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Executive Summary

Introduction

This paper reports on the Phase 2 (Data Gathering Stage) of the New Zealand Youth Traffic Offences and Traffic Offending project and follows on from Phase 1. This stage of the project is being carried out by Researching Impaired Driving in New Zealand (RIDNZ). The project is funded by the Automobile Association Research Foundation (AARF) and has a Stakeholder Reference Group consisting of:

- New Zealand Police
- Ministry of Justice
- Ministry of Transport
- New Zealand Transport Agency
- Department Of Corrections
- Department of Collections

Aims and Objectives of Overall Project

Identify effective interventions that reduce re-offending and produce compliant drivers, to improve road safety, crime-related and social outcomes, and reduce re-offending costs on the enforcement and criminal justice systems. The project also seeks to answer the questions:

1. Is traffic offending a leading path (if the term path is used as a first appearance at Court) into the criminal justice system for young New Zealanders?
2. Are there more effective interventions than standard penalties at reducing re-offending and improving road safety outcomes?

Aims and Objectives Data Gathering Phase 2

The Phase 1 Stakeholder Reference Group endorsed that Phase 2 should focus on:

- GDLS breaches
- Unlicensed driving
- Drink and Drug driving

The Phase 1 Reference Group unanimously agreed that the priority for the next phase of research was to gather more detail (number, demographics, location and offence types) to better understand factors underlying Driver Licence and Drink and Drug driving offending. The further research was also endorsed by the Phase 1 peer reviewer who also suggested that the further research be broken down by individual years to take into account the legislative changes referred to in the Phase 1 paper (eg driving age, driving test requirements and youth zero BAC).
Methodology

Phase 2 Data Gathering is a high-level scan of existing information and readily accessible data systems. To ensure that we completed the data scan phase of the project on time, and after consultation with the Reference Group, we narrowed down the information to:

- youth (aged 14-19)
- GDLS breaches, Unlicensed and Drink-driving offences
- calendar years 2009-2014
- Police districts and national data

Data sources were limited to:

**Driver Licence Register** (DLR)
**National Intelligence Application** (NIA)
**Police Infringement Processing System** (PIPS)
**Ministry of Justice ‘Case Management System’** (CMS)
**Ministry of Justice ‘Collections’ unit data base**
**Census Data**

These data sources were used to establish baseline data on offending and re-offending patterns that include:

- Number of Police offences (for offences covered by this phase of the project)
- GDLS breach data including offence type information (Curfew, Unsupervised etc). This information is further broken down by Police Outcomes and includes the use of compliance
- Re-offending follow up for Unlicensed as well as Drink driving
- Collections data on all offence infringements referred to Collections in 2009 and followed up until 2014 by outcome. The data will include outcomes of those Drink and Drug Driving infringements referred to Collections in 2012
- Census data on populations of 15-19 year olds by Police district
- NZTA data on recorded licensed youth drivers
- All the data is broken down by NZ Police districts and nationally
- The offence information is also broken down by individual age groups 14-19 years of age as well as by gender and calendar years 2009-2014 and includes any ethnicity data available
- Police detections and data on infringements/ referral to court for prosecution or all other Police outcomes of these traffic offences
- Ministry of Justice (MoJ) reoffending data on those referred to Court for prosecution for Unlicensed and Drink and Drug driving

All the collated data was returned to the source agencies where it was analysed for accuracy. The data was compiled into draft reports and these were discussed and refined by the researchers and the Reference Group. From these draft reports recommendations for further research were added to the report as were the limitations in the data provided. This stage of the project proposes to draw no conclusions or hypotheses regarding the data but is to be used to identify priority areas and to inform on recommendations for further study. Whilst the paper does contain Individual age groupings, gender
and ethnicity information the main purpose of the paper is to identify priority offence types and districts, to assist in prioritising and designing interventions and provide base data for researchers.
Information Sharing and Data Limitations

As with Phase 1 of this project the engagement and cooperation of the government agencies and departments involved in this project was vital. Without the oversight and input of the Reference Group this comprehensive review of the relevant data on youth traffic offending and offenders in New Zealand over the period 2009-2014 would not have been possible.

