**National Observer Assessment - Motorcycle - Part Referral**

For this assessment G was given the scenario of an associate who needed guidance in respect of system application and rural roads.

Eyesight test, disclaimer and ride protocols covered. G has very good communication skills and a pleasant style and attitude which would put an associate at ease.

Knowledge checks of POWDER and IPSGA carried out using questions and answers

The aim of the session was covered and there was clear evidence of a planned session including the route which was predominately rural areas.

G has very good communication skills and did review the previous sessions. However he does need to consider the associates needs, concerns and expectations. You have your agenda for the session – the associate will have their own personal agenda. If you explore these not only will it allow you to tailor the session to suit and give you an insight into any possible developmental areas but also provides a measuring tool to check learning at the end of the session.

During this session the riding faults were incorrect system application (gears before speed with sequential changes), no rear brake use, inappropriate positioning (consistently riding in middle of the road space) and cornering problems relating to the system fault and not having knowledge of limit point. The route selected was ideal for the subject matter.

G quite correctly introduced a mid ride stop where he did discuss use of gears but only in as much as me being in too high a gear which was causing unnecessary brake application. He quite correctly mentioned the safe riding rule and limit point of vision. Despite offering him a lead he failed to grasp that we needed to discuss the limit point in relation to cornering.

At the subsequent end of session debrief G gave a good explanation relating to positioning both on bends and when dealing with other hazards. Unfortunately he didn’t deal with the basic system fault of gears before speed or identify the braking error.

G’s following position was always safe but on occasions he was too far back which prevented him identifying the cornering issue. This will prevent identification of certain riding faults such as deceleration through the bend usually caused by limit point analysis problems or a system fault of gears before speed.

G gave a competent demonstration ride which was at a good pace with overtaking being demonstrated. There were occasions of a system fault of gear before speed and we discussed how this can impact on your overtake position and planning and general hazard management.

Unfortunately, on this occasion G was unable to demonstrate the competencies of a National Observer due to the areas highlighted in the competency criteria.

I would suggest that G develops the areas identified and then re-applies so we can assess the following competencies identified in the final report matrix:

4.1.1

4.2.1

4.2.2

4.3.1

4.3.2

Additionally 4.3.3 Development plan to resolve issues – unable to evidence due non identification of primary development areas

To summarise G has been successful in relation to the demonstration ride but needs to be reassessed at the “observer “competencies. By developing the areas highlighted he will I am sure be able to fulfil all the requirements of a National Observer.