etc.). This is the result of the government effort from 2006 onwards, prompted by the increasing share of motorcyclists in total fatalities in France (around 20%).

- Collection of data related to road safety (accident, infrastructure involved)
- Some data on mobility (type of motorcycles), but because there is no development policy for PTWs, not much mobility data is collected.
- There are different ways to collect data in France:
  o By the police (accident report)
  o By more specific and local collections (for example on injuries)
  o By the in-depth studies conducted by IFSTTAR.
- The data collected in the case of an accident are more or less the same as for cars: identity, age, experience, precise date, place, etc. = a total of 200 questions.
- In the case of an accident only involving material damage = just a European accident report
- In the case of injuries = police intervention (though around 30% of minor injuries are not reported) and accident report from the police with mandatory alcohol test.
- In the case of fatalities = mandatory test for alcohol and drugs.

Locally, and not with every accidents, IFFSTAR can carry out in-depth investigations.

All statistic are published monthly via a barometer, and annually through an annual report (paper and internet)
Data exchanged
National statistics are gathered at EU level on the basis of CARE.

(FR) D3: Infrastructure

Respondent:
Pascal Dunikowski  Délégation à la Sécurité et à la Circulation Routières ; Chargé de mission 2RM National - Secrétaire de la commission 2R/2RM du Conseil National de Sécurité Routière

Infrastructure guidelines
In France, the CERTU guidelines (from the Ministry of the Environment) represent PTW-specific infrastructure guidelines. But the French expert would be in favour of integrating these into general guidelines on infrastructure.

These guidelines are simple advice for engineers, resulting in their sub-optimal use and disparities within the territory. These guidelines are also a tool for users, to raise infrastructure problems on the road network.

Others questions
PTW riders are not legally considered as vulnerable road users in France. In the case of litigation, the evaluation is the decision of the judge; he has to decide whether the rider is a vulnerable road user.

The impact of the infrastructure directive on PTWs has not been very great. There has been no decrease in the number of PTW fatalities after hitting a crash barrier, despite the fact that there is a circular about the installation of safety barriers in curves. In France, riders fatalities involving a barriers are rare (around 1 fatality every 2 years per département) compared to fatalities involving a collision with another vehicle (car). So the issue is not really a priority

Need for EU actions
The French expert did not see any need for EU actions. But a best practice from France can be highlighted:

There is a new strategy on road safety in France. Until 2012, the Ministry issued directives and stipulated measures to be applied by the Conseil National de la Sécurité Routière (CNSR) = a
top-down approach. But since 2012, the CNSR has been given more power. It has its own parliament made up of 50 persons (civil society included). 4 committees are dedicated to different issues:

- Jeunes et éducation routière (young people and road education)
- Alcool, vitesse, stupéfiants (alcohol, speed and drugs)
- Outils technologiques et infrastructures routières (technological tools and road infrastructure)
- Usagers vulnérables: the committee on vulnerable road users principally targets PTW users.

In parallel, an expert committee also works on all these subjects in a more transversal way. The CNSR can work on infrastructure issues and take action. The first action has been to initiate real collaboration between the different stakeholders (including the national motorcyclists association), with a legal framework making it legally binding. This will be a real toolbox for users to raise problems on infrastructure (through the motorcycling community representatives).

**Reporting on infrastructure problems**

In France, a distinction is made between two aspects of infrastructure: comfort and safety. Concerning the safety aspect, the Préfet and the Conseil général are responsible for blackspot management. It can be dealt with at the local level but with few powers of decision (limited decentralisation).

**(FR) D4: Accident reporting**

**Respondent:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution and Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thierry Serre</td>
<td>IFSTTAR, Département Transport Santé Sécurité</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pascal Dunikowski</td>
<td>Délégation à la Sécurité et à la Circulation Routières ; Chargé de mission 2RM National - Secrétaire de la commission 2R/2RM du Conseil National de Sécurité Routière</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is only one police accident report in France (all road categories, all vehicles). On it, the type of road is specified. Even if there is no special section on PTWs, there are some specific questions: type of vehicle, brand and whether a helmet was worn.
According to the French expert, it would be interesting to have more information to measure the speed impact for example, which is not the case at present, as well as information on the safety gear worn by the motorcyclist and on vehicle deformation as a result of the crash.

The infrastructure section is not really developed in the police accident report. It just establishes facts. There is a list of different road characteristics but without detailed explanations. For example, there are check-boxes for “crash-barrier” or “tree” but to be checked only in the case of a crash with a vehicle. If the rider crashed into the tree because he fell off his motorcycle, it won’t be reported. There are “other” boxes that can be checked to be more flexible in the report, though their use is dependent on the police officer and the level of details he will provide. So the quality of any police accident report can vary greatly.

The police accident report can be filled out on the spot just after the accident, though sometimes there is a lack of information and the police have to come back to the spot some days later to complete the report. And one of the big problems of any accident report is that the person who intervened at the moment of the accident and the person who completes the report are different persons (different ministries, different services, etc.).

**(FR) D5: Research**

**Respondent:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thierry Serre</td>
<td>IFSTTAR, Département Transport Santé Sécurité</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pascal Dunikowski</td>
<td>Délégation à la Sécurité et à la Circulation Routières ; Chargé de mission 2RM National - Secrétaire de la commission 2R/2RM du Conseil National de Sécurité Routière</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Previous research done**

Recently, the government ordered a lot of studies on PTWs from IFFSTAR: on airbag jackets, on conspicuousness, on vehicles, on behaviour, on filtering, on electric PTWs, etc.

**Need for research at national level**

- On vehicles: ITS, trike accidents, electric vehicles.
- Riders: extreme behaviour, young, filtering
- Infrastructure: crash barriers, integration of PTWs in infrastructure design and test, PTW blackspots and areas of risk for PTWs (grey area).
Need for research at EU level

- National research on the evaluation of the consequences of the licencing scheme changes in France (effects on training contents, on novices’ behaviour and attitudes…) could be a very good topic for an EU research project, possibly based on the naturalistic studies we developed.

But it is difficult because certain data cannot be compared at EU level. For example, on airbag jackets, it is very difficult to design European standardization because of national differences. It would be interesting to have more information on protective clothing (wearing rate, state of protective clothing after crash).

In-depth study

IFFSTAR conducts in-depth studies but locally. The LAB (Renault-Peugeot) is also conducting in-depth studies, at a local level too.

As regards IFFSTAR, they are doing the in-depth study in Salon de Provence, though not on all motorcycle accidents or fatalities, meaning that they are not statistically representative. But they decided to study every type of accident that can occur with a motorcycle in order to be representative with regard to the variety of accidents.

Classic methodology: two investigators, one psychologist and one engineer go to the scene of accident. The psychologist interrogates witnesses and victims while the engineer studies the scene of the accident (picture, infrastructure, and vehicle). A second collection process starts, complementing the first one. At the end it is possible to analyse the accident infrastructure (barriers, curve, etc.), the rider (behaviour, experience, etc.) and the vehicle (state, deformation, etc.).

IFFSTAR conduct in-depth studies when an organisation or the government order such. They share the data with them and, depending on the ordering organisation, may publish the findings. Usually, for European and governmental studies, results are published. For governmental studies, results are used to design new measures, new road safety campaigns, etc.

(FR) D6: Traffic management and ITS

Respondent:
Pascal Dunikowski  
Délégation à la Sécurité et à la Circulation Routières ; Chargé de mission 2RM National - Secrétaire de la commission 2R/2RM du Conseil National de Sécurité Routière
ITS devices on motorways: the “autoroute info” priority radio broadcasts in the case of emergencies.

ITS devices on large roads: signposts with changing messages: can report the presence of motorcyclists, of filtering riders, etc.

There is no special tariff for motorcycles on motorways, as there are not enough motorcycles to be relevant (0.02% share). Tunnel use may be forbidden for motorcycles.

But in general, there is no specific mobility plan for motorcycles: as motorcycling is mainly seasonal, a leisure activity, masculine and expensive = this is not universal = , there is no specific strategy. In general, motorcyclists are considered more as an issue (high number of fatalities) than as a mobility solution.

PTWs are not allowed to use bus lanes. And there is no intelligent PTW parking system.

**(FR) D7: Awareness campaigns**

**Respondent:**
Pascal Dunikowski  
Délégation à la Sécurité et à la Circulation Routières ; Chargé de mission 2RM National - Secrétaire de la commission 2R/2RM du Conseil National de Sécurité Routière

**Campaigns on PTW safety**

This year the focus of awareness campaigns was on protective clothes: “On your motorcycle or scooter without full gear, you may lose your skin”. Last year it was on alcohol.

Awareness campaigns are part of the overall road safety governance. The CNSR make recommendations to the government on which topics awareness campaigns should focus. This means that citizens are involved in the process at an early stage. But at the end it is the ministry delegate who decides campaign topics (2 topics per year).

Campaign evaluation is done by the same advertising agency designing the campaign. On the one hand this means that it has all the information needed to run the evaluation but on the other hand, it lacks objectivity.

**Other campaigns**

Awareness campaigns are left up to the government and to insurance companies. Best practices in France to be highlighted: insurance companies are legally bound to dedicate 0.5% of their
turnover to communication on awareness. Most of the time, they create a specific agency to run these actions: on-the-ground work or awareness campaigns.

No comparison with other countries is made in France, and there is no contact with any other countries except Belgium and Italy.

Key elements for a campaign

The campaigns are more effective when they are broadcast on TV, enabling all motorcyclists to be reached. Campaigns done via specialized magazines are less useful because they reach motorcyclists often already aware of road safety.

(FR) D8: National strategies

Respondent:
Pascal Dunikowski Délégation à la Sécurité et à la Circulation Routières ; Chargé de mission 2RM National - Secrétaire de la commission 2R/2RM du Conseil National de Sécurité Routière

Key measures of the NS/AP

There is no specific development policy for PTWs (there are ones for bicycles, public transport and carpooling conducted by the Ministry of Environment). There is no strategic document for PTWs either, but there is a Direction de la sécurité et de la circulation routières (DSCR) committee for PTW road safety: one key national official + ministry advisor for PTW road safety + one official per département = Approach regarding the committee.

Key elements for PTW safety: embrace the EU objective of the 2020 European Strategy for Road Safety = target of bringing down road fatalities in France to 2000 in 2020. At present, France has a bad ratio in terms of fatalities/traffic/PTW stock.

- Obstacles: to establish (5 years) a multipartite observatory (authorities, users) to exchange information on the issue of road obstacles. Long-term objective to have “forgivable obstacles” which are not a deadly threat in the case of a crash.
- Infrastructure: observation phase.
- Equipment/safety gear: premature for action, but incentive and awareness campaigns for now.
Need for EU action

It would be better to set priorities at EU level.

**(FR) D9: Motorcycling community**

**Respondent:**

Pascal Dunikowski  
Délégation à la Sécurité et à la Circulation Routières ; Chargé de mission 2RM National - Secrétaire de la commission 2R/2RM du Conseil National de Sécurité Routière

Within the CNSR, motorcycle associations are involved together with national authorities in defining main issues and reporting problems on infrastructure, and in defining topics for awareness campaigns.
**GERMANY**

**DE) D1: Training, testing and licencing**

**Respondent:**
CIECA member CIECA
BASt Federal Highway Research Institute (BASt)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Licence scheme</th>
<th><strong>GERMANY</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minimum age</strong></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Training and testing</strong></td>
<td>Basic theoretical lessons (12 double lessons of 90 minutes) + 2 double lessons of 90 minutes + Basic practical training (minimum 6 x 45 min) + Theory and practical test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Requirement for the graduate licence</strong></td>
<td>Driving licence (which can only be class L) + 6 double lessons of basic training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 lessons of special drives + Theory and practical test OR A1 licence for at least 2 years + practical test</td>
<td>lessons of special drives + Theory and practical test OR A2 licence for at least 2 years + practical test</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Change of structure**

- AM driving licence class replaces the former classes M (two-wheelers up to 45 km/h) and S (three and four-wheelers up to 45 km/h). Previously driver education was separate for classes M and S; now it is integrated into one for class AM. Within the AM-training, practical training is only on two-wheelers, not on three- and four-wheelers.

- Up to January 2013, trikes faster than 45 km/h were ridden with a class B licence. Now they are driven with driving licences for classes A1 and A. In both classes practical training is only for two-wheelers, not for trikes. Quads faster than 45 km/h continue to be ridden with the class B driving licence.

- With the introduction of the A2 Class in January 2013 the limit was raised from 25 kW to 35 kW.

- The minimum age for class A (without prepossession of A1 or A2) was lowered from 25 to 24 years.

- The special speed limit of 80 km/h for A1 licence holders under the age of 18 was abolished.

**Improvements**

Up to now there are no evaluation results on the safety impact of the changes.

But the system of progressive access for A2 and A is good for road safety as it requires a minimum of 2 years' experience.

**Implementation difficulties**

Driving instructors consider it expensive to adapt their training vehicles to the new regulations.

Many “normal” owners and novice riders did not understand the difficult and complicated rules of the different categories.
The total cost of the PTW licence has only changed in a few areas: lower costs for the AM licence, higher costs for the A driving licence.

There are no detailed data on the number of licences yet. But there are indications that class A1 has become more attractive for under-18 riders due to the abolition of the 80 km/h speed limit.

The 4DLD

- Changes should be examined with regard to their safety implications to enable successful risk prevention. To this end, appropriate structures should be established and research resources should be provided.

- The integration of trikes in categories A, A2 and A1 is a mistake and is unsuitable. With regard to their physical behaviour and construction, trikes are like a four-wheel car. Even if they have a handlebar in front, i.e. they should go back to category B.

- The requirement of “motorcycles of a power not exceeding 35 kW and with a power/weight ratio not exceeding 0.2 kW/kg and not derived from a vehicle of more than double its power” should be removed.

(DE) D2: Data collection and statistics

**Respondent:**

BASl Federal Highway Research Institute (BASt)

Data collected

- MID (Mobilität in Deutschland – mobility panel in Germany) – not harmonized
- Fahrleistungserhebung (mileage statistics) – not harmonized
- Accident data – harmonized for fatalities (30 days)
- Vehicle population - harmonized

Data exchanged

Germany shares its official road accident statistics with the EU. These data are also available to the public.
**DE) D3: Infrastructure**

**Respondent:**  
BASt  
Federal Highway Research Institute (BASt)

**Infrastructure guidelines**

Yes. FGSV - Forschungsgesellschaft für Straßen- und Verkehrswesen [German Road and Transportation Research Association] (2007): MVMot - Merkblatt zur Verbesserung der Verkehrssicherheit auf Motorradstrecken [Guidelines for improving traffic safety along motorcycle routes], FGSV-Verlag, Köln, are PTW-specific infrastructure guidelines.

At national level the guidelines are not mandatory. However, a number of federal states have decided to make them mandatory (mainly federal states which have a problem with motorcycle safety issues).

**Need for EU actions**

- Harmonisation of under-ride guard rails on crash barriers  
- Implementation of PTW-specific aspects in RSA and RSI procedures  
- Review of the product standard EN 1317 with regard to under-ride protection beam

**Others questions**

PTW riders/passengers are included as vulnerable road users for all roads.  
PTWs are the target of the most regulation in the infrastructure directive.

**Report on infrastructure problems**

Germany does not collect reports on infrastructure problems.

---

**(DE) D4: Accident reporting**

**Respondent:**  
BASt  
Federal Highway Research Institute (BASt)
In Germany, there is only one police accident report (all road categories, all vehicles). And there is no section that focuses specifically on PTWs.

Infrastructural problems are taken into account as general accident causes concerning road surface conditions (e.g. slippery carriageway, road condition, defective condition of traffic signs/installations, insufficient road lighting or insufficiently secured railway crossings). Trees or other obstacles/barriers beside the carriageway are only registered in the case of one of the involved vehicles colliding with them.

The accident is registered by the police in situ, insofar as the police is called to the accident. The accident information is entered into the computer system later on at the police station. But it is also possible that an accident will be notified some time afterwards at the police station.

(DE) D5: Research

Respondent:
BASl Federal Highway Research Institute (BASl)

Need for research at national level

- More evaluation studies of implemented safety measures for PTWs (e.g. awareness campaigns, rider training, etc.) to measure their impact on road safety.
- Motorcycle conspicuousness and lighting
- Autonomous Emergency Braking (AEB) for motorcycles

Need for research at EU level

- Motorcycle conspicuousness and lighting
- Autonomous Emergency Braking (AEB) for motorcycles

Germany conducts PTW research with other EU countries through such EU projects as SAFERIDER or 2-BE-SAFE. In the view of the German expert, it would be interesting to have more common research. Germany also has bilateral exchanges with other countries (e.g. Austria, Switzerland, France, etc.). Bilateral studies have been conducted, though a bilateral study on motorcycle issues is not known.
In-depth study

No special in-depth accident study has been conducted in Germany with regard to PTWs – though the GIDAS (German In-Depth Accident Study) includes PTW accidents in its data base, allowing PTWs to be included in general GIDAS studies.