The expertise and knowledge of the analysts involved from all the agencies was also vital in identifying the most relevant datasets that would provide the most useful information. Anomalies in the data were resolved by these analysts. A specific recommendation from this report is that scheduling regular meetings of these analysts, to identify where different agencies may be able to data share more effectively, would be of great benefit.

While there were no major barriers to the identification of datasets and access to data, the key observed limitations to the data reviewed were as follows.

- The data from the NZ Police informed on offences and not offenders. Data on repeat offences of GDLS Breach infringements was not available. The NZ Police are currently unable to link these offences to offenders to record repeat offences. It may be worthwhile for future researchers to explore the possibility of tracking repeat offending for offences incurring demerit points (eg GDLS breaches), through the NZTA driver licence database, which accumulates demerit points by offender. This was not explored due to time, cost and the perceived difficulty of interrogating this complex database.
- Compliance figures do not record the total use of compliance, only those with positive outcomes. Those who do not comply are simply passed on to be dealt with through the usual system. The use of Police Compliance was not recorded on the police databases as an outcome until 2010. Barriers to uptake of compliance (and cost savings of increasing uptake) is a subject recommended for future research.
- The NZ Police does not gather any data on ethnicity at offence detection for traffic infringement offences and the NZTA does not hold ethnicity data on the licensed driving population.

Key Findings

- Total national youth traffic offences have decreased by 38.2% from 2009-2014
- The total youth driver population has decreased by 28.2% from 2009-2014
- Males accounted for 52.7% of the youth licensed driving population from 2009-2014. Males accounted for 71.8% of the traffic offences researched for this paper, where the gender could be identified
- Drink and Drug driving has decreased significantly; 62.3% from 2009-2014 as has repeat Drink and Drug driving offending; 84.9% from 2009-2014
- From 2009-2014 90% of all ‘Drove Without Appropriate Driver Licence’ offences, that resulted in an infringement fee, were referred to Court unpaid.
- Across all the Police districts the highest number of Learner driver offences were: ‘Learner Driver Unaccompanied’ and ‘Learner licensee failed to display an "L" plate’
• The national average percentage of GDLS ‘Learner’ offences, when expressed as a percentage of the total number of traffic offences, has increased by 69%
• From 2009-2014, 79.3% of all GDLS ‘Learner’ offences, that resulted in an infringement fee, were referred to Court unpaid
• The national average of fines referred to Court unpaid for GDLS ‘Learner’ offences has decreased by 18.7% from 2009-2014
• Across all the Police districts the highest number of Restricted driver offences were: ‘Restricted Driver Carries Unauthorised Passenger’ and ‘Restricted Driver Unaccompanied Between 10pm And 5am’
• The national average percentage of GDLS ‘Restricted’ offences, when expressed as a percentage of the total number of traffic offences, has decreased by 4.8% from 2009-2014
• From 2009-2014, 57.2% of all GDLS ‘Restricted’ offences, that resulted in an infringement fee, were referred to Court unpaid.
• The national average of fines referred to Court unpaid for GDLS ‘Restricted’ offences has decreased by 37.4% from 2009-2014
• As the age increases in the data so do the number of offences, though 18 year olds account for the majority of ‘Restricted Driver Unaccompanied Between 10pm And 5am’ offences and Learner and Restricted Driver ‘Other’ offences. ‘Restricted Driver Carries Unauthorised Passenger’ offences peak at 17 year olds and decline as the age increases
• By 2014 62.8% of the fines referred to Collections for ‘Drove Without Appropriate Driver Licence’ offences, in 2009, had been paid
• By 2014 49.3% of the fines referred to Collections for GDLS ‘Learner’ offences, in 2009, had been paid
• By 2014 61.5% of the fines referred to Collections for GDLS ‘Restricted’ offences, in 2009, had been paid
• The total national amount of monetary fines imposed for collection for all the GDLS and Unlicensed driving infringement offence fines referred to Collections in 2009 was $18,897,072. By 2014, $7,680,946 of the fines referred to Collections in 2009 were remitted. Of the total amount of monies remitted 59.1% were replaced with Community Work
• The total national amount of monetary fines imposed for collection for all the Drink Driving infringement offence fines referred to Collections in 2012 was $137,693. By 2014, $16,606 of the fines referred to Collections, in 2012, were remitted. Of the total amount of monies remitted 55.1% were replaced with Community Work
• Police are currently unable to link infringement offences and offenders
• The Police districts; Bay Of Plenty and Eastern appear most frequently in districts that are above the national average offence percentages
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Introduction

