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**How should the Levy be spent?**

The Levy should be spent in a way that results in the maximum possible improvements in rider safety. The following issues were considered in determining the types of measures that should be funded and how much funding they should receive:

* The size of the rider safety issue addressed by the measure
* How much effect the measure would have on the issue
* How long the effect would last
* How confident we are about the estimated size of the effect
* The cost of the measure
* The acceptability of the measure to riders, other road users and road safety agencies
* The likelihood that the measure would be funded from other sources

Thus, a measure that has been proven to produce major, lasting reductions in large rider safety issues for relatively low cost should be accorded highest priority.

Table 1 summarises the type of measures that are suitable for Levy. For some types of measures, funding of implementation is recommended. For most measures, it is recommended that funding should be directed to R&D or evaluation. This is recommended where the measure has potential for success but needs further development (including trials, pilot schemes or demonstration projects) or where funding for implementation could or should be provided from other sources.

In Table 1, the amount of funding to be allocated to particular types of measures is categorised as Small (less than 1% of the Levy), Medium (1% to 9% of the Levy) or Large (10% or more of the Levy). The percentages of funding were allocated to types of measures according to how much expenditure it was considered that would be needed to undertake the measure and how likely it was that the measure would lead to significant improvements in the safety of riders.

Thus, the S, M and L recommendations in the Table relate to allocation of expenditure, rather than directly to the priorities that each type of measure should have.

**Estimating the benefits to rider safety**

These guidelines set out to select the types of programs that are likely to have the greatest benefits in improving rider safety, but there are no guarantees that individual programs will indeed be successful. The road-based programs have less risk of poor return on investment (since we know they work for other road users), but some of the other programs should be seen as more speculative investments in solving difficult problems.

The guide proposes that the Levy funds be spent on a mixture of research and development, implementation and evaluation. It is easier to measure the benefits of implementing programs than the benefits of research and development, and evaluation. Nevertheless, research and development is needed to ensure that the best programs are implemented and evaluation is needed to judge what worked and what did not in order to guide future expenditure.

In conclusion, the Levy provides an opportunity to fund programs that will result in real gains in rider safety. This document provides guidelines for maximising the value of this dedicated funding for motorcycle safety.

**Table 1. Recommended allocation of Levy funding.**

**S=<1%, M=1-9%, L=10%+ of total annual funding of about $6millon.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Type of measure | **Main issue addressed** | **R&D, Trials** | **Implementation** | **Evaluation** |  |
| Education | | | | | |
| Improving rider hazard perception and responding | Inexperience or lack of recent experience | M | M (if R&D completed) | S (if implemented) |  |
| Improving resources for novice riders | Inexperience or lack of recent experience | M | L | S |  |
| Improving the effectiveness of protective gear | Vulnerability to injury | M | M | S |  |
| Improving driver awareness of motorcycles | Intersection crashes,  Failure to see motorcycles | M | M |  |  |
| Engineering, technology and ITS | | | | | |
| Improved vehicle safety of motorcycles | Various | M | M |  |  |
| Treat motorcycle run-off-road blackspots | Run-off-road crashes | S | L | S |  |
| Treat motorcycle blackspots (not run-off-road) | Intersection crashes | S | L | S |  |
| Treat selected motorcycle routes | Road surface and environmental hazards | S | L | S |  |
| Reducing injuries at barriers and road/roadside hazards | Vulnerability to injury | S | L | S |  |
| Improved technology and assessing emerging technology | Various | L | S | S |  |
| Enforcement | | | | | |
| Improved detection of offenders | Unlicensed riding | M | L | S |  |
| Enforcement (cars and motorcyclists) at motorcycle blackspots | Vulnerability to injury | S |  | S |  |
| Improved enforcement of drink riding | Run-off-road crashes | S |  | S |  |
| Enhanced information for decision making | | | | | |
| Review of information availability and needs | Information Strategy | S | M |  |  |
| Better information about on-road and off-road motorcycle crashes | Under-reporting and biases in motorcycle crash statistics | M | M |  |  |
| Characteristics of good riders | Various | S |  | M |  |
| Speed and speeding in motorcycle crashes | The role of speed and speeding | M |  |  |  |
| Injuries in off-road motorcycling | The safety of off-road riding | S | S |  |  |