(DE) D6: Traffic management and ITS

Respondent: 
BASSt Federal Highway Research Institute (BASSt)

PTWs are not integrated into intelligent traffic management in Germany. PTWs are not included in intelligent road and bridge tolls, there is no intelligent parking system for PTWs, and PTWs are not allowed to use bus lanes.

(DE) D7: Awareness campaigns

Respondent: 
BASSt Federal Highway Research Institute (BASSt)

Campaigns on PTW safety

- “Runter vom Gas” [“slow down”] run by the Federal Ministry of Transport and Digital Infrastructure (BMVI) and the German Road Safety Council (DVR).
- “Riskier nichts!” [“don’t take a risk”] by the German Road Safety Organization (Deutsche Verkehrswacht), the Federal Ministry of Transport and Digital Infrastructure (BMVI) and the Federal Highway Research Institute (BASSt)
- “Risiko Raus” [“remove the risk”] by the German Statutory Accident Insurance (Deutsche Gesetzliche Unfallversicherung, DGUV)

The three campaigns mentioned above target various types of road users but contain material specifically targeting PTW drivers.

- “German Safety Tour” resp. “Motorrad-Sicherheitstraining auf der Straße” by the German Insurance Association (GDV) and the German Road Safety Council (DVR).

The aim of these campaigns is to enhance awareness for special safety problems that cannot (easily) be solved by infrastructural or vehicle adaptations.
Positive points:

- The Runter vom Gas campaign is well known within the German population. It started in 2008 and has been continued since then with varying material. In addition to hoardings alongside motorways and TV-/cinema- commercials there are activities presented at events (e.g. music festivals, football games etc.) especially addressing young drivers. The campaign has its own website presenting all campaign material and additional traffic safety tips. On the website there is a special area addressing motorcycle safety.

- The campaign targets certain specific groups. i.e. young car drivers (18-24 years) and motorcyclists between the ages of 40 to 50 years. There is a special campaign website where information about the activities and tips for safe driving can be found.

- The campaign contains a special motorcycle motive.

- A famous German motorcycle racer is the face of the campaign specifically targeting motorcyclists. The main focus of the campaign is on road safety training courses. There is a campaign website on which practical information on safe motorcycle riding can be found.

Negative elements:

- The strategy of the campaign has changed several times, starting with shocking messages on the hoardings and ending up with hoardings showing positive emotional drivers. The campaign does not focus very much on a specific target group but is aimed at reaching every road user group.

- The slogans used are not very clear and could be misunderstood.

- The campaign is not specially directed towards motorcyclists. The material is rather unspecific.

- The number of participants is very limited. Within the runtime the campaign’s name has been changed.

The campaign was evaluated but the study only covered public awareness of the campaign. For all campaigns there is no knowledge of their impact on traffic safety due to a lack of assessment studies.

Other campaigns

The German expert is not aware of campaigns run by motorcycle organizations.
Key elements for a campaign

- For a campaign to be successful, the audience needs to be targeted in the right way.
- Practical information for safe motorcycle riding must be provided.
- Other countries often use shocking pictures or videos to provoke behavioural change. German experts are not convinced that such shock strategies have a long-term effect on safe traffic behaviour.

(DE) D8: National strategies

Respondent:

BASt Federal Highway Research Institute (BASt)

Key measures of the NS/AP

- Target group-specific measures should consider e.g. a rider’s age, experience, attitude and lifestyle. The development and improvement of target group-specific forms of outreach have to take these differences into account, especially in road safety communications.
- Improving the visibility of motorcyclists, especially by means of reflective materials (here: compiling a framework for minimum qualities and performance of such materials).
- Fitting all motorcycles with anti-lock braking systems as standard.

Need for EU action

- Announced in the 2011 Road Safety Programme is the intention to encourage the European Commission to seek European rules on the mandatory fitting of ABS on motorcycles above 125 cc.

(DE) D9: Motorcycling community

Respondent:

BASt Federal Highway Research Institute (BASt)
The relationship between BAS and the motorcycle associations is good. BAS collaborates with motorcycle associations on infrastructure issues and in research.
**GREECE**

**(EL) D1: Training, testing and licencing**

**Respondent:**
Stratos Georgiopoulos
Ministry of Infrastructure, Transport and Networks

**Licence scheme**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Licence category</th>
<th>Minimum age</th>
<th>Vehicle</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AM</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Moped with a maximum speed of 45km/h and engine volume up to 50cm³ or engine power up to 4KW for electric engines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trike with a maximum speed of 45km/h and engine volume up to 50cm³ or engine power up to 4KW for electric engines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Light quad with a maximum speed of 45km/h, empty vehicle mass up to 350 kg and engine volume up to 50cm³ or engine power up to 4KW for electric engines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Motorcycle with an engine volume up to 125cm³, engine power up to 11KW and engine power to weight ratio lower than 0.1 KW/kg.</td>
<td>With a Greek driving licence of Category B or Category B1 from other EU member states, insofar as issued before 18-1-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Motor trike with an engine power up to 15KW.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Motorcycle with an engine power up to 35KW and engine power to weight ratio lower than 0.2 KW/kg.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>24 or 22 if holder of A2 licence for more than 2 years</td>
<td>Any motorcycle</td>
<td>With a Greek driving licence of Category B or Category B1 from other EU member states, insofar as issued before 18-1-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Motor trike with an engine power over 15KW.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Change of structure**

Issuing a category AM driving licence was previously the responsibility of the Traffic Police, and is now carried out by the Regional Transport Services in accordance with the legislation of the Ministry of Transport which incorporates the European directive.
Two new tests relating to obstacle avoidance and emergency braking have also been added.

A new category of driving licence (A2) was introduced and the hours of required theoretical and practical courses increased.

The requirement was introduced for motorcyclists to wear special gear (boots, gloves, jackets and trousers) during the examination.

**Improvements**

- All categories of driving licence are issued by a single agency competent for the training and the examination.
- A new category of driving licence (A2) has been created.

**Inconveniences**

Increasing cost for new motorcycles in line with the new driving licence categories, rider equipment costs, costs for additional courses.

**Implementation difficulties**

The number of driving licences has increased because progressive access from one category to another was abolished.

**(EL) D2: Data collection and statistics**

**Respondent:**

George Yannis  
National Technical University of Athens, Department of Transportation Planning and Engineering

**Data collected**

- The number of registered PTWs is recorded. The data are EU-harmonized.
- Data are not collected for accidents with only material damage.
- For each accident the following variables are recorded by the traffic police and processed by the Hellenic Statistical Authority (EL.STAT.): Area type, kilometre, road type, road ID, date, fatalities, serious injuries, minor injuries, number of vehicles involved, weather conditions, road conditions, lighting, road type, vehicle type, accident type, vehicle
manoeuvre, traffic, vehicle age, nationality, engine size, seat belt, brake, number of passengers, alcohol test, driving licence, gender, age, safety system.

Accidents with fatalities are not or only occasionally investigated in-depth.

Data exchanged

All data collected by Greek authorities are exchanged with the EU.

The Statistical Authority publishes Annual Statistical reports including data on road accidents.

In addition, the traffic police publish data on fatal road accidents each year including the following data: date, area type, road type, time, accident type, vehicle type, user type, age group

There is a need for a common methodology for collecting PTW vehicle kilometres, as well as the respective PTW performance indicators (helmet wearing, speeding, drink-and-drive, etc.).

(EL) D3: Infrastructure

Respondent:
George Yannis National Technical University of Athens, Department of Transportation Planning and Engineering

Infrastructure guidelines

There are no PTW-specific infrastructure guidelines in Greece.

Need for EU actions

- Road Safety Audit / Inspection Guidelines and Procedures should be established at an EU level.
- There is an only limited sharing of information and best practices, both in general and on PTWs in particular. This would be a point to be improved

Report on infrastructure problems

There is no systematic collection of infrastructure problems by authorities. This is done only occasionally, mainly for research purposes.
**(EL) D4: Accident reporting**

**Respondent:**
George Yannis       National Technical University of Athens, Department of Transportation Planning and Engineering

There is only one type of police accident report (all road categories, all vehicles) filled in for each road accident involving casualties. The road category is reported in the form.

There is no particular section focusing on PTWs. There is a question on the type of vehicles involved in the road accident, so if PTWs are involved, this is reported here. However, there are a couple of questions only for PTWs (helmet wearing, seat position).

The police accident report does not take infrastructural problems into account.

In filling out the form, no difference is made with regard to the type of vehicle(s) involved in the accident. Generally, each vehicle involved in the accident is numbered (no 1 being the one that caused the accident in the view of the police officer). Then, all information is entered separately for each vehicle (e.g. characteristics of driver 1, of driver 2, use of safety equipment by driver 1, by driver 2, characteristics of vehicle 1, of vehicle 2, etc).

**(EL) D5: Research**

**Respondent:**
George Yannis       National Technical University of Athens, Department of Transportation Planning and Engineering

**Need for research at national level**

- Data on accidents, exposure, behaviour, infrastructure and vehicles.
- Conspicuousness, urban mobility, road equipment, vehicle technologies, enforcement, training, campaigns.
- Experiments in a simulator, naturalistic driving, accident modelling.

**Need for research at EU level**

- Data on accidents, exposure, behaviour, infrastructure and vehicles.
Conspicuousness, urban mobility, road equipment, vehicle technologies, enforcement, training, campaigns.

Experiments in a simulator, naturalistic driving, accident modelling.

Greek universities and research institutes participate actively in PTW research in Europe and worldwide and are always interested in being involved in new, interesting and innovative further research initiatives.

In-depth study
Greece has not undertaken any in-depth accident causation study on PTW accidents.

(EL) D6: Traffic management and ITS

Respondent:
George Yannis  National Technical University of Athens, Department of Transportation Planning and Engineering

According to the Greek expert, PTWs are included in intelligent road and bridge tolls and are allowed to use bus lanes. But there is no specific strategy to include PTWs in intelligent parking system.

(EL) D7: Awareness campaigns

Respondent:
George Yannis  National Technical University of Athens, Department of Transportation Planning and Engineering

Campaigns on PTW safety
No inventory of campaigns exists in Greece. The Road Safety Institute Panos Mylonas occasionally conducts PTW campaigns. No analysis of campaigns takes place in Greece.
(EL) D8: National strategies

Respondent:
George Yannis
National Technical University of Athens, Department of Transportation Planning and Engineering

Key measures of the NS/AP

- Awareness campaigns on mobile device use and alcohol-impaired riding.
- Training and awareness campaigns on the use of protective gear (helmet, jacket etc.) and avoidance of aggressive riding.
- Updated theoretical and practical training for PTWs
- Progressive licencing system, licence suspension after a serious accident or serious traffic violation etc.
- Technical inspection of motorcycles, with priority given to motorcycles under 250cc: implemented.
- PTW safety awareness and information campaigns.
- Measures to improve the conspicuousness of PTWs (daytime running lights, reflective clothing etc.): daytime running lights have been implemented, however are not effectively enforced and are therefore not widely used.

The Greek experts recommend for the next road safety action plan working on:

- Awareness campaigns on mobile device use and alcohol-impaired riding.
- Training and awareness campaigns on the use of protective gear (helmet, jacket etc.) and avoidance of aggressive riding.
- Updated theoretical and practical training for PTWs
- PTW safety awareness and information campaigns.

Need for EU action

- Standards for 'PTW-friendly' safety barriers.
- Urban mobility plans should merge with urban safety plans.
(EL) D9: Motorcycling community

**Respondent:**
George Yannis  
National Technical University of Athens, Department of  
Transportation Planning and Engineering

The relationship between the Greek government and motorcycle associations is good. When necessary, they work with motorcycle associations on DLD issues. They also sometimes work with them on data collection, traffic management and awareness campaigns. And they work with motorcycle associations on a national strategy for road safety.
**HUNGARY**

**(HU) D1: Training, testing and licencing**

**Respondent:**
CIECA member CIECA

Licence scheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HUNGARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum age</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and testing</td>
<td>Theory test + practical test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirement for the graduate licence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Change of structure**

According to the CIECA member, because the Hungarian structure was the same as now under the 3DLD, there were only 5 main changes:

- the category “M” was renamed to “AM” to comply with the international terminology;
- category A restricted was renamed to A2;
- introduction of a very simple procedure for category A1 for those having a category B licence. Previously, category A1 licencing required a full training and testing procedure. All that is now required is 2h of practical training and testing;
- the direct access age has been increased from 21 to 24;
- motorcycle power and cylinder volume data have had to be slightly raised.
Implementation difficulties

No implementation difficulties perceived by the CIECA member

(HU) D2: Data collection and statistics

**Respondent:**
Eva Csapó  
Hungarian Central Statistical Office (HCSO), Services and Foreign Trade Statistics Department, Transport unit

**Data collected**

A questionnaire has to be filled out for every accident involving personal injury, but not for ones with just material damage. Data collection is legally binding.

Data are collected on accidents with fatalities. A fatal accident is one in which one or more persons were killed on the spot or died within 30 days as a result of the accident.

The data collection system contains only those accidents reported to the police. There is a so-called underreporting phenomenon in every country, but the not-reported cases cannot be considered the fault of data collection.

- Data collected provide an insight into the factors leading to the accident, such as the surroundings, lighting and weather conditions, the category of road and accidents while under the influence of alcohol.
- Statistics separately list drivers by their age and driving practice and the number of persons killed or injured in accidents by their role in traffic, age and the use of a safety belt.

HCSO does not investigate accidents “in-depth”. This is the task of research institutes.

**Data exchanged**

The main users of data on accidents involving personal injuries are the Hungarian Public Roads Administration Non-profit Ltd., the Institute for Transport Sciences and the Ministry of National Development.

For international purposes, data are provided to DG Mobility, to the CARE database in xml format (yearly), and to Eurostat (yearly). In the quarterly statistical reflections, stADAT, table data are preliminary, and are finalized after checking and correcting yearly data 5 months after the reference year.
As part of the legal harmonization process on EU accession in 2004, Hungary is now obliged to transmit data on road accidents involving personal injuries to the EU database. The definitions of the road traffic accidents are fully adapted to EU and international standards. The Hungarian national collection system has been adjusted to the CADaS structure. Variables are divided into four categories: Accident, Road, Traffic Unit and Person. Motorcycles and mopeds are part of traffic units.

The EU is not interested in the cause of the accident because accidents can be due to more than one reason. It would be interesting to compare.

(HU) D4: Accident reporting

Respondent:
Ferenc Pausz  GRSP Hungary Association

There is only one police accident report in Hungary (all road categories, all vehicles).

The police patrol investigating the accident scene has to enter all important road parameters into the accident report form (for example: road category, road configuration, road training etc.).

In the standard accident report form the focus is on the person causing the accident and any participants, as well as the vehicle used, meaning that motorcycles and mopeds are included. Specific details of the motorcycle are recorded in the subsequent investigation of the accident when the vehicle is investigated by an expert in the matter.

During the police investigation the police officer has to collect all evidence, look for (eye) witnesses, and take photos.

Generally the aim of the police investigation is to find the person causing the accident from a legal perspective. The road (the location of the accident) and vehicle parameters are important and this data is included in the accident report.

(HU) D7: Awareness campaigns

Respondent:
Ferenc Pausz  GRSP Hungary Association
**Campaigns on PTW safety**

- **Motorbike Charta** (Motorkerékpáros charta – 15.05.2010): This Charta includes some sentences about safe motorcyclist behaviour. To signal his agreement with them, a motorcyclist can sign this paper.

- **Open Road Festival – 27.05.2013**

- **Launch of the school moped programme** (Sulimoped program indulása – 07.05.2013): This programme grants a moped licence to students at the end of primary school.

In Hungary all relevant accident prevention tasks are listed in the Traffic Safety Action Programme, including the responsible organisations. The National Committee of Accident Prevention is responsible for advertising and campaigns. This organisation is located within the Hungarian National Police HQ. It organises campaigns and a lot of meetings and motorbike festivals in Hungary.

There are also campaigns on PTW safety targeting other road users:

- **Pay attention to them!** (Figyeljünk rájuk!)
- **Help the advance of motorbikes!** (Segítse a motorosok előrejutását!)