This paper reports on the Phase 2 (Data Gathering Stage) of the New Zealand Youth Traffic Offences, Traffic Offending project and follows on from Phase 1. This stage of the project is being carried out by Researching Impaired Driving in New Zealand (RIDNZ). The project is funded by the Automobile Association Research Foundation (AARF) and has a Stakeholder Reference Group consisting of:

- New Zealand Police
- Ministry of Justice
- Ministry of Transport
- New Zealand Transport Agency
- Department Of Corrections
- Department of Collections

Aims and Objectives of Overall Project

Identify effective interventions that reduce re-offending and produce compliant drivers, to improve road safety, crime-related and social outcomes, and reduce re-offending costs on the enforcement and criminal justice systems.

At its meeting on 17 August 2014 the AA Research Foundation (AARF) asked:

- Is traffic offending a leading path (If the term path is used as a first appearance at Court) into the criminal justice system for young New Zealanders?
- Are there more effective interventions than standard penalties at reducing re-offending and improving road safety outcomes?

To answer these questions, AARF approved funding for a Phase 1 ‘Data Gathering’ component of the project to investigate youth traffic offences and traffic offending in New Zealand.

The involvement of government organisations are a key element to the overall success of the project as a whole. The project aims to develop the involvement of government and non-government organisations in the project. The project aims to share the information gathered to a wide spectrum of stakeholders involved in youth traffic offending in New Zealand and to involve the international community regarding matters pertinent to the project. The project aims to provide detailed information on youth traffic offending and offences in New Zealand so that policy makers can be better informed when making decisions regarding these matters.

Phase 1 identified, among other key findings, the top three priority issues for youth (aged 14-19) from 2009-2013 were:

- **Graduated Driver Licence System (GDLS) breaches** account for 72% of all youth High Risk Driving infringement offences, and 27% of all youth traffic infringement offences; 73% of GDLS breach infringement offences were referred to Court unpaid.
- **Unlicensed Driving** was the second highest High Risk Driving infringement offence with over 60,000 offences.
• **Drink Driving** was 54% of first time (and 53% of total) youth traffic Court offences.

### Aims and Objectives Data Gathering Phase 2

The Phase 1 Stakeholder Reference Group endorsed that Phase 2 should focus on:
- GDLS breaches
- Unlicensed driving
- Drink and Drug driving

The Phase 1 Reference Group unanimously agreed that the priority for the next phase of research was to gather more detail (number, demographics, location and offence types) to better understand factors underlying Driver Licence and Drink and Drug driving offending. The further research was also endorsed by the Phase 1 peer reviewer who also suggested that the further research be broken down by individual years to take into account the legislative changes referred to in the Phase 1 paper (eg driving age, driving test requirements and youth zero BAC).

### Methodology

Phase 2 Data Gathering is a high-level scan of existing information and readily accessible data systems. To ensure that we completed the data scan phase of the project on time, and after consultation with the Reference Group, we narrowed down the information to:

- youth (aged 14-19)
- GDLS breaches, Unlicensed and Drink and Drug driving offences
- calendar years 2009-2014
- Police Districts and national data

#### GDLS breaches
- Age
- Gender
- District
- Offence Type (curfew, carrying passengers, unsupervised driving)

#### Unlicensed Driving - Drink and Drug Driving
- Age
- Gender
- District

Data sources were limited to:
- **Driver Licence Register** (DLR)
- **National Intelligence Application** (NIA)
- **Police Infringement Processing System** (PIPS)
- **Ministry of Justice ‘Case Management System’** (CMS)
- Ministry of Justice ‘Collections’ unit data base
- Census Data
These data sources were used to establish baseline data on offences/offending that include:

- Number of Police offences (for offences covered by this phase of the project)
- GDLs breach data including offence type information (Curfew, Unsupervised etc). This information is further broken down by Police Outcomes and includes the use of compliance
- Re-offending follow up for Unlicensed as well as Drink driving
- Collections data on all offence infringements referred to Collections in 2009 and followed up until 2014 by outcome. The data will include outcomes of those Drink and Drug Driving infringements referred to Collections in 2012
- Census data on populations of 15-19 year olds by Police district
- NZTA data on recorded licensed youth drivers
- All the data is broken down by NZ Police districts and nationally
- The offence information is also broken down by individual age groups 14-19 years of age as well as by gender and calendar years 2009-2014 and includes any ethnicity data available
- Police detections and data on infringements/ referral to court for prosecution or all other Police outcomes of these traffic offences
- Ministry of Justice (MoJ) reoffending data on those referred to Court for prosecution for Unlicensed and Drink and Drug driving

All the collated data was returned to the source agencies where it was analysed for accuracy.

The data was compiled into draft reports and these were discussed and refined by the researchers and the Reference Group. From these draft reports recommendations for further research were added to the report as were the limitations in the data provided.

This stage of the project proposes to draw no conclusions or hypotheses regarding the data but is to be used to identify priority areas and to inform on recommendations for further study. Whilst the paper does contain Individual age groupings, gender and ethnicity information the main purpose of the paper is to identify priority offence types and districts.

Working with the Reference Group and data analysts within the NZ Police, Ministry of Justice and NZTA, available and relevant data was identified. Data sets were formulated into workbooks for detailed analysis and compilation into tables and figures.

**Legislative Changes**

There were two major changes to legislation in the years being reviewed and these changes need to be recognised and their impact on interpretation of trends over time should be explicitly noted in consideration of all of the relevant tables and comments.

**Licence Age**

Firstly, the Learner licence age was raised from 15 to 16 years of age, in August 2011. This effectively means that there is a meaningful drop in numbers of persons licensed later than 2010 particularly in the 15-19 age bracket under study. In addition to the increased licence age in August 2011, a strengthened restricted licence practical test was introduced in February 2012.
Zero youth alcohol limit
Secondly legislation was introduced in August 2011 related to zero alcohol levels for young drivers (under 20 years of age).

It is important to recognise and take into account these legislative changes in 2011 and 2012 when reviewing all the data contained within this paper.
Information on Data

The information contained in this paper refers to youth (ages 14-19) unless otherwise stated, for example 15-19 year olds. All the following information has been broken down by Police districts, except in the national data section. These districts can be observed in Figure below.

*Figure 1: New Zealand Police Districts*
This paper separates the Police Districts and reports on the number of offences for the three offences covered by this paper. This paper also reports on Police outcomes, Court outcomes and Re-offending data. Collections data on all fines referred to collections for Police infringements in 2009 is also followed through, by outcome, to 2014, for Unlicensed and GDLS breach offences and from 2012\(^1\) through to 2014 for Drink Driving offences. Gender information for the three offences is also provided and ethnicity data on those offences requiring a Court outcome.

The information contained in this section relates to offences and not offenders it may be that several offences were committed by an individual offender. For more information see ‘Information Sharing and Data Limitations’ (Page, 68).

**Offences**

This paper covers three offence categories

**Unlicensed Driving**

The category of Unlicensed driving can be further broken down by two offences:

- Drove without appropriate driver licence (L144 offence code; possible infringement offence)
- Unlicensed Driver Failed To Comply With Prohibition (B184 offence code; Court offence). This offence is for all Unlicensed drivers, who having been ticketed previously for Unlicensed driving (L144), are forbidden from driving until they have obtained a licence. When they are caught again, they are charged with this offence, B184, instead of L144. This offence is dealt with by a Charging Document, not an Infringement Offence Notice (ION)\(^2\), and the vehicle they were driving would be impounded.

