

We have deliberately refrained from the implementation of this subject in the driving simulation. Although it would be technically possible to simulate a virtual fleeing vehicle of the fugitive the danger of a “navigation motivation” had to be considered. The trainees would frequently try not to lose the fugitive vehicle from their field of vision, and therefore act contrary to public safety, which has to have priority over catching the fugitive.

### 3.2 Crew Management

This integrated practical training is performed in real traffic outside the Police stations and is intended to foster the teamwork of driver and co-driver in order to sensitize as a central criterion the efficiency for Urgent Duty Missions. Central in this is the efficient sharing out of the tasks in the mission vehicle and the reactions to stress situations.

Particularly the orderly procedure of the radio traffic with the Police Centre, mutual support to discover the approach route, recognition of dangers, and error-free handling of street directories and maps, as well as agreement for the tactical approach method to resolve the conflict at the destination of the mission is trained here.

### 4. Detention in real Traffic

The exercises also have to be carried out in real traffic. Central to these exercises to be passed under the theme “The vehicle as mission tool” is the most unlike variations of methods of detention in the public traffic arena.

The following topics are acted through:

- The nature of specific driving environment dangers in towns, highways and motor ways;
- The safe approach and unambiguous directing to suitable locations of the person to be detained;

- Competent actions in connection with uncertain or wrong reactions of the other traffic participants.

The instructor conducts a discussion after each exercise.

### Experiences

Since commencement more than 2,800 young Police officers have undergone this training. The acceptance of the separate training modules is very high among the officers taught. This particularly applies to the training equipment - the driving simulator. After a short acclimatization phase the training officers hardly notice any difference between virtual and real traffic environments.

The performance of the CBT segments is equally appreciated. The officers-in-training generally handle the Computer Based Training well and feel motivated because of the management of the “computer” medium. Effective transfer of things learned into practical use is generally assured.

In summary the evaluation of results demonstrates that officers using the modular simulator-supported training concept obtain the necessary engagement competencies in order to accomplish real Urgent duty Missions in a professional and safe manner. By offering the only safe option to portray relevant danger situations, simulation presents a unique opportunity to teach safe driver training strategies while excluding all types of risk.

Judging by requests, not only from Police Departments, but particularly also from Urgent Duty Services and Fire Brigades, there is a vast potential for training requirements using the system described above. As an integrated concept the simulator-supported driver training by the Bavarian Urgent Duty Police is unique, because it is far more extensive than pure simulator driving.

Translation by Max R. Pallavicini  
ALP Risk Management  
Canberra ACT, Australia

## Policies of the Australasian College of Road Safety

By Ken Smith, Fellow ACRS

Have you ever looked at the policy page on the ACRS website? ACRS policy statements were created for two reasons: to have a reasoned statement on where the ACRS stands on different road safety issues and problem areas, and to provide a resource for ACRS members when needed for media statements, response to questions and the like.

Each policy statement is made up of the policy position statement itself, a short statement of the objective/s that implementation of the policy would achieve, and a discussion providing background and reasoning behind the policy position being adopted. There is usually also a list of references to substantiate the points being made and provide a source for further information.

It has been the practice for the National Executive to review policy statements to see whether new or updated statements are

needed, or to respond to an emerging need. If so a new or updated statement is written, reviewed by the Executive or in cases an 'expert' in the field co-opted by the policy committee, and submitted to members for consideration and adoption amongst the papers sent to members for the AGM. Because of the complexity of issues and the time available before the AGM it is usually not possible for members to seek amendment to policies - they have to be accepted or rejected by members voting at the AGM. On occasion, however when there has been an objection to a proposed policy statement it has been further considered, modified or withdrawn altogether.

There are now some 24 policy statements in four groups. It has not been possible to review them every year, and some it must be admitted are very much in need of updating. The ACRS National Executive at a recent meeting decided that policy

statements would be reviewed in a more systematic way, with a more formal process of examining in turn the ones in need of updating, and seeking the assistance of experts in the fields covered by each. Hopefully all the experts we need can be found in the ranks of ACRS members, but we will go wherever we need to find the expertise.

In 2006 the National Executive policy committee is made up of Dr Barry Watson, Chair

Dr Raphael Grzebieta

David Healy

Anne Harris

Ken Smith (assisting)

We propose a series of articles in succeeding issues of the Journal presenting one or more of the policy statements and discussing or presenting more background information about them. Where necessary we will seek comment on them, but we will be happy to have your views in any case. We begin the series this issue with two policy statements.

## Carriage of Driver's Licence

### ACRS Policy Position

All drivers should be required to carry a valid driver's licence and produce it on demand.

Producing a driver's licence on demand should be a primary enforcement measure, ie Police may ask a driver to show a licence without any other infringement having first been committed.

### Objective

To enhance effectiveness of provisional licence restrictions and licence suspension, and disqualification penalties.

### Discussion

At present most jurisdictions except NSW give a period of grace in which to produce a driver's licence. This gives scope for circumventing such requirements as provisional or probationary licence restrictions and licence suspension.

In the case of suspension or disqualification, the penalty is intended to maintain respect for and effectiveness of socially approved sanctions for breaches of licence conditions.