Campaigns, especially when they are well designed, effectively draw attention to the target group or issue in focus although for only a short time. It is a good idea to launch a campaign when a particular road safety aspect is moving towards a negative trend or when it is seasonal or occurs under circumstances related to a certain period.

The positive points of these campaigns are that their aims are real and the message is clear. They promote partnership between car drivers and motorcyclists with the aim of reducing the number of motorbike accidents.

**Other campaigns**

According to the Hungarian expert, campaigns run by motorcycle organizations complement the government's accident-prevention campaign. Sometimes focusing on special skills, the message of a campaign is timely and better specified than the government's, though perhaps message delivery is not as effective, as it is often a financial issue.

**Key elements for a campaign**

For a successful campaign:

- A short and popular message
– The message should be surprising and creative
– A lot of people can feel themselves addressed by this message

To be avoided:

– Long and unintelligible messages
– A message not recognised by road users
IRELAND

(IE) D1: Training, testing and licencing

Respondent:
Pat Travers Road Safety Authority, Chief Driver Tester

Licence scheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AM</th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum age</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20 or 2 years of A1 licence</td>
<td>24 (direct access) or 2 years of A2 ! Only available if the progressive access was not used between A1 and A2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and testing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Initial Basic Training for A2 + Practical test on A2 motorcycle</td>
<td>Initial Basic Training for A + Practical test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirement for the graduate licence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A1 licence for at least 2 years + 11 hours of progressive module training on an A2 motorcycle</td>
<td>A2 licence for at least 2 years + 11 hours of progressive module training ! Only available if progressive access was not used between A1 and A2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Best practices to be highlighted: It is a combined approach: all categories are available by direct access, though there is an option for riders to select progressive access when moving beyond the category A1. So it is a joint approach. There is an option at one stage to choose progressive access. Otherwise, a rider just needs to have reached the minimum age for the category, i.e. there are 4 entry points for direct access.
Initial Basic Training as a mandatory requirement for all riders. They must take this Initial Basic Training regardless of what point a rider enters motorcycling. At the first entrance point, a rider has to take a test.

A rider can choose progressive access just once because he needs to be tested on a larger motorcycle to check whether he can handle it.

**Change of structure**

The biggest change was the introduction of the mandatory training, though it was in place before the 3DLD entered into force, so the transition was easy. All Ireland had to do was to adapt its compulsory training to the directive. The difference to the 3DLD now is the possibility of progressive access.

Progressive access was welcomed by the motorcycling community and by driving instructors because the mandatory training was already in place.

With the mandatory training, we had to review the registration and certification of instructors. This has made a big difference in the training given to young riders.

**Improvements**

Reduction of the cost for riders: before the 3DLD, riders had to take mandatory training and a test. But now with the possibility of progressive access at one point, riders can skip the basic training and the test.

**The 4DLD**

- Irish experts would like to see the Commission taking the lead in sharing best practices between EU countries. It would be interesting to have training content shared at EU level to be able to compare and learn from others, especially from countries with the same kind of characteristics.

- Common framework for the preparation of instructors, while ensuring that they can contribute input.
Data collection and statistics

Respondent:
Forbers Vigors  National Roads Authority
Yaw Bimpeh  Road Safety Authority

Data collected
It is the police which collect the data (location, injuries and vehicle details). But there is no other data collection specifically for PTWs apart from the data about the vehicle, as for other road users. No more information than for cars: age, gender, helmet wearing, injury, behaviour, alcohol (but not drugs).

Mobility data is also collected through two sources: the national vehicle test centre and a Road Safety Authority survey targeting PTW riders.

In 2014, data collection was upgraded, benefiting future research on PTW safety, above all about safety barriers (wall barriers, concrete barriers, cable barriers, etc.): a study to find out whether a safe barrier is preferable to a wall or a fence, etc.; information about accidents involving a safety barrier. The 2014 upgrade is mostly about roadside features and does not include the state of the road or maintenance data.

If there is a fatality, a forensic expertise is compiled. We end up with three different reports: the police report, the forensic expertise (with information about the vehicle, driver - a very detailed report) and the report from the National Road Authority (within 7 days) focused more on the road structure itself. There are also blood tests in the case of fatalities, collected by the Road Safety Authority. It takes a long time to gather all this information.

Data exchanged
The in-depth form in the case of a fatality is not shared at EU level.

The only report shared with the EU is the formal accident report from the police. Even the National Road Authority and the Road Safety Authority do not have formal access to the forensic report.

The Road Safety Authority publishes an annual “Road Collision Fact” report on its website, meaning that it is available to the public. Moreover, it cleans and harmonises its data before sharing them with stakeholders. The Road Safety Authority uses these data for the design of new measures, road safety campaigns, etc.
The police reports are available to the National Roads Authority but not to the public, and motorcycle national associations similarly do not have access, though they can ask the National Roads Authority for a research project.

Data collection can take several months in Ireland. Sharing the National Road Authority form at EU level would take too long even if it would be interesting to have a better understanding of the common problem. It would be interesting to have more high-level information about what other countries have done in the field of road safety, to have information on quality, and to see the results of measures taken in other countries, allowing Ireland to import best practices.

(IE) D3: Infrastructure

Respondent:
Forbers Vigors National Roads Authority

Infrastructure guidelines
In Ireland, there are general infrastructure guidelines for all road users. They do not integrate the specificities of the motorcycle use, as they cover all road users, including PTW riders. Road design has thus to consider safety elements for all road users: i.e. it is a global approach.

It is mandatory for designers to take PTW factors into account. Specific PTW features are rightly considered during the road design phase.

Others questions
PTW riders and passengers are considered as vulnerable road users on all roads because the EU directive for PTWs has been implemented in the whole country. The idea was not to have specific measures for PTWs but to take the safety of all road users into account at all stages.

Need for EU actions
- Roadside barriers and the inclusion of PTWs in their testing.

For the other infrastructure elements, such as signposts, Ireland is at present trying to do this with its own understanding and standards.

Ireland shares its issues, concerns, best practices, recommendations with other EU countries within a PTW road safety group and also shares this information with the UK in particular.
Reporting on infrastructure problems

Ireland has been collecting reports on infrastructure problems since 1994, through the analysis of black spot management HT15 reports on high collision locations within the national and non-national road network. It’s a national standard complying with the EU directive.

Ireland also performs road safety inspections throughout the country.

There is a particular form for infrastructure issues within the National Road Authority, helping understand why an accident occurred on a particular section of the road: LA16 form.

(IE) D4: Accident reporting

Respondents:

Forbers Vigors  National Roads Authority
Yaw Bimpeh  Road Safety Authority

There is only one police accident report in Ireland (all road categories, all vehicles). The police have to fill in a report for each crash. On it, there are questions about the location, the road type, the place, the time, the type of vehicle involved, age, gender, etc.

The police accident report is now in electronic form, no longer on paper.

The report takes into account infrastructural problems such as road type, road furniture and design (bend, etc.). This information is shared with the National Road Authority which is required to go to high-incident sites for to see whether the road needs repairs.

There are different investigations in the case of a collision. If the collision is minor, the police just fill in the standard collision report at the scene of the accident to try to reconstruct what happened. If there is a fatality, a forensic expertise is compiled. There are 3 different reports: the police report, the forensic expertise (with information about the vehicle, driver – a very detailed report) and the National Road Authority report (within the 7 days) focusing more on the road structure itself.

(IE) D5: Research

Respondent:

Forbers Vigors  National Roads Authority
Previous research done

They are currently working on an in-depth study of PTW accident causes.

Need for research at national level

- Roadside barriers: there were 14 motorcycle fatalities in 2014, representing 13% of collisions. They often involved a collision between a car and a motorcycle; just two involved an accident at a junction and one with a bench. So PTWs and infrastructure are not really a big issue, it is more an issue for all road users. The top infrastructure issue is roadside barriers.

Need for research at EU level

They are working with other countries on PTW safety, and with Euro-RAP on such research issues as rope barriers.

In-depth study

In the case of fatalities requiring a forensic expertise, Ireland does an in-depth study: the Road Safety Authority collects data from blood samples, what the drivers was doing, etc.

(IE) D6: Traffic management and ITS

Respondent:
Forbers Vigors National Roads Authority

PTWs are not specifically integrated into the intelligent traffic management in Ireland. Ireland is currently moving toward ITS but for now it is not really developed. The focus is put on the identification of traffic peaks, black spots, and knowing what kind of measure has to be taken to solve the problem. ITS allows them to identify the issue.

Road tolls are used on private roads, but ultimately it is the National Roads Authority which defines the different categories for tolls. Motorcycles are not in the same category than cars.

In practice, PTWs are allowed to use bus lanes, as are taxis, but not cycle paths.
**ITALY**

**(IT) D2: Data collection and statistics**

**Respondent:**
Lucia Pennisi  
Italian Automobile Club, statistical department  
Marco Broccoli  
ISTAT

**Data collected**
CARE data except for the severity of injuries. They distinguish between casualties and injuries.

The “road accident survey” covers all road accidents resulting in deaths (within 30 days) or injuries (including all kinds of PTWs and bicycles), involving at least one vehicle being driven on the national road network and reported by a police authority or military corps.

After an accident, data is only gathered when at least one person (driver, passenger, pedestrian) has been injured or killed: the injured person(s), gender and age of the rider/driver, not the passengers.

Italy does not investigate accidents with fatalities in-depth. Accident circumstances referring to the first two vehicles involved are reported on the statistical form by the police inspecting the accident with regard to traffic problems, vehicle defects or damage and the driver’s psycho-physical condition. In-depth accident research can be done at local level. In theory, at local level, it is possible to gain useful in-depth information on PTW accidents, but it is not used at national level. The In-Safe project on road accidents involving PTW is being conducted by University of Florence.

**Data exchanged**
All the ISTAT data are sent to the CARE database. CARE provides Member States access to this central database.

Data provided concerns all road accidents resulting in deaths or injuries, including all variables collected in relation to the accident, vehicle and person.

The European Commission’s Directorate General for Mobility and Transport, responsible for CARE (the Community database on Accidents on the Roads in Europe) recommended that EU countries adopt the CADaS (Common Accident Data Set) protocol as the format for making data available every year.
The Common Accident Data Set (CADaS) consists of a minimum set of standardized data elements, allowing road accident data to be compared in Europe. Using it, further common variables and values will be added to those already contained in the CARE database, maximizing the potential of the CARE database and allowing more detailed and reliable analyses at European level.

The Italian experts would like to see the following data exchanged at EU level:

- For PTWs, more information not in statistical form: information on infrastructure, roadside barriers (kind of barriers), final position of the vehicle (on or off-road, how distant it is from the impact point, etc.).
- More information on the rider: at present, we only collect data on whether he was wearing a helmet, but we need information on the type of helmet, and whether he was wearing any other safety gear.
- A detailed GPS reference, allowing infrastructural deficiencies to be identified.

**(IT) D4: Accident reporting**

**Respondent:**
Lucia Pennisi Italian Automobile Club, statistical department

In Italy, there is no harmonised police accident report. The local police can use a specific form they have devised. But they all send data to the statistical office on a common form. There were attempts to harmonise reporting among the 20 different regions but it was impossible to find a common position.

The state police (motorway) have two reports: one for material damage only and one for injuries or fatalities. These are the same for all regions. And the carabinieri also have one report for the whole of Italy.

Italy does not have a specific police accident report for PTW accidents, though according to Italian experts, it could be useful. Sometimes, they compile a specific report or study, but information on PTWs is not disseminated.

They also recommend taking infrastructural problems into account.

The police accident report can be filled in at the scene of the accident, but sometimes the police have to compile the report afterwards. Only the police can fill in the report.
(IT) D5: Research

Respondent:
Luca Persia
Centre for Transport and Logistics (CTL), "Sapienza" University of Rome

Previous research done
PTW road accidents represent an important issue for road safety in Italy. However PTW safety research is mostly funded by PTW manufacturers. Therefore it is mainly focused on vehicle safety. Studies related to other topics such as infrastructure safety have been carried out by road network managers but in general there is a lack of structured funds to cover other important issues and a lack of common research objectives.

Need for research at national level
- Improve knowledge of PTW accident causation (e.g. an in-depth accident causation study)
- Enhance PTW riders’ education and training (e.g. assess the use of driving simulators for training or the introduction of Graduated Driver Licensing (GDL) for PTWs)
- Improve knowledge of PTW rider behaviour and measures addressing PTW rider behaviour (e.g. use of a helmet, use of protective gear, violations)
- Safer roads for PTWs (e.g. forgiving roads)
- Develop PTW accident prediction models

Need for research at EU level
- Road infrastructure safety design and management is needed. In several countries, road administrations and other stakeholders have developed road design and maintenance management guidelines to improve PTW safety. Best practices and impact assessments in this field would be useful.

A lot of effort has been put into PTW safety research in the last few years. In the 2011-2020 policy orientations on road safety the European Commission aims at "encouraging research and technical developments aimed at increasing PTW safety and reducing the consequences of accidents". Several topics are mentioned such as standards for personal protective equipment, airbags, the use of ITS applications and the extension to PTWs of the existing EU legislation on roadworthiness testing.
PTW safety research in Italy is mainly based on EU-funded research and research performed by vehicle manufacturers. It would be surely interesting to participate in a common research project on PTW safety.

**In-depth study**

In-depth accident causation studies specific to PTWs are limited to EU-funded projects like MAIDS. Other EU-funded projects such as SAFETynet, DACOTA and RATIF all refer to road accidents in general.
(LV) D2: Data collection and statistics

**Respondent:**
Aldis Lama  
Road Traffic Safety Directorate

**Data collected**
Latvia collects the same data for all accidents with injuries.
Latvia collects drug and alcohol data in the case of any accident involving injuries, and these are included in the police accident report. The alcohol limit is 0.5%, but for novice drivers (experience less than 2 years) the limit is 0.2%.

**Data exchanged**
Latvia publishes its data in a statistical report as well as on our website. It also shares them with other stakeholders, while keeping some for internal use, for other ministries, associations, etc.
The Latvian accident database is part of CARE. The police collect data, but only that for the CARE database, no additional data (such as mobility data). This is because the CARE database is already very complete.

(LV) D3: Infrastructure

**Respondent:**
Maris Zalaiskalns  
Latvian State roads

**Infrastructure guidelines**
There are no PTW-specific infrastructure guidelines in Latvia

**Need for EU actions**
From the infrastructure point of view, there are no such problematic issues in Latvia that transcend national jurisdiction and need to be addressed at European level.
At present, Latvia does not share PTW information and best practices in general at European level.

Report on infrastructure problems

Latvia collects information on road accidents and, in accordance with Directive 2008/96/EC, conducts NSM (Network Safety Management): determination of the most dangerous road sections and “black spots”, which are then made known to all road users. But they do not collect special information about PTW accidents.

(LV) D4: Accident reporting

Respondent:
Aldis Lama Road Traffic Safety Directorate

There is only one police accident report in Latvia (all road categories and all vehicles). There is one section for vehicles, but not specific for motorcycles.

There are enough details in it to determine what happened. For accidents without injury and just material damage, it is not necessary for the police to fill in a report when the accident was only minor.

The police accident report collects details about the road design (curves, material of the road). It includes some on road maintenance factors, such as the road condition, whether the road was slippery, wet, covered with snow, etc. But there are no factors about the design itself, like signposts, obstacles, etc.

It is the police who fill in the form, just after the accident. The Ministry of Transport just uses statistics.

(LV) D5: Research

Respondent:
Aldis Lama Road Traffic Safety Directorate
Need for research at national level

At present, there is no research on PTW safety in Latvia. There are some groups (from the university) on road safety, on psychological issues or on infrastructure issues, but there are no research projects on riders or PTWs.

It would be interesting to have some research on PTW safety to increase knowledge, especially as the number of PTW users is steadily increasing, as is the number of accidents involving motorcyclists.

But, on the other hand, in Latvia we just have 6 months of PTW use, so maybe it is not such a big issue.

(LV) D6: Traffic management and ITS

Respondent:
Boriss Jelisejevs Head of TIC, Latvian state roads (NRA)

At this moment there are no specific plans or measures to meet the needs of motorcyclists in ITS strategy, which is mainly oriented towards pre-trip and on-trip traffic info for road users. There are no specific traffic management tools for this target group.

There are no toll roads in Latvia. A vignette for use on the national core road network applies to heavy vehicles since 07.2014.

PTWs are not allowed to use bus lanes, and there is no specific strategy to include PTWs in intelligent parking systems.