**Graduated Driver Licence System (GDLS) Breaches**

The Graduated Driver Licence System (GDLS) was introduced in 1987 to manage the exposure to crash risk of novice drivers as they learn to drive. Learner drivers are required to be accompanied by a supervisor at all times. A supervisor must have held a full car licence for at least 2 years; sit in the front passenger seat (with limited exceptions); and be fit to drive (e.g. not over the alcohol limit). Restricted licence drivers may not carry passengers (with limited exceptions) or drive at night (10pm-5am) without a supervisor. For drivers under age 25 there are mandatory minimum time periods that must be served before a novice driver can apply to move to the next stage of the GDLS:

- 6 months for learner licences, and
- 18 months (or 12 months on completion of an approved course) for restricted licences.

These restrictions provide for novice drivers to acquire skills and experience under lower risk conditions before advancing to the next stage of the system. It is intended that drivers progress through the GDLS  

\(^1\) The infringement offence for Drink Driving was introduced in August 2011. 2012 has been chosen as a starting point for measuring Collections outcomes to give a full years data.

to a full drivers licence. The aim is for drivers to do so in a graduated manner, demonstrating they have both the skills and the competence to drive safely under particular conditions. The required levels of supervision and restrictions reduce at each of the three stages in the licensing process until drivers have both the skills and the knowledge to drive safely and independently. The GDLS system is credited with producing a significant drop in crashes, injuries and deaths.

A challenge to GDLS system integrity is produced when novice drivers drive outside the restrictions of licences. Surveys have consistently shown a willingness of novice drivers to breach the GDLS conditions.\(^3\) While learner drivers have a low crash risk the high crash risk period during the restricted licence stage justifies a particular focus on restricted licence holders. In addition to the increased licence age in August 2011, a strengthened restricted licence practical test was introduced in February 2012.

GDLS breach offences can be divided into two categories:

- **Learner offences**
- **Restricted offences**

The category of Learner offences can be further broken down by two of the most numerous offences and an ‘Other’ category that covers all other learner offences. The two main offences are:

- Learner Driver Unaccompanied
- Learner licensee failed to display an "L" plate\(^4\)

The category of Restricted offences can be further broken down by two of the most numerous offences and an ‘Other’ category that covers all other Restricted offences. The two main offences are:

- Restricted Driver Carries Unauthorised Passenger
- Restricted Driver Unaccompanied Between 10pm And 5am

**Drink and Drug Driving**

Before August 2011 the youth limit (drivers under 20 years of age) was: Blood Alcohol Concentration (BAC) 0.03 (30 milligrams of alcohol per 100 millilitres of blood) and Youth Drink Driving penalties were by definition Court sentences. From August 2011, the youth alcohol limit was set at Zero, with 0 - 0.03 BAC attracting an administrative sanction (fines and demerits).\(^5\) All of the offence categories for Drink and Drug driving contained in this paper would require a Court appearance excepting the previously mentioned infringement offences. No detailed information has been provided on the different Drink and Drug driving offence categories.

---


\(^4\) In New Zealand if you are a learner driver you must display L (learner) plates on the vehicle at all times when you are driving.

Offences relating strictly to Drug Driving are:

- Driving Under The Influence Of A Drug
- Drove Impaired - Blood contained evidence of the use of a qualifying drug
- Drove with blood containing evidence of use of controlled drug
- Drove impaired - blood contained evidence of qualifying drug - 3rd or sub
- In charge - blood contained evidence of controlled drug - caused injury

There were a total of 213 offences recorded for these offences for all districts and all ages 2009-2014. This equates to 0.6% of the total (33709) national Drink and Drug driving offences.

Census Data

The Census data provides the estimated resident population of youth (15-19) and gender for Police districts. Ethnicity data is provided on estimated resident population of youth (15-19). The ethnicity descriptions were prioritised6 by:

- Maori
- Pacific
- Other

Police Data

The data contained in this section has been retrieved from the Police Infringement Processing System (PIPS) and the National Intelligence Application (NIA). The workbooks formed from these databases give the breakdown of youth and adult infringements and offences for the years 2009-2014 also broken down by the type of resolution.

Information Included

All infringements and offences for:

- GDLS Breaches
- Unlicensed Driving
- Drink and Drug Driving
- Total Youth Traffic Offences

The data covers offences and not offenders. Data covers Youth (14-19) offences by Police district, by age, and by gender, the GDLS Breach data excludes stage 2&3 accelerated licence offences. The total offences Data excludes pedestrian and bicycle offences.