If restrictions and penalties are able to be easily circumvented by non-production of a driver's licence, they lose their force. The effectiveness of sanctions can only be maintained if drivers can be sure that they are likely to be asked to produce a photographic driver's licence on the spot with no option to produce it later.

It is suggested that there is a need for measures to identify persons who produce a licence that has been suspended or cancelled, to eliminate evasion by this means. Technological means such as 'smart' licences with embedded chips that can be read and status determined instantly would be a means to this end.

## Comment

This position is still valid and still needed. The reasons for requiring compulsory carriage of a driver's licence are just as valid as when the policy statement was written. To these reasons might be added another one: that serious and habitual criminal offenders are often also unlicensed, and if compulsory licence carriage were a universal requirement then it is possible that some of these might be apprehended in licence checks, whether under a requirement to produce on demand or in licence checks at random breath tests (see Watson, reference tba).

In passing, even in NSW where production of a licence on demand is mandatory, requiring the licence to be produced in random breath tests is not universal. This should be reinstated.

Queensland Transport has produced a proposal for a 'smart' driver's licence [reference tba].

It has been noted recently that in NSW suspension of the driver's licence is among the penalties for some offences having nothing to do with vehicle use, such as non payment of fines for failing to vote at a local government election. Whether this practice has also been adopted in other jurisdictions is unknown. This is iniquitous and should be protested against very strongly.

## Enforcement and Penalties

### ACRS Policy Position

ACRS supports enforcement measures that:

- enhance respect for road law
- emphasise certainty of detection and punishment
- demonstrably have the safety of road users as a primary concern, and by corollary reject implications of revenue raising.

Compulsory carriage of a driver's licence is an essential component of enforcement and a deterrent to unlicensed driving.

Penalties for traffic infringements should be sufficient to act as an effective deterrent, appropriate to the offence and applied rigorously.

Revenues from traffic fines should be directed to enhancement of safety.

### Objective

To support effective, equitable enforcement of road law.

### Discussion

Enforcement is a critical component of maintaining order and safety in road traffic, and public respect for and compliance with road law. The weight of enforcement should be directed to behaviours and locations that are known crash problems.

The ACRS policy position follows the basic principles of effective deterrence and application of penalties when infringements are detected.

A brief statement of these principles is:

- Enforcement should in general involve a visible Police presence (this does not prevent random techniques or operations), and be carried out in a fair manner
- Enforcement should emphasise certainty of detection and apprehension before severity of penalty
- Enforcement should be seen to be rational and to have a safety objective. Accusations of revenue raising, whether justified or not, reduce respect for the law.

Enforcement of road law should have a preventative function. Enforcement practices such as those outlined should be aimed as much at preventing infringements as detecting them.

Appropriate measures can include information and education, speedometer checks and messages, warnings, and a high level of visible police presence on the roads.

Penalties for traffic offences need to be sufficient to be an effective deterrent against offending, but should be appropriate to the safety implications of the offence and provide for a mix of administrative and court-imposed sanctions. Severity of penalty should not be substituted for certainty of detection: there is little sense in applying a very severe penalty as a deterrent if the perceived probability of detection is so low as to make the likelihood of incurring the penalty negligible.

Some principles are:

- There should be reasonable certainty that penalties for infringements will be imposed, and will be not easily escapable
- Penalties should be imposed as soon as possible after the infringement is detected, especially in the case of camera offences where the infringement is notified some time after the offence
- The severity and scale of penalties should be appropriate to the offence, and should provide a range of financial, licence and custodial or community service sanctions
- There may be case for scaled penalties that include official cautions and warnings that refer directly to the safety issue.

Licence removal should be used sparingly and for serious offences, and should carry with it a real threat of detection of unlicensed driving. Therefore, one component of enforcement policies should be compulsory carriage of the driver's licence.

A frequent public concern is that enforcement and traffic fines are perceived as 'revenue raising'. This should be avoided by ensuring that enforcement is carried out in a fair manner and towards behaviours, and in locations that are recognised safety problems. The proceeds of traffic fines should not go into general State revenues, but should preferably be applied to road safety improvement. This could take the form of 'black spot' removal, public education and information campaigns, or road safety research.

## Comment

This policy statement probably also requires little modification. However it glosses over one point on which there is some debate: covert detection of offences as against visible police presence, particularly with respect to speed offences. Arguably, covert detection using speed cameras deters speeding because road users do not know where or when they might be under surveillance and likely to be caught, and therefore in theory, always drive within the law. This requires fairly heavy and continuing publicity to ensure that road users remain aware of the possibility of being caught anywhere, any time.

On the other hand, if the speed camera unit is operating covertly and not seen, and drivers do not know they have been caught, they do not modify their behaviour as they do on seeing a police or speed camera vehicle. It is entirely possible under these circumstances to lose one's licence in an afternoon without knowing and without the chance to modify one's behaviour. The deterrent effect is lessened if the punishment for the offence is not directly linked in place and time with the offence. There is also an element of procedural fairness.

This debate is probably not over. The ACRS policy statement leans towards a visible police presence and on-the-spot enforcement – combined, of course, with checking the driver's licence.

Ken Smith, FACRS