(LV) D7: Awareness campaigns

Respondent:
Boriss Jelisejevs Head of TIC, Latvian state roads (NRA)

There were two campaigns for PTW rider safety in Latvia:

- Running from 17 April till 6 May 2008 there was a campaign for motorcycle and moped safety named “Watch twice! Twice!”
- Running from 17 May till 9 June 2013 there was a campaign for the safety of moped riders named “Moped is small and vulnerable!”
(LV) D8: National strategies

**Respondent:**
Aldis Lama  
Road Traffic Safety Directorate

There are no specific measures to enhance PTW safety, as the PTW share of deaths is small (7.3% of all deaths). Active use of PTWs lasts approximately 6 months – from April till October. The Latvian expert recommends working on speeding, but no specific measures for PTWs. Priority is more on pedestrians and cyclists. As regards safety measures, motorcyclists are considered as car drivers. Apart from a safety campaign targeting motorcyclists at the beginning of the season, he doesn’t see a need for other measures.

(LV) D9: Motorcycling community

**Respondent:**
Aldis Lama  
Road Traffic Safety Directorate

In Latvia, there are no big biking associations, but more different small groups. Since 2001, the PTW community in Latvia has been steadily growing, and now there are a lot of people for whom a PTW is not merely a means of transport, but lifestyle. Consequently, some specially oriented NGOs are being set up to protect the interests of motorcyclists. Their main concern is the quite poor road surface conditions of Latvian roads and road maintenance, as PTWs are more sensitive to such aspects than cars.
(LT) D1: Training, testing and licencing

Respondent:
CIECA member CIECA

Licence scheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AM</th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum age</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24 (direct access) or 2 years of A2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and testing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Training + Theory test + Practical test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirement for the graduate licence</td>
<td></td>
<td>A1 licence for at least 2 years + Practical test</td>
<td>A2 licence for at least 2 years + Practical test</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Change of structure
A practical test for candidates to category A from A2.

Improvement
The progressive access to take a licence before the minimum age required for the direct access.
**LUXEMBOURG**

**(LU) D1: Training, testing and licencing**

**Respondent:**
Serge Muller  
Société Nationale de Circulation Automobile (SNCA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Licence scheme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minimum age</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training and testing</th>
<th>AM</th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical course of 12h + computer-based theoretical exam</td>
<td>Theoretical course of 12h + computer-based theoretical exam + 16h of practical instruction + practical exam</td>
<td>Theoretical course of 12h + computer-based theoretical exam + 16h of practical instruction + practical exam + 1 full day course during the 2 years probationary licence</td>
<td>No direct access to the category A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement for the graduate licence</th>
<th>AM</th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1 licence for at least 2 years + 7h of theoretical and practical course on a A2 motorcycle + 1 full day course during the 2 years probationary licence</td>
<td>A2 licence for at least 2 years + 4h of theoretical and practical course on a category A motorcycle. He will then be issued with the corresponding A driving licence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Change of structure**

One major change introduced on 19 January 2013 was the introduction of the progressive access to categories A2 and A, and the possibility of getting a B100 code. Furthermore driving schools have become more involved in certain categories and are taking on major responsibilities.
Improvements
Training courses for progressive access.

Implementation difficulties
Some minor issues concerned the false interpretation of the progressive access from A1 to A2 by some candidates.

Due to the optional progressive access from A1 to A2 (7 supplementary hours of instruction) and mandatory progressive access from A1 to A2 (4 supplementary hours of instruction), the cost of gaining a licence has increased, those these have so far not been passed on to the citizen.

The price before the 3DLD for a category A licence was €1600, now the price for A2 + A is €2000.

Since 2006 the number of MD driving licences obtained has remained around 600 a year. No significant change in the number of licences granted has been observed.

The 4DLD
The Luxembourger expert recommends including more precise criteria on driving instructors and driving schools.
Furthermore as a non-motorbike topic we would recommend following the CIECA recommendation to allow a C1 driving licence for non-professional drivers, mainly to solve the problems with the growing community of camping car users.

(LU) D2: Data collection and statistics

Respondent:
Marie-Jo Airoldi  Statec (statistical institute)

Data collected
In Luxembourg, crash data are collected by the national police called to the scene of any crash. Accidents without injuries are not include in the statistics. The reports are transmitted to the national statistical institute (Statec) responsible for compiling the data.

There is no special compilation for PTWs. Fatalities are fully covered. A number of fatalities for which suicide or a health reason leading to death can reasonably be detected are not included in the road crash statistics.
In addition, as from 2012, Luxembourg also takes into account, again on the basis of the National Police Reports, up to 3 reasons which might have led to the accident. They have also started collecting approximate data about the distance from the place of residence of the users involved in injury accidents. The aim of this is to find out if accidents are happening on roads known by the users.

**Data exchanged**

The data used for statistics are those defined in the CADaS Model (Common Accident Data Set) for meeting the needs of the CARE Community Road Accident Database.

National associations have access to the statistics because they are public. But they do not have access to accident reports due to data protection. They do have access to anonymized accident statistics. On request, Statec will produce statistics on special topics.

*(LU) D3: Infrastructure*

**Respondent:**  
Paul Mangen  
Ministère du Développement durable et des Infrastructures,  
administration des ponts et chaussées

**Infrastructure guidelines**

There are no PTW-specific infrastructure guidelines in Luxembourg; they mostly use French, Swiss and/or German ones.

**Others questions**

PTW riders and passengers are considered as vulnerable road users for all roads.

No special attention to PTWs was needed in the framework of the infrastructure directive for PTWs, as Luxembourg authorities considered that their TEN-T network already provides a high safety level for PTWs.

**Reporting on infrastructure problems**

Luxembourg collects reports on infrastructure problems. But there is no specific software to collect them.
(LU) **D4: Accident reporting**

**Respondent:**
Thierry Weber  
Police Grand-Ducale, Direction des Opérations et de la Prévention

There is only one police accident report in Luxembourg (all road categories, all vehicles). Nevertheless, there is a working group for motorcycles within the Ministry of Environment and Infrastructure which can specifically focus on motorcycle accidents. On the basis of their analysis, they can advise improving a particular road section dangerous for PTWs (improving safety by installing warning signs for motorcycles for example).

Police do not take infrastructural problems into account when writing an accident report. The police investigation report is sent to the public prosecutor.

Accident investigation reports, in an anonymized form, can be requested by a specialized working group within the national traffic committee for study purposes in order to improve public infrastructure and eliminate black spots related to infrastructural problems.

The organization *Ponts et Chaussées* can ask the police for an anonymized copy of a report, for use as a basis for improving the safety of the road concerned. In the case of repeated accidents on one road section, *Ponts et Chaussées* may conduct a technical study to understand the cause of these accidents. At the scene of any accident, it is the duty of the police to intervene. After that, accident reports are analysed. If necessary, experts can come to the scene of an accident when there is a specific infrastructure issue to deal with.

---

**D5: Research**

**Respondent:**
Alain Disiviscour  
Chargé de direction au Ministère du Développement durable et des Infrastructures, Département des Transports, Direction de la Circulation et de la Sécurité routières

**In-depth study**

Analyses of accident reports are made. But for in-depth analyses, there is a problem with the critical mass in order to have scientifically meaningful results. The relatively small number of accidents (from a statistical perspective) does not allow a conclusive scheme.
**(LU) D6: Traffic management and ITS**

**Respondent:**
Paul Mangen  
Ministère du Développement durable et des Infrastructures, administration des ponts et chaussées

The road network of Luxembourg is free of tolls.

PTWs are not allowed to use bus lanes. And there is no strategy to include PTWs in intelligent parking systems.

**(LU) D7: Awareness campaigns**

**Respondent:**
Alain Disiviscour  
Chargé de direction au Ministère du Développement durable et des Infrastructures, Département des Transports, Direction de la Circulation et de la Sécurité routières

**Campaigns on PTW safety**

Over the last few years, no campaign has been launched targeting motorcycles as a separate group of road users.

**Other campaigns**

Most fatal accidents were however caused by foreign drivers these last years. Campaigns at a national level would not reach out to these road users. Luxembourg tries to reach out to them via articles in the international motorcycle press.

Recent road safety campaigns have therefore targeted all vulnerable road users, and not specifically motorcyclists.

Sometimes foreign campaigns manage to reach Luxembourg. Luxembourg experts take note of them, but they are not analysed.

**Key elements for a campaign**

Luxembourg experts think that it would be good to have common European awareness campaigns which could then be adapted for each country.
The best place to broadcast campaigns is in cinemas, as one gets up to 100% attention from the audience. Even if a campaign does not target road safety per se, topics like respect, noise emission, etc. are also important.

It is important to alternate campaign themes and styles (shocking, humorous, etc.) constantly in order to keep people mindful of road safety topics.

**(LU) D8: National strategies**

**Respondent:**
Alain Disiviscour
Chargé de direction au Ministère du Développement durable et des Infrastructures, Département des Transports, Direction de la Circulation et de la Sécurité routières

**Key measures of the NS/AP**
Over the past few years (2011-2014), Luxembourg has implemented several measures to increase road safety for motorcyclists, due to the increasing number of fatalities. The national strategy developed is a mix of evaluations of existing measures, the further development (if necessary) of what is already in place and the development of new measures. There is a certain mix between old and new measures.

There is no precise timeline for the national road safety plan. Due to the size of the country, it is difficult basing national strategy on statistical data, as just a few more fatalities can create a peak in the data. Therefore, it is necessary to analyse a certain period of time (at least 5 years) in order to be able to pinpoint the topics needing attention.

Under the authority of the Commission de circulation de l’Etat (the national road commission, which brings together different stakeholders) a working group was established with a focus on PTW topics: groupe de travail motocyclistes. Members are the Department of Transport (presidency), representatives of driving schools, the national Road Administration (Ponts & Chaussées, vehicle inspection centres, the police, motorcyclists’ associations (in Luxembourg there are several clubs for different types of users, brands, etc. - LMI is the biggest one and covers some of them). Their measures:

- Second phase of the A licence: Mandatory training after two years of holding the licence to increase motorcyclists’ capacity to really handle their vehicle and to raise their risk awareness.

- Days of training during springtime to prepare for the biking season, open to all motorcyclists. The participation fee is more symbolic (€25-30) and there are public subsidies.
Police campaigns at the beginning of the biking season. Roadside controls in order to check the technical state of the vehicle, tyres, papers, etc. It is complementary to the periodic roadworthiness tests (same as with cars: in phase to be changed from 3.5+1+1 to 4+2+1+1).

Constant installation of safety roadside barriers, with a system of double rails. There are no numbers to prove the dangerousness of roadside barriers, but the emergency services have reported that safety barriers manage to minimize the severity of accidents.

For accident-prone roads, a new road sign was developed in 2014 and put up to warn motorcyclists of road hazards = “Panneau moto danger”.

Fixed speed cameras at black spots (non-specific for PTWs) are to be deployed in 2015.

A dedicated working group on black spots (for all road users) can also ask for the design of the road, signposting, speed limits, etc. to be modified.

These measures have been effectively implemented.

It is difficult to assess the impact of a specific measure. But in general, the measures are increasing road safety. Maybe the mandatory training after two years of holding an A licence is the most effective measure.

One particularity of Luxembourg is the share of foreign tourists in national road fatalities. In fact tourists have represented the majority of road fatalities (PTW) these last years. The question was how to reach out to those drivers, because national measures and campaigns would only have a very limited or even no effect on them. Therefore Luxembourg decided, in cooperation with the national tourism office and foreign moto-touring magazines, to conduct awareness campaigns targeting tourists in other countries (Alpentourer, Germany, the Netherlands, Belgium, etc.).

Despite this, fatalities have increased, mainly due to fatal accidents with cars in town.

New measures are decided when new data becomes available. If a topic needs specific attention the CCE working group will deal with it.

Need for EU action

Luxembourg thinks that a discussion about the possibility of making the wearing of protective clothing (boots, gloves, etc.) mandatory should be taking place at EU level. In Luxembourg, protective clothes are mandatory for the driving test but not on the road. Surveys within the groupe de travail motocyclistes have achieved some good results. But there is an issue of European standards for protective clothing. There are for instance no European standards for gloves. Without a standard, enforcement is not possible. Even if the use of protective clothing is not (and perhaps will never be) mandatory at European
level, the European Union should introduce European standards allowing countries to go further if they wish to.

- Luxembourg fully supports the ABS regulation. It would like to see even more technical safety systems being developed and introduced on a large scale for PTWs.
- European awareness campaigns based on shared values and topics, but easily adaptable at national level.

(LU) D9: Motorcycling community

Respondent:
Alain Disiviscour  Chargé de direction au Ministère du Développement durable et des Infrastructures, Département des Transports, Direction de la Circulation et de la Sécurité routières

Motorcycle representatives are included in topics related to PTW safety within the groupe de travail motocyclistes, as is the case for every other subject involving PTW safety, DLD issues, infrastructure, research, traffic management, awareness campaigns, and the national strategy for road safety.

Moreover, national associations have access to statistics. They are public. But they do not have access to accident reports due to data protection regulations, though they do have access to anonymized accident statistics.
**MALTA**

**(MT) D1: Training, testing and licencing**

**Respondent:**
CIECA member CIECA

Licence scheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AM</th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum age</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24 (direct access) or 2 years of A2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and testing</td>
<td>Theory test (computer based) + Practical test (on private and public roads)</td>
<td>Theory test (same as AM) + Practical test (on private and public roads)</td>
<td>Theory test (computer based) + Practical test (on private and public roads)</td>
<td>Theory test (same as A2) + Practical test (on private and public roads)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirement for the graduate licence</td>
<td>No graduate licence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Change of structure**

Candidates have systematically become more conscious about the different types of motorcycle categories (especially in terms of engine size, power output and weight) and the skills/experience needed to safely control different type of motorcycles. As a result, training providers are now providing customised training courses to cater for this demand.

**Improvements**

Candidates are automatically restricted from obtaining a motorcycle licence which allows them to ride powerful motorcycles at a young age with very limited experience and technical knowledge. So the staged licence is an improvement for safety.

**Implementation difficulties**

There were some technical issues with the training providers related to test vehicles, but in general it was well accepted.
Training providers had to update their fleet of vehicles to be in line with the new directive. As a consequence, financial costs were incurred on their part, though these were not reflected in training fees.

It seems there has been an increase in the demand for motorcycle licences. And there is also a higher demand for professional motorcycle training (slight increase in the number of training providers which is now contributing to a higher level of training).

The 4DLD

Malta, as a member of CIECA, recommends that the technical specifications for the test vehicles must remain in order to avoid a later financial impact on the training sector.

The minimum speed of 50km/h during the practical test should be revised, especially for the emergency stop exercise.
THE NETHERLANDS

(NL) D1: Training, testing and licencing

Respondents:
Robbert Verweij Department of Road Safety, Ministry of Infrastructure and Environment
Saskia de Craen SWOV Institute for Road Safety Research

Licence scheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AM</th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum age</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24 (direct access) or 2 years of A2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and testing</td>
<td>Theory test + practical test</td>
<td>Theory test + practical test (closed area) + practical test (on the road)</td>
<td>Theory test + practical test (closed area) + practical test (on the road)</td>
<td>Theory test + practical test (closed area) + practical test (on the road)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirement for the graduate licence</td>
<td>A1 licence for at least 2 years + practical test (on the road)</td>
<td>A2 licence for at least 2 years + practical test (on the road)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Change of structure
Changes from low-/high-powered motorcycles to 3 categories: In the previous structure there were 2 categories (A light: engine power limited to 35 kw → from age 18; and A unrestricted → direct access from age 21). Because of the A1 category in the 3DLD, all access to other categories was moved up by two years.

In the Netherlands, there are no rules on the amount of training, though instructors have to be certified. So nothing changed here.

Inconveniences
From the perspective of traffic safety, there are no large improvements visible yet. We don’t expect any reduction in risk through the new engine size categories (since no relation is known between a rider’s age/engine size and crash risk).
They do however expect a certain mitigation, with riders starting to ride later (the older, the lower the risk). But this shouldn’t be a large effect (most riders in the Netherlands are already somewhat older when they start riding) and detailed crash statistics for 2013 are not available yet.

Implementation difficulties
Riding schools have to buy more bikes and the new regulations are very difficult to understand for non-experts.

The price of a driving test is similar. But it has primarily become more expensive for those riders wanting access to A unrestricted as early as possible. They would have to take four practical tests and a theory test.

A1 is hardly ever used.

**(NL) D2: Data collection and statistics**

**Respondents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Robbert Verweij</td>
<td>Department of Road Safety, Ministry of Infrastructure and Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saskia de Craen</td>
<td>SWOV Institute for Road Safety Research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data collected**

- RAI and Bovag keep many details (number of PTWs sold per age group/power/usage/etc).
- Mileage, accident statistics etc.
- Crash records registered by the police. Details depend on the severity of the accident. Location, time, type of crash, type of road, weather, etc. always reported, but all from the perspective of the police officer
- Injury information registered by hospitals
- Mileage information (annual national questionnaire)
- Information on vehicle fleet and sales (+ import/export/destruction).

In the Netherlands the police are responsible for collecting information on crashes. Information (but less detailed) also comes from hospitals. All motorcycle crashes are recorded by the police in the Netherlands. For fatalities, the registration rate is over 90% whereas for serious road
injuries among motorcyclists, the registration rate dropped from about 60% in 2000 to 35% in 2009. In other words, in 2009 the majority of seriously injured motorcyclists were not registered!

In general, in-depth studies are not carried out on accidents with fatalities. Sometimes for legal purposes the police investigates in-depth. The Dutch police have special teams for collecting extra (in-depth) data in the case of a serious crash. There is no investigation on alcohol and drug in the case of fatalities because it is considered that the riders have been punished enough. For statistics, it can be a problem.

Data exchanged

Most data is publicly available and actively shared amongst PTW stakeholders.

SWOV receives data and shares them with the public in an online database. Available for everyone, they can make their own selection of data.

Crash data are made comparable with the common variables of earlier CARE-PLUS projects. Some variables remain incompatible. All data is available subject to data privacy etc. And SWOV is involved in a number of European projects (i.e. SafetyNet) and working groups (IRTAD).

They recommend exchanging more data at EU level:

- Accident types, accident causes.
- All information about crashes and mileage; insofar as these data can be made comparable (e.g. by harmonizing the variables collected).
- For the in-depth information it is not so much about sharing, but it would be interesting to cooperate in an in-depth investigation (comparable to the MAIDS study)

(NL) D3: Infrastructure

Respondent:
Robbert Verweij Department of Road Safety, Ministry of Infrastructure and Environment

Infrastructure guidelines

In the Netherlands, the PTW guidelines are incorporated in regular road requirements: CROW publications. Under the strategic plan for motorcycles, they took all the measures for PTWs and integrated them in all publications related to road design or road construction.
CROW publications are not mandatory. An attempt was made to make them mandatory, but it was not possible due to the different road owners. This means that all these guidelines are voluntary and it would be too expensive to implement them for some roads. However, non-compliance needs to be explained by road owners and can be used against them in any law-suit. Normally these recommendations are implemented, although there is a tendency to implement them at their ‘lowest level’.

Others questions

There is no legal definition of a vulnerable road user, though it is being debated. It is a question of semantics. As a PTW rider’s risk per kilometre is very high, he might be viewed as a VRU. But traditionally, VRUs usually only include cyclists, pedestrians and elderly people. And cyclists are protected more than other road users in the case of any road accident.

Legally speaking, PTW riders/passengers are thus not vulnerable road users.

In the context of the infrastructure directive, the Netherlands has been replacing roadside barriers with PTW-friendly ones in dangerous curves and are continuing to do so. Other road owners are following suit.

Need for EU actions

- Integrate PTW demands in regular road requirements.
- The problem of the EU is that any action it takes can only be on EU-wide problems. The best thing for the EU to do is to provide funding to make dangerous roads safer for PTWs. But the problem is that a road is not dangerous for all road users. Some roads are more dangerous for PTWs than for other road users.
- Help for national and local governments to identify what is a dangerous road for PTWs. Though an accident can be a symptom of a problem with the road, this is not always the case as it can also be caused by rider behaviour. And a road can be also dangerous even if no accident has ever happened on it.
- Location of poles and lanterns.

Reporting on infrastructure problems

Information on accident location is collected. MAG NL also maintains a reporting centre where road users can report infrastructural dangers for PTWs. Information can be used at local and national level. They check on the Euro-RAP ranking, as well as having a database listing where
accidents happened (CICIA). They have already addressed black spots, with the result that accidents are now not really related to infrastructure, but to a combination of rider behaviour, the state of the vehicle. The state of the road is rarely the sole cause of an accident. The focus is thus now on the behaviour (alcohol, speed, protective clothing and tiredness).

There is no specific software to integrate and collect infrastructure data.

**NL** D4: Accident reporting

**Respondents:**
Robbert Verweij  
Department of Road Safety, Ministry of Infrastructure and Environment
Saskia de Craen  
SWOV Institute for Road Safety Research

There is only one police accident report in the Netherlands (all road categories, all vehicles).

There are no specific questions on PTW.

If infrastructural problems have contributed to a crash they are collected, though there is no specific section on infrastructure, i.e. there are no questions on infrastructure as such. But the police officer has to indicate what contributed to the crash. In answering this question, they can specify whether it was infrastructure-related, whether there was debris on the road, etc. It is therefore up to the police officer to recognize whether there was any problem with the infrastructure.

However this is not encoded in the accident database. Infrastructural conditions, such as at a (signalized) intersection or a pedestrian crossing, should always be reported independent of their relation to the crash.

For some crashes the police are present and have to fill in an electronic form collecting all the information. This information is then passed on to the government. In some cases, insurance companies also make further investigations. And in the case of a lawsuit, there can be more investigation as well, though not by the police, meaning that the government does not get this information.

According to these reports, only 1% of motorcycle crashes are caused by speed. But in fact, speed has to be at least a contributory factor in many accidents. It is difficult for a police officer alone to identify the cause of the accident and its contributory factors.

But there is a second data source: if a person is injured and goes to the hospital, the hospital collects certain data on his injuries and the vehicle. But then weather, infrastructure, location, etc. are not collected by the hospital.
Both records are combined by the government. This information is given to SWOV yearly, with the annual statistics made public on the SWOV website.

**D5: Research**

**Respondents:**
- Robbert Verweij, Department of Road Safety, Ministry of Infrastructure and Environment
- Saskia de Craen, SWOV Institute for Road Safety Research

**Previous research done**

In the last couple of years, SWOV has performed quite a lot of research on PTWs (effect of training, conspicuousness, etc.). There is no reason to complain about funding. The number of fatalities decreased from 54 in 2012 to 29 in 2013 (not proven to be related to the research).

**Need for research at national level**
- Accident causes.

**Need for research at EU level**
- Training: there is not much concrete scientific evidence that training is effective in reducing the crash risk. However, training is often considered an effective countermeasure. It would be valuable to *scientifically* evaluate existing training curricula/methods to find out what works and what doesn’t work.
- Safer vehicles: rider safety could be improved by motorcycle developments (while passive safety for cars has improved tremendously, there has been less improvement for motorcycles). Many ITS are car systems adapted to fit motorcycles. One should start from the perspective of the motorcycle and see what can (technically) be improved.
- The MAIDS study is still very often referred to. However, this study is 10 years old. It is time for a new European in-depth study, differentiating between different (types of) countries. PTW use is completely different in Southern European countries (Spain, Italy) than in Northern European ones (the Netherlands, Norway). Problems and crash characteristics also differ a lot.
Currently, the Netherlands does not cooperate with other countries. But cooperation would be interesting. A lot of use was made of the MAIDS research, and the Netherlands is hoping to lead one of the EU PTW research groups next year.

**In-depth study**
SWOV has done several studies on visibility and accident causation. The conclusions are shared and presented at national and international PTW events.

**(NL) D6: Traffic management and ITS**

**Respondent:**
Robbert Verweij  
Department of Road Safety, Ministry of Infrastructure and Environment

Generally speaking, the Netherlands doesn’t really use ITS for traffic management. The country is still working on how to integrate them. They tried dedicating lanes to trucks, but it turned out that it was no help in reducing traffic congestion. Bus lanes are used by taxis, but not PTWs. Many of the bus lanes are made in such a way that it is dangerous to drive on them if you are not a bus. PTWs thus do not use them. Apart from cycle lanes, there is no dedicated lane.

Generally speaking, ITS are oriented toward cars. For example, until recently, speed cameras did not recognize PTWs.

There are no tolls in the Netherlands, except in one tunnel.

And there is no specific strategy to include PTWs in intelligent parking systems.

**(NL) D7: Awareness campaigns**

**Respondents:**
Robbert Verweij  
Department of Road Safety, Ministry of Infrastructure and Environment

Saskia de Craen  
SWOV Institute for Road Safety Research
Campaigns on PTW safety

In the Netherlands there are not many campaigns focused on PTWs. PTW and rider organizations do hand out brochures on specific topics (i.e. the 3DLD, directions on how cars and motorcycles should safely interact when filtering); but this is relatively small-scaled.

As motorcycles are a relative small group there are no mass media campaigns for PTWs. Stakeholders communicate with PTW users using government budget.

Other campaigns

Public research has shown that it is more useful to communicate a message to car drivers to take care and pay attention to all VRUs, rather than focusing just on PTWs.

The Dutch expert is aware of the Belgian campaigns.

In the Netherlands, the government and research institute encourage campaigns run by motorcycle organizations. There is a motorcyclist forum, which includes riders associations, the PTW industry, testing organizations, and the ministry (which provides funding). The forum could be the place to agree on a message to be communicated to the public, but in fact, there has been a lack of ideas and cooperation over the last couple of years, with the result that there has only been one campaign, and that there has been no funding in the last few years.

Key elements for a campaign

– Show PTW riders concrete solutions for handling situations.

– The biggest problem with awareness campaigns is that they are not usually evidence-based. In the rare case that a campaign is evaluated, it usually only looks at “reach” (did people see and understand the message). We should however also measure whether behaviour has actually changed on account of the campaign, by observing pre- and post-campaign behaviour (not by measuring self-reported behaviour)!

(NL) D8: National strategies

Respondent:
Robbert Verweij Department of Road Safety, Ministry of Infrastructure and Environment
Key measures of the NS/AP

There is a general road safety plan and a specific action plan for PTWs, containing 7 concrete measures for PTW:

- Train advanced motorcycle skills
- Provision of information for motorcyclists and promoting the use of protective gear
- Provision of information and education for motorists
- Specific attention for motorcyclists completing category B driving instruction
- Investigate the impact of visibility on motorcycle safety
- Drafting of CROW guidelines
- 3DLD implementation

The evaluation phase is currently underway and the second action plan for PTWs riders is being drafted for 2015, involving all stakeholders interested in PTW safety. The evaluation phase should thus highlight what has been done, what remains to be done and what should be continued.

The next action plan will focus on risk perception. At present, there are courses for riders allowing them to better perceive road risks road, and this really increases their safety. But the problem is that it is very difficult to provide these courses. If they are not given the right way, it will actually increase the risk, because riders will think they are better riders and take more risks.

A further focus should be on ITS and PTWs: what can ITS do for riders, what can it not do, etc. Riders need to be involved in this process because there is a kind of break between old and young riders about ITS.

Need for EU action

- Increase communication with riders: EU and national authorities talk too much about riders instead of talking to riders
- Increase the knowledge and understanding of authorities on riders and PTWs.
- The EU should focus on risk perception and risk assessment, stipulating additional training courses, advanced riding courses, etc. to help riders identify risks and dangers. And this training content would be more effective for road safety that the graduate A licence.
The relationship with motorcycle associations is really good in the Netherlands. They are included in every topic related to PTW safety.
(NO) D1: Training, testing and licencing

Respondent:
Lasse Haslie 
Norwegian Public Roads Administration

Licence scheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NORWAY</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum age</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>17 lessons to learn basic traffic rules + 3 lessons on motorcycle riding, safety and training + 4 lessons in safe road riding + Practical test</td>
<td>17 lessons to learn basic traffic rules + 3 lessons on motorcycle riding, safety and training + 4 lessons in safe road riding + Practical test</td>
<td>4 lessons on riding techniques + 6 lessons on safe road riding + Practical test</td>
<td>4 lessons on precise riding techniques + 8 lessons on safe road riding + Practical test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirement for the graduate licence</td>
<td>3 lessons on motorcycle riding, safety and training + 4 lessons on safe road riding + Practical test</td>
<td>3 lessons on motorcycle riding, safety and training + 4 lessons on safe road riding + Practical test</td>
<td>A1 licence for at least 2 years + Practical test</td>
<td>A2 licence for at least 2 years + 7h of training</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Norway, the licence scheme is organised around the obligatory training divided into 4 steps:

Step 1: basic traffic rules
Step 2: motorcycle riding, safety and training
Step 3: riding techniques
Step 4: safe road riding

Change of structure

Before the 3DLD, the licence scheme in Norway was very much the same. The training scheme for category A licences did not really change, with just 2 more lessons on safe road riding being added.
The 3DLD inserts the A2 category between the A1 and A licence. Before the 3DLD, there was no A2 licence, though people with an A-licence could ride a motorcycle up to 400 cc before the age of 21.

**Improvements**

With the A2 licence, young riders have to take 7 hours training to gain the full A licence.

**Inconveniences**

The only problem is with the test vehicle. The test vehicle requirement is illogical.

**Implementation difficulties**

Except for the 7 hours of training between the A2 and A licence, the cost of the A licence has remained the same.

**4DLD**

- Norway is not fully satisfied with the test vehicle requirement. In the first year of 3DLD implementation, there was the possibility to use the same motorcycle for the A2 and A test, which was a good thing.

---

**(NO) D3: Infrastructure**

**Respondent:**

Lasse Haslie       Norwegian Public Roads Administration

**Infrastructure guidelines**

There are PTW-specific infrastructure guidelines in Norway. These guidelines started out as advisory, but now most of the (Norwegian) standards within the guidelines are mandatory. And because they are mandatory, they are mostly implemented.

**Others questions**

In Norway, motorcyclists are legally considered as vulnerable road users, it is a legal concept.
Need for EU actions

- The standards implemented in Norway are worth being implemented as EU standards. For a start, motorcycles should always be included in all road standards.

Sharing takes place during conferences at EU level, during working groups, etc. but not really on PTW safety and infrastructure.

(NO) D5: Research

Respondent:
Lasse Haslie Norwegian Public Roads Administration

Need for research at national level

- Study on behaviour and on naturalistic driving.

Need for research at EU level

- Naturalistic riding study. There is already an EU project on that and it is indeed really important.
- More cooperation and exchange of knowledge and expertise between European countries. We lack comparisons.

There is a lot of information exchanged between Nordic countries, and in various workshops. For example, for the 3DLD, CIECA organised workshops where it was possible to exchange information between countries.

In-depth study

Norway undertook an in-depth accident causation study on PTW accidents between 2005 and 2009. This was done under a Norwegian methodology. The main conclusions were that the work Norway had done until 2009 to improve road safety needed to be carried on, and that they were on the right track. Another conclusion was that a large percentage of accidents were due to extreme behaviour. At the Road Administration they know that they have to work on this, reducing this kind of behaviour: awareness, enforcement, training, etc.
(NO) D6: Traffic management and ITS

**Respondent:**
Lasse Haslie               Norwegian Public Roads Administration

In Norway, though there is work being done on vehicle technologies, there is none being done on ITS for traffic management.

PTWs are integrated and do not have to pay any road tolls.

PTW are allowed to use bus lanes, but ITS is not used for their management.

There is no electronic system for parking.

(NO) D7: Awareness campaigns

**Respondent:**
Lasse Haslie               Norwegian Public Roads Administration

**Campaigns on PTW safety**

The government does not conduct campaigns, successfully delegating this work to the motorcycle association, NMCU, which is designing the campaign, and using human resources from the Norwegian Public Roads Administration to develop it. Norwegian authorities are not financing this campaign as such. There is no formal ex-post evaluation of the campaign.

**Other campaigns**

Norway does not look at foreign awareness campaigns.

**Key elements for a campaign**

- According to the Norwegian authorities, a campaign reaching inexperienced riders to explain to them how to avoid having an accident would be really great. But the problem is that they do not know how to reach this category of riders.

- One of the key elements of any successful campaign is to integrate riders within the campaign.
**(NO) D8: National strategies**

**Respondent:**  
Lasse Haslie  
Norwegian Public Roads Administration

Key measures of the NS/AP

The strategy for motorcycle safety is currently being translated in English. It is the first strategy for PTWs in Norway.

The key elements are:

- Good education for road users and instructors
- Voluntary training and courses at low cost
- Campaign in collaboration with the NMCU
- Safer vehicles and ITS
- Road infrastructure handbook. Make roads more efficient for motorcycles
- Re-evaluation of Vision Zero

There will be an evaluation with clear measurements in 2017.

Need for EU action

An important area for EU work is a comparison of the work done by the different countries on the European Commission’s policy orientations on road safety.

**(NO) D9: Motorcycling community**

The relationship between Norwegian authorities and NMCU is really good. They are included in almost all the work related to PTW safety.
(PL) D1: Training, testing and licencing

Respondent:

CIECA member CIECA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLAND</th>
<th>AM</th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24h of theoretical courses + 24h of practical training (12h on testing ground + 14 in traffic) + theoretical test + practical test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirement for the graduate licence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(PL) D3: Infrastructure

Respondent:

Katarzyna Kwiecień General Directorate of National Roads and Motorways

Infrastructure guidelines

There are no PTW-specific infrastructure guidelines in Poland.

For Polish authorities, in general PTWs are not a top safety problem, at least not yet. The share of PTW users in traffic fatalities is 8%. Though it is increasing, it is still much lower than for non-motorised users (pedestrians and cyclists – 40%).
Reporting on infrastructure problems

Road sections are ranked according to accident concentrations and density. Sections with a high accident density are subject to a detailed Road Safety Inspection to identify potential infrastructure and maintenance problems. Accident data is also used for prioritizing road safety interventions requested by local authorities or citizens.
PORTUGAL

(PT) D1: Training, testing and licencing

Respondent:
CIECA member CIECA

Licence scheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AM</th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum age</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24 (direct access) or 2 years of A2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Theory test + Practical test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Theory test + Practical test (including in traffic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirement for the graduate licence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A1 licence for at least 2 years + Training in practical test</td>
<td>A2 licence for at least 2 years + Training in practical test</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Change of structure

According to the CIECA member:

- Introduction of specific manoeuvres done in closed areas, without traffic.
- Introduction of progressive access to higher-powered PTWs, with practical tests for each category (A1 to A2 and to full A).
- Direct access to category A already existed, though the age limit was increased to 24.
- The PTW characteristics for progressive access to each category were changed.

Improvements

According to the CIECA member, the progressive access to a PTW licence with mandatory training and/or testing is a measure that may contribute to increased PTW road safety. But there is not yet enough evidence or available data to start any assessment at this point.
Implementation difficulties

According to the CIECA member, they have difficulties with:

- Special manoeuvres in closed areas due to the necessary public investment to adapt test centres.
- It will be necessary to change some of the PTWs used in training. In some cases, this will involve the acquisition of new motorcycles by driving schools, a very difficult aspect due to the current economic situation.

The 3DLD also increased the cost of gaining a licence, as motorcyclists must have more training and pay an administrative fee for the tests.

There has been a decrease in the number of new PTW drivers between 2012 and 2014, though the percentage by gender has not changed. There has been an increase in the average age of new PTW drivers. And finally, men qualify for category A licences later than women, and the average age of new PTW drivers (all categories) is higher among men.

The 4DLD

As implementation of the 3DLD is fairly recent, there isn’t yet enough information to make a correct assessment and draw conclusions on what needs to be changed / implemented in the near future.
**ROMANIA**

**(RO) D1: Training, testing and licencing**

**Respondent:**
Gino-Theodor Bosman  
Ministry of Internal Affairs, Driving Licencing and Vehicle Registration Directorate

**Licence scheme**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROMANIA</th>
<th>AM</th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum age</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24 (direct access) or 2 years of A2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and testing</td>
<td>Theory test + Practical test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Training (24h of theory + 26 of practice) + Theory test + Practical test (manoeuvres, skills, behaviour)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirement for the graduate licence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A1 licence for at least 2 years + Training (12h of theory + 10h of practice) + Theory test + Practical test (skills and behaviour on testing ground and in traffic)</td>
<td>A2 licence for less than 2 years + Training (24h of theory + 20 of practice) + Theory test + Practical test (manoeuvres, skills, behaviour) OR A2 licence for at least 2 years + Training (12h of theory + 10h of practice) + Theory test + Practical test (skills and behaviour on testing ground and in traffic)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Change of structure

The main change consists of introducing the test of skills and behaviour in real traffic both in the training course and the examination procedure.

A significant change in MC training patterns is the introduction of the practical test in real traffic, which involved developing a special chapter in the curriculum of driving schools and driving licencing authority procedures.

Improvements

The introduction of category A2 and increasing the minimum age for direct access to category A from 21 to 24

Implementation difficulties

The examination procedure used for the practical test in real traffic was subject to plenty of discussion and controversy, due to the risks for the driving instructor accompanying the applicant during the examination. There are still people advocating that the applicant should be alone on the motorcycle. The actual procedure aims, on the one hand, to protect the applicant through possible instructor intervention and, on the other, to increase the quality of practical training given by driving instructors.

Financial difficulties for driving schools, as the changing of the technical features of the motorcycles used for category A tests required the purchase of new and more expensive motorcycles.

The training cost to obtain a category A1 licence has remained unchanged, averaging €100. However, the training cost to obtain a category A licence has increased by 20-30%, averaging €150. The examination fee has remained unchanged, respectively €15 for the first three examinations and €20 as from the fourth examination.

Due to the increased minimum age for category A, the number of applications fell by 3 times in 2013 compared to 2012, from 12,337 to 4,516. In 2013, 325 persons obtained category A2 licences, while the number of those obtaining A1 remained constant.

The 4DLD

Traffic rules will probably remain unchanged for a long time. However, safe PTW riding remains a problem given that their technical characteristics allow motorcycles to manoeuvre into spaces and at distances impossible for vehicles in other categories (at least 4 wheels). On the other hand, practical training cannot be done at the actual performance parameters of a
motorcycle, referring here in particular to speed, acceleration and braking. Therefore, it is important to retain/include progressive access from one category to another, including from A1 to A2 which does not exist at the moment, subject to a licence holder’s experience in riding the bike effectively and not to the period a licence of this category has been held. From this perspective, we believe it necessary to enhance the role of professional motorcyclist associations able to administer the transition from one category to a higher one, dependent on the criteria stated above.

(RO) D2: Data collection and statistics

**Respondent:**
Valentin IONITA  
Romanian Traffic Police Directorate

**Data collected**

Romanian police collect all accident data, including information on the place of the accident, road condition, the possible cause and the vehicles and persons involved.

In the case of a motorcycle accident three categories of information are collected: accident-related variables (which include road-related variables); vehicle-related variables; person-related variables.

The level of detail of the variables and values corresponds to all data useful for macroscopic data analysis and not for detailed reconstruction of the scene of the accident, which is of local interest for each file.

All accident data are disseminated to other entities responsible for increasing road safety awareness. They publish them in annual road safety reports.

**Data exchanged**

Romania transmits all data on accidents to the CARE database and must make the necessary adjustments to provide CADaS data to the EU.

Romania doesn’t send the EU personal data (social id number, address, etc) about the person involved in the accident, though these are collected in a database.

All data required to be exchanged with the EU. The accident data are always compared with data from other EU countries.
(RO) D4: Accident reporting

Respondent:
Valentin IONITA Romanian Traffic Police Directorate

There is only one police accident report in Romania (all road categories, all vehicles). There is no section that focuses specifically on PTWs in our standard accident report form.

The police accident report takes infrastructural problems into account. All problems identified at the scene of the accident are sent for analysis to the prosecutors who can establish the guilt of the roads administrator. In the case of infrastructural problems, the police also have to notify the road administrator to fix them.

The same procedure is applied for all accidents. First, at the scene of an accident, the police officer writes down a report with all the data which might otherwise be lost (road condition, weather conditions, etc.). After that, a technical examination of the PTW will follow (all the data and details are written in the report). Finally, the personal data of the accident victims, passengers and witnesses are entered into the report, together with the first conclusions about the cause. A few days may be needed to get all data.

(RO) D7: Awareness campaigns

Respondent:
Christian Andries Ministry of Home Affairs – General Inspectorate of Romanian Police – Road Traffic Directorate

Campaigns on PTW safety

The National Traffic Education Campaign “Choose life!” started in 2009. This is the main campaign, and we are conducting other campaigns under this umbrella. The campaign “Share the road” started in 2011. The idea is to make road users (PTW users and others) aware of their obligations in traffic. For PTW users, the idea is to encourage them to use appropriate safety equipment and adopt safe behaviour on the road and prevent aggression.

With PTW riders reappearing in traffic every spring, the main idea was to make sure they have the right safety gear: meetings with riders (organised in conjunction with motorcycle organisations) and video clips are used to get riders to adopt the right behaviour in traffic. Moreover, Romanian authorities discuss this a lot with biking organisations.
The theme of the campaign is determined by the number of accidents and an analysis of road safety. Moreover, other stakeholders have underlined the importance of behaviour and protective gear for PTW safety.

The road traffic department chooses the theme of the campaign and tries to win the support and help of stakeholders and other actors.

Campaigns consist mainly of video clips and flyers.

The positive points are:

- Consultation: involvement of stakeholders.
- Positive impact of the campaign: improvement in behaviour (respect of traffic rules, riders more responsible, respect of other road users), wearing of safety gear.
- The message of the campaign is positive: making PTW riders responsible.

The negative elements are:

- Lack of funding: not enough money to really reach all kinds of riders.
- Lack of certain actors in the process: we try to discuss issues with other road safety actors in Romania to make them aware that road safety is the issue of everyone. However some actors are not yet involved.

The causes of traffic accidents vary, with guilt lying both with motor vehicle drivers and other traffic participants. The main problem is the lack of education ensuring the safe “cohabitation” of all public road users. The National Traffic Education Campaign “Choose life!” is trying, as its main objectives, to improve knowledge of and compliance with traffic rules, as well as making road users aware of the risks they are exposed to when breaking traffic rules. For these reasons, the objective of the campaign is to promote the knowledge and right use of traffic regulations by traffic participants, getting them to assume preventive traffic behaviour.

There is no way of evaluating the campaign. However the number of PTW users using proper equipment has increased since 2011 (starting point of the campaign), and behaviour in traffic has improved. So apparently, these campaigns are having the right impact.

Other campaigns

Romanian authorities are aware of foreign campaigns. The UK “Think” campaign also contains road safety video-clips and recommendations for PTWs with a view to helping riders avoid being involved road traffic accidents.
Key elements for a campaign

Successful campaigns:

- Proper identification of the problem: in order to have a good campaign, we have to see what the actual problems with PTWs are.
- Talking to others road users: to talk with car drivers and all road users, and make them aware of PTW presence.
- Adapting tools to the campaign target: to create elements with a positive impact on the issue. If PTW riders are young, you have to use the relevant tool to address the right target. Different category of users = different tools.
- The message must be trustworthy: the PTW users have to realise that these campaigns aim at enhancing their safety.

Bad campaigns:

- Targeting the wrong population: a bad campaign is a campaign which wrongly identifies the campaign target, with the result that the tools then target the wrong population.
SLOVAKIA

(SK) D7: Awareness campaigns

Respondent:
Petra Groschová
Ministry of Transport, Construction and Regional Development, Department of Road Safety

Campaigns on PTW safety
Slovakia is conducting PTW campaigns targeting motorcyclists and car drivers, including flyers for cyclists, events for children and for cyclists.
BECEP organizes campaigns separately for motorcyclists and cyclists, because these are the most vulnerable traffic participants.
Positive aspects are definitely information about, for example, equipment, injuries, crashes, etc.

Other campaigns
Slovakia is aware of the campaign run by the Czech Republic. They consider it to be good, receiving very positive responses.

Key elements for a campaign
- Successful campaign: to inform as many people as possible.
- Bad campaign: maybe ones that might encourage drivers to ride faster because their safety equipment is better or their insurance will cover all costs in the case of an accident.

(SK) D8: National strategies

Respondent:
Petra Groschová
Ministry of Transport, Construction and Regional Development, Department of Road Safety

Key measures of the NS/AP
The target is to decrease the number of crashes by 50% by 2020 (with 2010 as the base year).
Safety measures are implemented every year.

The Slovakian expert recommends working on prevention, education and providing more information.
**SLOVENIA**

**(SI) D1: Training, testing and licencing**

**Respondent:**
Tina Bizjak, Andraz Murkovic  
Slovenian Traffic Safety Agency, Department for development and coordination of road safety

**Licence scheme**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLOVENIA</th>
<th>AM</th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum age</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>20 or 24 (direct access)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate licence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirement for the graduate licence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Change of structure**

The possibility of progressive licencing from A1 (16) to A2 (18) and finally A (20) or direct access at 24

**Improvements**

In Slovenia MC training was properly regulated even before the 3DLD (practice on non-traffic surfaces was established before the Directive). In 2009, the training rules for driving licence applicants were defined more precisely. After the 3DLD there were no major changes, because the adopted rules already took the 3DLD orientations into account.

**Implementation difficulties**

The A2 category was implemented in Slovenia before other EU countries (2009), which had resulted in Slovenian riders with A2 licences facing problems in other countries due to a “non-valid” category.

Until 19 January 2013, there were technical problems regarding the minimum cc.
**D2: Data collection and statistics**

**Respondent:**
Tina Bizjak, Andraz Murkovic  
Slovenian Traffic Safety Agency, Department for development and coordination of road safety

**Data collected**
Traffic accident data collected by the police: complete typology of road accidents: age, date, sex, injury type, causer, alcohol, cause of road accident, type of road, urban/rural road.

Number of registered PTWs

No in-depth accident studies are conducted in Slovenia.

It would be interesting to have more PTW comparisons (per million inhabitants) between EU member states.

**Data exchanged**
All data are sent to CARE and the IRTAD database.

At national level, the police carry out an analysis of PTW road safety once a year. The Slovenian Traffic Safety Agency conducts analyses when needed at the micro level (analysis of PTW accidents on state roads or in municipalities, etc.). PTW accident data are included in the monthly report on the road safety situation in Slovenia, which is sent to the Minister of Infrastructure (also responsible for transport). Our general analyses are available to the public.

**D3: Infrastructure**

**Respondent:**
Tina Bizjak, Andraz Murkovic  
Slovenian Traffic Safety Agency, Department for development and coordination of road safety

**Infrastructure guidelines**

There are no infrastructure guidelines in Slovenia. But there are technical specifications for protective barriers, in which the road safety barriers for motorcyclists are described in detail.
(SI) D4: Accident reporting

**Respondent:**

Tina Bizjak, Andraz Murkovic  
Slovenian Traffic Safety Agency, Department for development and coordination of road safety

In Slovenia, there is only one police accident report (all roads, all vehicles).
There is no specific section on PTWs.
Police accident reports do not take into account infrastructural problems.

( SI) D5: Research

**Respondent:**

Tina Bizjak, Andraz Murkovic  
Slovenian Traffic Safety Agency, Department for development and coordination of road safety

Need for research at national level

Road accident data: manoeuvres of PTW riders, data about PTW passengers involved in road accidents.

Research on protective equipment use (helmets, protective clothing, reflective clothing, etc.)

In-depth study

Slovenia has never undertaken any in-depth accident causation study on PTW accidents.

( SI) D6: Traffic management and ITS

**Respondent:**

Tina Bizjak, Andraz Murkovic  
Slovenian Traffic Safety Agency, Department for development and coordination of road safety

In Slovenia, there are no tolls on road, but there is a vignette system, also for PTWs.
PTWs are not allowed to use bus lanes.
(SI) D7: Awareness campaigns

Respondent:
Tina Bizjak, Andraz Murkovic
Slovenian Traffic Safety Agency, Department for development and coordination of road safety

Campaigns on PTW safety

The campaign on PTW safety was run and coordinated by the police in cooperation with other stakeholders (Ministry of Infrastructure, Roads Agency, Slovenian Traffic Safety Agency, the motorway company, etc.).

The campaign contained thematic brochures for all PTW riders (for example: “Curves, don’t miss them. The art of stopping.”; “Speed, don’t miss! The feeling for life.”; “Don’t miss! – Predict the situation.”).

In 2013, Slovenian Traffic Safety Agency prepared new video spots (from a motorcyclist’s point of view and from a car driver’s point of view) mostly focusing on the promotion of protection gear.

The Roads Agency installed new warning signs (as on the picture) for motorcyclists.

The motorcyclist website (supermotorist.si) was established and different contents related to PTW safety made available to the public.

Preventive events (workshops) for motorcyclists at the beginning of motorcycling season were also organized by the police.

These campaigns are done by advertising in the media (spots on radio and TV), press conferences, preventive events, promotional material (brochures, posters) and additional measures implemented for the safety of PTW riders (protective fences, warning signs, additional motorcyclist safety barriers)

The most positive thing about a PTW campaign is for it to be a joint campaign, managed and coordinated at national level in conjunction with different stakeholders. The reach of the campaign is thus higher than it would be with several campaigns organized locally.
The positive aspects of these campaigns are above all the connections made among road safety stakeholders, and that there are periods dedicated to PTW safety (all preventive activities in determined periods are focused on PTW safety).

Other campaigns

Slovenian authorities are aware of campaigns in other countries, but they are not familiar with them in detail.

The campaigns run by motorcyclists’ organizations are usually organized locally, with a smaller population targeted. At the same time they can be really efficient as the motorcyclists are targeted on a more personal level.

Key elements for a campaign

In our experience, the key elements of any successful campaign is media advertising (on TV, radio, billboards) and prevention work in the field (practical workshops at the beginning of motorcycling season). It is important to focus on and promote correct behaviour from both a motorcyclist’s and car driver’s point of view.

(SI) D8: National strategies

Respondent:
Tina Bizjak, Andraz Murkovic
Slovenian Traffic Safety Agency, Department for development and coordination of road safety

Key measures of the NS/AP

– Infrastructure and PTW black spots: checking road sections where PTW accidents with fatalities or severe injuries have occurred; the installation of the quality road equipment; strict control of certain regular maintenance work on road sections where PTW accidents with fatalities or severe injuries have occurred; installing quality road equipment enhancing safety for motorcycle and moped drivers (anti-collision colour, appropriate safety fences); the monitoring of the number of traffic accidents with the participation of motorcycle and moped riders.

– Awareness campaigns: realization of preventive campaigns to improve the safety of PTW riders; to encourage patience and responsible behaviour on the part of all traffic participants.
− Young riders: to encourage young riders to be patient and act responsibly in road traffic and highlight factors influencing safety in road traffic; the preparation of the programme in the context of the education of adolescents in elementary and middle schools with an emphasis on traffic psychology

− Training: implementation of courses for PTW riders in driving schools who already have a driving licence for the right category within a lifelong learning context; to encourage safe PTW riding with an emphasis on defensive driving and developing skills

− Protective clothing: to increase the use of quality gear for the protection of PTW riders and passengers; to increase the use of the high-visible equipment (helmet, suit); to ensure higher active and passive safety for motorcycles and mopeds

− To change the conditions for compensation payments; an agreement of insurance companies with the Slovenian Insurance Association on new conditions for paying compensation

− Enforcement: to implement checks of PTW riders where and when road rules are frequently violated and where accidents involving PTWs are frequent; checks on the psychophysical state of drivers and whether they have a valid driving licence for the category of PTW used; checks on the use of approved safety helmets; roadworthiness checks for motorcycles and mopeds with an emphasis on vehicles which have been rebuilt in breach of the approval regulation

− Vehicle safety: to encourage the purchase of new PTWs with advanced technology

The implementation of the measures listed above is planned for the period 2013-2022 (within the Resolution on the national road safety programme for the period 2013-2022) and is in progress.

The impact of these measures will be evaluated through different indicators (black spots, proper signalization of obstacles and dangerous sections; a plan of preventive activities; promotion of safe training; monitoring the number of motorcycle or moped accidents, etc.).
(ES) D1: Training, testing and licencing

Respondent:
Marta Carrera  Directorate General for Traffic (DGT), Ministry of Interior

Licence scheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AM</th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minimum age</strong></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 years of A2 licence (no direct access)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Training and testing</strong></td>
<td>Theory test + Practical test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Requirement for the graduate licence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>A1 licence for at least 2 years + Theory test (reduced to specific questions for this category) + Practical test in open road</td>
<td></td>
<td>A2 licence for at least 2 years + Training (9h)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Change of structure

- A new category: A2, to ride motorcycles with a maximum power of 35 kw.
- The progressive access to a PTW driving licence, i.e. the possibility to access a PTW licence step by step. We believe in gaining experience with a lower-powered motorcycle and then moving up to a higher category.
- A training course to gain access to the A category. As the holder is already a motorcycle driver, we don’t repeat the driving test. What we have is a (practical and theoretical) course with a higher-powered motorcycle.

Improvements

According to the CIECA member, progressive access is an improvement. It allows experience to be gained with a lower-powered PTW, thereby reducing road fatalities.
Implementation difficulties

According to the CIECA member, there is an issue over the A2 motorcycle not derived from more than twice the initial power. Moreover, as Spain was the first country to implement a new method for obtaining the A category licence under the 3DLD, it experienced difficulty in creating a new course for obtaining the A category. There were also difficulties with training operators: the need to run specific training courses for the A category with a new motorcycle, professional instructors.

According to the CIECA member, with the new licence category, the cost to pass all the progressive tests has increased. And driving schools have had to buy new motorcycles for the A2 licence.

According to the CIECA member, the number of A category licences issued has dropped because of the new A2 category, as riders have access to good motorcycles with decent power without having to have an A licence.

The 4DLD

According to the CIECA member:

- Harmonised access to the A category between the member states.
- Specialisation for A category instructors.
- Specialisation for A category examiners.
- The need to create a new test for A2 (different to A1) to separate both categories in the test with different manoeuvres.

(ES) D2: Data collection and statistics

Respondent:
Álvaro Gómez
Directorate General for Traffic (DGT), Ministry of Interior

Data collected

- Number and characteristics of registered PTWs: name and make (brand name) of the manufacturer, vehicle identification number (VIN), model, type/variant/version, mass, engine power, engine capacity.
- In the case of a motorcycle accident:
Information about the accident, road, vehicles and users involved.

Regarding the vehicle: registration number, date of registration, country of registration, make and model, status of periodic roadworthiness test and compulsory insurance, type of vehicle.

Possible values for the field ‘type of vehicle’ are: moped, motorcycle with less than 125cc, motorcycle with more than 125cc.

Police officers conduct in-depth investigations of every fatal accident for legal purposes.

Data exchanged

Data on the number and characteristics of registered PTWs can be regarded as EU-harmonized, since they comply with the EU directives on the approval of motor vehicles.

All information contained in the National Register of Road Accident Victims is exchanged yearly with the European Commission, in order to update the CARE database.

Spain publishes several statistical reports, and presents them to stakeholders. They have also started publishing reports on specific topics, such as urban areas and cyclists. A report on PTW accidents is expected to be published by the end of 2015/beginning of 2016.

Recommendations:

- New and more detailed classification of the vehicle would be useful. Engine power or capacity, available in many countries, are not fully related to the typical use of the vehicle. The type of motorcycle (i.e. scooter, cruiser, sport…) would be very useful.

(ES) D3: Infrastructure

Respondent:
Ana Blanco  Directorate General for Traffic (DGT), Ministry of Interior

Infrastructure guidelines

A specific guideline for motorcyclist protection systems MPS (barriers) was approved in 2008. This guideline includes specific criteria for the systematic use of MPS, with the aim of increasing the safety of motorcyclists by reducing the consequences of an accident when one occurs.

Until 2014, the specific MPS guideline had to be applied in conjunction with a general guideline for the use of safety barriers.
Besides the MPS guideline, a new Road Code will be approved which will include a regulation on advanced stop lines, which are used in urban streets.

These guidelines are mandatory for the national network and are implemented on a voluntary basis for regional or local roads. In the case of the national network, it is mandatory to follow the criteria for the installation of MPS in new road projects, while these guidelines have also been used for sections with problems. During the past few years many road administrations developed plans for deploying these systems in their networks, which have since been implemented or are ongoing.

Others questions
PTWs included as vulnerable road users on the whole network.

Need for EU actions
Spain can share its practices on Motorcyclist Protection Systems and Advanced Stop Lines.
The eSum Project had a deliverable including best practices on infrastructure for PTWs in urban areas.

Reporting on infrastructure problems
The Directorate General for Traffic collects reports on accidents with fatalities and injuries. This information is analysed, including the geographical location of accidents. If there is a concentration of accidents in a certain location, a deeper analysis is conducted.
The administrations in charge of road maintenance (infrastructure managers) collect information related to infrastructure problems, and often use it for black spot warnings, but mainly to evaluate whether it is necessary to make any change for instance in signalling or in road surface maintenance.
Spain uses the GIS software for traffic and road safety analyses.

(ES) D4: Accident reporting

Respondent:
Álvaro Gómez, Pilar Zori   Directorate General for Traffic (DGT), Ministry of Interior
There is a single police accident report (all road types and all road users). There is no particular section on PTWs.

The accident report contains a number of fields on infrastructure, including: road type, road designation and kilometre, type of junction (if applicable), state of the road surface, road lighting, visibility, speed limit, number of carriageways, number of lanes, lane width, hard shoulder width, number and type of safety barriers, road markings, road margins.

The accident form is generally filled in on the spot. The form is later uploaded into the National Register.

**(ES) D5: Research**

**Respondent:**
Fermina Sánchez  
Directorate General for Traffic (DGT), Ministry of Interior

**Need for research at national level**

- PTW rider road safety training.
- Study of PTW rider types: characteristics and behaviour
- Modification of risky behaviour
- Adaptation of infrastructures.
- Awareness raising.

**Need for research at EU level**

- Studies to evaluate the effectiveness of safe-driving courses for motorists.
- Research on the effectiveness of PTW safety equipment.
- Infrastructure safety: safety barriers for motorcycles.
- Coexistence of motorcyclists and other road users.
- Obtaining and sharing risk exposure data.
- Characterization of PTW risk group profiles in order to decide and implement specific measures as part of a European Strategy to increase PTW road safety.
- Naturalistic studies on motorists’ behaviour.
In-depth study

Spain was involved in several EU in-depth analyses: MAIDS, DACOTA.

A national project was conducted in 2009, analysing more than 300 in-depth investigations conducted by police officers for legal purposes. The aim was to extract a common data set in order to analyse risk factors.

(ES) D6: Traffic management and ITS

Respondent:
Ana Blanco
Directorate General for Traffic (DGT), Ministry of Interior

There is no specific strategy for intelligent traffic management for PTWs: they are included in the measures related to the group of light motor vehicles. Even if management is still conventional, PTWs are included in urban mobility plans (in Madrid and Barcelona above all).

There are no bridge tolls in Spain. On motorways, PTW riders pay the same as other light vehicle users. Talking about intelligent roads, PTWs are also allowed to use high occupancy vehicle lanes.

In Madrid and in some other cities PTWs are allowed to use bus lanes. And in the Strategic Plan for the Road Safety of Motorcycles and Mopeds, overall access to bus lanes by PTWs was also a solution proposed to reduce PTW accidents.

Most cities have dedicated spaces for PTW parking which are free of charge, as a policy encouraging this mode of transport.

(ES) D8: National strategies

Respondent:
Álvaro Gómez
Directorate General for Traffic (DGT), Ministry of Interior

Key measures of the NS/AP

There are two main national strategies in the field of PTW safety: one specifically for motorcycles and mopeds, and a general one in which PTWs are also included. In addition, there
have been/are a number of plans and strategies at local level. Motorcycle associations and manufacturers, as well as research centres, also play an active role in improving PTW safety.

The ‘Strategic Plan for the Road Safety of Motorcycles and Mopeds’ contains the following objectives:

- Preparing motorcyclists for safe driving: Modifying access tests, access progressiveness, road safety training.
- Minimizing high accident rate scenarios: traffic management, adapting infrastructures, vehicle equipment and characteristics.
- Fighting risk behaviour: raising awareness, preventive action targeting risk driver categories, detecting and sanctioning risky driving.
- Adopting mitigating measures: infrastructures, assistance, motor biker equipment.

The ‘Spanish Road Safety Strategy 2011-2020: 36 measures in 12 programmes: licencing, progressive access, training, traffic management, infrastructure, vehicle equipment, awareness, extreme behaviour, sanctions/fines, protective equipment.

32 measures are in the process of being implemented. An evaluation process is planned to fine-tune these measures. At the end, 13 measures have shown mitigated results, the others have been more successful.

The impact of the national strategies is measured mainly by assessing the evolution of the number of accidents involving PTWs, as well as the number of casualties. Overall, the number of fatalities among motorcycle users (mopeds excluded) has decreased by 52% between 2007 and 2013, after a sharp increase of 72% between 2003 and 2007. Hospitalized injured, as registered by the police, have decreased by 28% since 2003. This assessment is also conducted for specific groups of users (age, sex), motorcycles (age, displacement) and roads (built-up, non built-up areas).

Need for EU action

- Training and education: procedures for obtaining driving licences; awareness-raising campaigns.
- Vehicle safety: research on the benefits of advanced safety systems; promotion of their use; legislation, where cost-effective.
- User safety: protective clothing (research, promotion, standardization); conspicuousness.
- Infrastructure safety: safety barriers for motorcycles; road margins and intersections; best practices in urban areas.
- ITS and traffic management: cooperative systems, e-call.
- Data: promotion of in-depth investigations of accidents involving PTWs at a European level; new definition of seriously injured.
- Enforcement: technological innovations; promotion of controls for the detection of driving under the influence of drugs; cooperation among Member States.
(SE) D1: Training, testing and licencing

Respondent:
Olof Stenlund Swedish Transport Agency

Licence scheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AM</th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum age</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24 (direct access) or 2 years of A2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Compulsory education + minimum 12h of theoretical and practical courses (minimum 4h of practical training) + Theory test</td>
<td>Mandatory risk education: 3h of theoretical education + minimum 4h hours of practical training + Theory test + Practical test</td>
<td>Mandatory risk education: 3h of theoretical education + minimum 4h hours of practical training + Theory test + Practical test</td>
<td>Mandatory risk education if such education is not completed for a lower category + Theory test + Practical test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirement for the graduate licence</td>
<td></td>
<td>A1 licence for at least 2 years + Theory test + Practical test</td>
<td>A2 licence for at least 2 years + Theory test + Practical test</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Passing driving licence tests is the traditional Swedish model used to gain a driving licence (all categories).

Normally a driving test is less costly for the candidate compared to a mandatory training course. But it is considered that a good driving test requires good training on the larger vehicle. How much training is needed to pass the test varies a lot from person to person.

Change of structure

The 3DLD raised the minimum age for direct access to category A from 21 to 24.
The A2 category was introduced and the A category with restricted power (max 25 kW) abolished. One difference between A2 and A-restricted is that it requires a driving test to upgrade from A2 to A, compared with A-restricted which automatically changed to unrestricted A after 2 years.

Improvements

− The 3DLD creates better conditions for unified driving licence rules throughout the EU.
− It strengthened progressive access, meaning that driving licence holders can gradually move up the licence ladder with increasing age and/or more experience, gaining access to the more demanding vehicles within a vehicle category.

Implementation difficulties

There were a lot of discussions on the definition of category A2 - "not derived from a vehicle of more than double its power". Swedish authorities decided that this should be read in a way that the motorcycle is not derived from a vehicle with a power above 70 kW.

In Sweden, a student can choose to learn to drive without a driving school (with a layman instructor). And certain private persons sometimes had problems when not allowed to use their own motorcycle during driving tests in cases where the motorcycle did not meet the minimum requirements for driving test vehicles.

With regard to the cost of the PTW licence, there is one difference for those who choose to take category A2 and then later upgrade to category A. In such a case, there will be the cost for a new driving test and eventually pre-test training costs. Those who previously had category A-restricted licences were automatically upgraded without a driving test after 2 years. How much a category A driver's licence costs varies greatly from person to person, mainly dependent on how many driving lessons are taken at a driving school. The majority of riders in Sweden do their drivers training both with private instructors and with driving school instructors. Others take lessons at driving schools only, and some only with private instructors.

One PTW driving lesson at a driving school costs between €55 and €95. The price for an A-restricted licence (with the Automatic Upgrade to A) before the 3DLD was at least €650 (mandatory costs) but normally about €1100 - 2100, depending on the number of lessons taken at a driving school. The price of the licence A2 + A licence is about the same now, but with additional costs for the practical driving test. A practical driving test costs €180 or €230 (in the evening and at weekends). And there will also be € 25 for the licence itself.

This means that it costs at least €205 more to gain an A licence under the new rules for those not waiting until they are old enough for direct access to A. Moreover, there can be additional costs when upgrading if there is a need for additional pre-test training.
The most noticeable change in the number of approved motorcycle licence tests was in 2012 when the number increased. Swedish authorities assume that this was because more 21-22 year-olds took the opportunity to take the category A test before the age limit was raised to 24. But compared to the preceding years 2010 and 2011 it was only a small difference in numbers.

(SE) D2: Data collection and statistics

Respondent:
Johan Strandroth The Swedish Transport Administration (Trafikverket)

Data collected
Regarding crashes and injuries there are three major sources for data. First, in-depth studies of fatal crashes conducted by the Swedish Transport Administration (STA); second, police-recorded crash data; and third hospital admission data for diagnosed injuries. The hospital and police data are linked together in a database. Regarding other statistics, there is information of number of vehicles, driver’s licences, annual vehicle mileage on which roads, average speed, helmet use, etc.

For all crashes with injuries there is a linked police/hospital report containing information of vehicle involved, the driver’s licence, accident location and road characteristics, injury diagnosis and other information about the person such as age and gender, etc.

STA has been carrying out in-depth studies for each fatal road crash since 1997. Crash investigators systematically inspect the vehicles involved and record the direction of impact, vehicular intrusion, protective clothing, airbag deployment, tyre properties, etc. The crash site is also inspected with regard to road characteristics, collision objects, etc. Further information is provided by forensic examinations, witness statements from the police and reports from the emergency services.

Data exchanged
Data and statistics are shared at the national level, and used for research, for internal use in traffic safety management and for communication purposes.

Statistics on fatalities and injuries are harmonized for reporting to the CARE database.

Swedish experts recommend that hospital data with injury diagnoses should be exchanged at EU level, enabling a greater understanding of PTW injury patterns throughout the EU.
(SE) D3: Infrastructure

Respondent:
Roger Johansson The Swedish Transport Administration (Trafikverket)

Infrastructure guidelines
There are PTW-specific infrastructure guidelines in Sweden. Within these guidelines, the demands are mandatory, advice is not. But no evaluation has yet been made on their implementation.

Others questions
PTW riders and passengers are considered as vulnerable road users throughout the Swedish road network.
Guidelines on the PTW infrastructure directive are being prepared.

Need for EU actions
- EU-standards for guardrails

Report on infrastructure problems
In-depth-studies are made for all fatal crashes, and infrastructure problems are taken into account. Specific software to collect infrastructure issues is under development.

(SE) D5: Research

Respondent:
Matteo Rizzi Folksam (insurance company), Road Safety Research department

Previous research done
Sweden is conducting research in the context of its motorcycle strategy, which is the platform for other research projects. Thank to this, they have a good picture of what a motorcycle accident
looks like and what kind of intervention is needed for safety. These studies are allowing them to fine-tune their strategy.

**Need for research at national level**

- Research on vehicle safety (active and passive on-board systems), as at present there is not too much PTW safety research in Sweden, maybe explained by the lack of a motorcycle industry in Sweden.

- The amount of funding should be increased to match the number of motorcycle fatalities. Though 14% of fatalities are motorcyclists, 14% of the research funding is not dedicated to motorcycles.

**Need for research at EU level**

- Need for a holistic approach in Europe to gain a better understanding of motorcycle use through Europe = conduct mobility research.

- Conduct more a comprehensive study to understand how the motorcyclist community works and how to address safety issues.

Sweden is coordinating research with other EU countries, but it could be better. Universities are collaborating in EU projects, but there is no bilateral contact with other countries, except for a few cases. Swedish experts are really interesting in collaborating more with other EU countries.

**In-depth study**

Sweden does in-depth studies on fatal accidents only. A national methodology is used, but it is pretty close to the OECD methodology: a visit to the crash site (as soon as possible but after the emergency services); checking all data (vehicle estimation, use of protective equipment, etc.) and including the use of hospital and police reports.

But it is very expensive and it’s better to have some objective to ask all the questions needed.

A big part of the work is done in the context of the motorcycle national strategy, which is updated every 3 years.

The more important finding of these in-depth studies is the extreme vulnerability of motorcyclists. More needs to be done to prevent crashes rather than increasing the wearing of protective clothing. The way to save lives is to prevent crashes. For that, it is important to encourage (mandatory) ABS use and speed compliance, and to address the “extreme behaviour”
(extreme speed, no helmets, alcohol and drugs, etc.) which accounts for 30% of motorcyclist fatalities.

The results are completely open and public, available from the Ministry of Transportation and for SMC.

**SE) D6: Traffic management and ITS**

**Respondent:**  
Jörgen Persson  
The Swedish Transport Administration (Trafikverket)

There is no particular ITS strategy for motorcycles.  
PTWs are normally exempt from tolls.  
Normally, PTW are not allowed to use bus lanes but local exceptions may occur.  
There is no specific strategy to include PTWs in intelligent parking systems.

**SE) D7: Awareness campaigns**

**Respondent:**  
Roger Johansson  
The Swedish Transport Administration (Trafikverket)

**Campaigns on PTW safety**  
Swedish authorities do not run stand-alone campaigns because they think they are generally ineffective. They also consider that the Administration is not a trustworthy sender. SMC carries out some campaigns, being a much more trustworthy sender. Campaigns run by motorcycle organizations are better than ones run by state authorities.

**Key elements for a campaign**  
For effect the campaign should promote a change in legislation or another change in the transport system.
(SE) D8: National strategies

Respondent:
Jörgen Persson The Swedish Transport Administration (Trafikverket)

Key measures of the NS/AP

- Increasing the share of motorcyclists keeping to the speed limit.
- Increasing the share of motorcycles with ABS
- Increased focus on high visibility and attention
- Safer roads
- Lower level of extreme behaviour on motorcycles.

The share of overall mileage done by motorcycles equipped with ABS as well as of motorcyclists keeping to the speed limit is deemed as having the greatest effect on road safety.

The strategy is long-term. Its aim is to show how the number of fatally injured motorcyclists and moped riders can be halved and how the number of very seriously injured can be reduced by 40% between 2010 and 2020. The strategy is an aid for governmental authorities, organizations and other stakeholders in their annual planning.

The measures are having an effect:

- Increased share of motorcycles with ABS. Efforts to increase the proportion of motorcycles sold with ABS have been successfully. While the percentage of motorcycles sold with ABS was just 15% in 2008, it was 80% in 2013!
- Increased share of motorcyclists keeping to the speed limit. The target of reducing speeding violations has not been achieved, and there is still much work to do. The Swedish Transport Administration has begun to measure motorcycle speeds more systematically.
- Safer roads. The Swedish Transport Administration has raised road maintenance objectives after a review of current regulations.

In the areas of visibility and extreme behaviour, they need more knowledge on effective measures.

Need for EU action

- Introduce a requirement that all bikes have ABS.
- Make demands for speed support systems.
- Forbid advertising based on speed.
Swedish experts believe that an EU strategy would be of great value. A common approach can be unifying and cost-effective. In such a strategy, measurement/monitoring and research and innovation are key elements. It is important to drive the development of knowledge on the effects of such areas as guard-rails/crash barriers, e-call, MSC, airbags and warning systems.
SWITZERLAND

(CH) D1: Training, testing and licencing

Respondent:
CIECA member CIECA

Licence scheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SWITZERLAND</th>
<th>AM</th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 or 16 (to be decided)</td>
<td>Not yet decided</td>
<td>Not yet decided</td>
<td>Not yet decided</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and testing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The introduction of a theory test and practical test is planned</td>
<td>Before the 3DLD, 16 (vehicle with a cubic capacity limited to max. 50 cm³) 18 (other vehicles)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirement for the graduate licence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A1 licence for at least 2 years + Test option planned (practical test)</td>
<td>A2 licence for at least 2 years + Test option planned (practical test)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Change of structure
Though Switzerland is not formally bound to adopt the 3DLD, there is currently a legislation project in which the 3DLD regulations are being discussed in order to decide which are also of use in Switzerland and should therefore be implemented. It is planned to put the draft decree to public consultation during 2015. Which regulations will be introduced and when are dependent on the results of this public consultation.
Improvements

The Swiss CIECA member considers there is some potential for safety in the progressive access to the higher categories and no direct access to the highest category, but it is not yet decided if this measure will be introduced.
**UNITED KINGDOM**

(UK) D1: Training, testing and licencing

**Respondent:**
CIECA member            CIECA
Chris Parr            Driver and Safety Standards Agency, Assistant Chief Driving
                                      Examiner, Operations Motorcycle team
Catriona Henderson    Road User Licencing, Insurance and Safety

Licence scheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNITED KINGDOM</th>
<th>AM</th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum age</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24 (direct access) or 2 years of A2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and testing</td>
<td>Compulsory Basic training (CBT) + Minimum 1 day basic training course + Theory test + Practical test</td>
<td>Compulsory Basic training (CBT) + Theory test + Practical test (off-road and on-road)</td>
<td>Compulsory Basic training (CBT) + Theory test + Practical test (off-road and on-road)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirement for the graduate licence</td>
<td></td>
<td>A1 licence for at least 2 years + No change but on A2 motorcycle</td>
<td>A2 licence for at least 2 years + No change but on A motorcycle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NORTHERN IRELAND</th>
<th>AM</th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum age</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24 (direct access) or 2 years of A2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and testing</td>
<td>Theory test + Practical test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirement for the graduate licence</td>
<td>A1 licence for at least 2 years + Theory test + Practical test (special manoeuvres test + on road test)</td>
<td>A2 licence for at least 2 years + Theory test + Practical test (special manoeuvres test + on road test)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Change of structure
A big change was the introduction of the A2 licence.

Riders in the UK also lost the entitlement to an automatic licence upgrade after a two year period on having passed their test on a 125cc bike.

According to the CIECA member, there are also several changes to be noted: new moped category AM, new motorcycle category A2, trikes changed from B1 to categories A1 and A, a higher age limit for access to category A (from 21 to 24) and the implementation of progressive access to higher motorcycle categories.

Improvements
The UK is generally happy with the licence changes.

Slow speed controls: this can be attributed to learners having to spend more time practicing for the Module one part of the test.

According to the CIECA member, no PTW safety improvements have been identified.

Inconveniences
UK authorities have concerns that the A2 and A class machines are too closely matched, i.e. you can use the same type of bike for both tests.

Another main issue regarding 3DLD introduction is that the new licence laws have devastated the market for 17 / 18 year-old riders taking the A1 motorcycle test.

Due to the changes there is no incentive to take a test until the age of 19.

Implementation difficulties
The main difficulty was to keep the costs realistic whilst introducing the new regulations.

Technically, the UK allowed the use of restrictor kits to reduce engine power; this resulted in training schools not having to change all of their bikes at once.

Initial problems arose due to the lack of motorcycles available on the market in the A2 category – this has improved, with manufacturers now producing different models of bikes that conform to the A2 regulations.

The cost for the test is the same, however due to the increased number of licence categories there are more training and test costs to gain a full cat A licence. The training price stays the same for
each category but if someone gets into motorcycling at 17, they will have to pay for 3 lots of training and 3 tests to gain a full bike licence.

There was a huge increase in people taking their motorcycle licence before the 3DLD. Between 2013 and 2014, there was a significant drop of people taking a licence, and now the number of people taking a test is rising and getting back to normal. There has been a huge drop of licences granted for A1: from 6,798 before 3DLD to 599.

According to the CIECA member, general trends in rider testing have remained relatively stable over the last four years. Between April 2010 and March 2014, the number of candidates (over 25) presenting themselves for tests did not vary greatly from one year to the next. The trends for 2010/11-2011/12 show relatively stable numbers presenting themselves for tests in each age group. There was an increase in younger riders presenting themselves for tests in 2012/13. However, since January 2013 the number of young riders (ages 24 and under in this context) presenting themselves for practical tests has dropped compared to previous years.

But there is a positive impact for women: the new A2 category has benefitted female riders as the bikes are typically smaller and less powerful, giving them confidence when riding mid-range motorcycles.

According to the CIECA member, there were changes to IT systems and the system is over-complicated. Moreover, instructors, learners and manufacturers object to having to take a PTW test to gain access to trikes if they want to ride across the EU. They also object to the minimum age of 21, as many trikes are car-based and bear no relation to a PTW.

The 4DLD

- The A2 licence must be wider, as the A2 and A categories are currently too similar.
- EU to work on the content of training standards across Europe.
- According to the CIECA member: any further DL directive should take account of the REFIT principles
- According to the CIECA member: No further changes should be made to motorcycle testing until the 3DLD changes have been evaluated
- According to the CIECA member: Any new proposal should be evidence-based
- According to the CIECA member: We would not want the provisions of article 6 (3) extended beyond national territories.
(UK) D2: Data collection and statistics

**Respondent:**
Catriona Henderson  Road User Licencing, Insurance and Safety

Data collected
Concerning alcohol or drug use in an accident with fatalities, it is the coroner who makes this analysis for unusual death. Finding alcohol in the case of fatalities is common, and the UK publishes the data. But drug use is less common.

(UK) D3: Infrastructure

**Respondent:**
Catriona Henderson  Road User Licencing, Insurance and Safety

Infrastructure guidelines
There are PTW-specific infrastructure guidelines in the UK. These guidelines are non-binding and merely represent best practice. The implementation of these recommendations depends on the local authorities who decide the design of the road. Some local authorities see road safety as a high priority and make sure their roads are safe by implementing as many guidelines as possible, while for others, road safety is not an issue or a priority. It is a decentralized subject in the UK.

Others questions
There is no statutory definition of VRUs, nor any specific law or protection for VRUs, but PTW riders and passengers are generally treated as such from a road safety point of view. But from a mobility point of view, there is no encouragement or discouragement on the use of PTWs.

There are already high standards implemented in the UK, though they do not specifically match the infrastructure directive for PTWs. This means that the UK has to change a lot of standards to be in phase with EU, though British experts do not think it will improve anything.
Need for EU actions

Infrastructure is the task of local authorities who deal with local roads. EU harmonization does not seem relevant as different countries do not share the same problems. So the UK prefers to deal with infrastructure at a local level = subsidiarity.

Since the infrastructure directive, UK wishes the EU not to be involved in infrastructure anymore. The important thing is the outcome (less road fatalities) and not the way you achieve this outcome.

UK had contact with the Netherlands about road design schemes and bicycle safety. This can include the impact of infrastructure designed for bicycles or motorcycles. Benchmarking is done and best practices exchanged, but collaboration with other countries is very limited in general.

Reporting on infrastructure problems

The Ministry of Transport is only responsible for motorways, while local authorities are responsible for their roads, including infrastructure problems and how to deal with them. With regard to motorways, the Highways Agency evaluates black spots and where to make improvements to the network. There is no central ITS system for controlling the infrastructure. It is managed locally only.

(UK) D4: Accident reporting

**Respondent:**
Catriona Henderson Road User Licencing, Insurance and Safety

There is only one police accident report in the UK (all vehicles). The police accident report takes into account infrastructural problems only if they are contributory factors to the crash. They do include the road condition, defects, but there is a quality problem in these reports because it is the policeman who decides and judges the situation.

(UK) D5: Research

**Respondent:**
Catriona Henderson Road User Licencing, Insurance and Safety
Previous research done
UK is currently studying young drivers.

Need for research at EU level
Research would be the only area for EU action.
  – Young drivers

In-depth study
In-depth study was done in the UK in 2008.

(UK) D6: Traffic management and ITS

Respondent:
Catriona Henderson Road User Licensing, Insurance and Safety

It is a local decision to allow PTWs to use bus lanes.

(UK) D7: Awareness campaigns

Respondent:
Tim Lennon Department for Transport
Victoria Judd Department for Transport; Marketing Campaigns Manager

Campaigns on PTW safety
The Think! Campaign is an umbrella campaign conducted for many years now in the UK. Within it, the THINK BIKER campaign is dedicated to PTW safety.

A new campaign on motorcycles was launched in September 2014. Essentially, this year’s motorcycling campaign is aimed at drivers and riders. There were ‘Didn’t See’ adverts aimed at reminding drivers to take longer to look for bikes. These were broadcast on national radio between 21 July and 17 August.

The aim of the new campaign is to increase riders’ knowledge and their use of defensive riding skills and to encourage them to take further training.
The campaigns are made with a comparison with police to check for problematic behaviour. It works for cars, and now there is a department and special program for PTWs aimed at changing problematic and minor behaviour.

**Other campaigns**

British authorities are aware of campaigns run by other governments, but it is not necessarily relevant to copy other countries’ awareness campaigns because of the cultural gap. Something which works in Sweden won’t necessarily work in the UK.

Motorcycle organisations do lobbying mostly and not necessarily awareness campaigns.

**(UK) D8: National strategies**

**Respondent:**
Catriona Henderson Road User Licensing, Insurance and Safety

**Key measures of the NS/AP**

It is unlikely that Government will renew its 2004 Motorcycling Strategy. However, the MCIA (The Motorcycle Industry Association) is thinking about a strategy at present and the road safety department is involved in that work. Stakeholders will be able to bring in their own input, and maybe they will be able to touch more areas and users, because it will be done in collaboration with the MC community. MCIA will integrate PTWs but not really mainstream them.

**Need for EU action**

No action should be taken at EU level on this subject, or on any other subject apart from research.

The only thing would be a worldwide measure for headlights for example.