The NZ Police also supplied Youth licensed driving population estimates by Police district based on data supplied by the New Zealand Transport Agency.7

---

6 This prioritisation is the same used for the Court outcome ethnicity data.
7 These numbers differ slightly from the NZTA LDP data used in the National section of this paper as the Police LDP data includes all classes of licence holder. This difference is 0.6% on average or, on average, 946 extra licensed
GDLS ‘Double’ Infringement Data
This refers to offenders receiving more than one infringement offence at detection. For example a driver not displaying an ‘L’ plate and driving unsupervised could receive two infringement offences at one detection. Though this data is not included in the paper it is referred to in the ‘Information Sharing and Data Limitations’ section.

Referral of fees to Ministry of Justice (Collections)
The monetary penalty recorded on an infringement notice is referred to as an 'infringement fee'. If the infringement fee is not paid in full by the due date, it is referred to the Ministry of Justice for enforcement of a ‘fine’. This is at the 71 days after the notice i.e. 56 days plus another 15 day to allows for late returns from the second notice. Police do not record whether the infringement fees referred to Ministry of Justice are paid, remain outstanding, or whether the requirement to pay the fee has been withdrawn.

Court Data and Re-offending Data
Data on cases and re-offending cases supplied by the Ministry of Justice Case Management System. Data provides information on Drink and Drug driving and Unlicensed driving cases. Data provides gender, age (14-19) and ethnicity prioritised by:
- Maori
- Pacific Peoples
- Other

The Drink and Drug driving re-offending data includes any case involving a Drink or Drug Driving charge. Therefore, numbers will be greater than those shown for Drink and Drug driving in the Court outcomes data as that data only included cases where Drink or Drug Driving was the lead offence in the case. Similarly Unlicensed Driver Compliance data includes any case involving an Unlicensed Driver Compliance charge. Therefore, numbers will be greater than those shown for Unlicensed Driver Compliance in the Court outcomes data as that data only included cases where Unlicensed Driver Compliance was the lead offence in the case.

New Zealand Transport Agency Data
National data supplied on Licensed Driving Populations (LDP) by licence type (Learners, Restricted and Full) for Class 1 licence types, 2009-2014. Data used in Phase 1, on number of current licence holders by gender and age group as at 31 December 2009-2013, was also incorporated.

National Data
The National data section covers all the data provided by Police district nationally. Further detailed information on each district can be found in the districts section of the paper. Specific ethnicity data has not been included in the national data.

---

8 Excludes addresses that were unrecognised.
National Averages Data
This section gives national average data on the offences covered by the paper as well as fines paid vs referred to Court and Collections outcomes. District data on those districts above/below the national averages are provided.

Police Districts Data
The data on Police districts is provided by district alphabetically. Descriptions of all tables and figures follow directly after each table and figure.

Outcome Definitions

Police Outcomes Data

**Convicted in Court** - Convicted after court hearing

**Prosecuted** - Decision to prosecute after explanation from offender received. Decision to Prosecute will be the outcome when the offender is under 17. The decision is to prosecute but, as they are dealt with in the youth court, a conviction is not recorded because of their age. However, some offenders may be transferred to the district court if the offending is serious enough, then a conviction will be entered, even though they are aged under 17, and they will then have the ‘Convicted in Court’ status code.

**Waived** - Decision to waive notice after explanation from offender received (or dealt with by youth aid)

**Fee Paid** - Infringement fee paid within allotted timeframe of the Police Infringement Bureau (PIB), 28 days plus 28 days, and hence is not referred from PIB to the Court collections system.

**Referred to Court Unpaid** - Offender did not pay the Infringement fee and it was referred to Court for collection. Police do not record if the fee was eventually paid or not.

**Withdrawn** - Offence was withdrawn from Court, usually after another charge had been laid.

**Dismissed** - Dismissed by the Court

**Admin Withdrawn** - Withdrawn from the Court for administrative reasons

**Issued** - **Awaiting disposition** - No outcome as yet

**Warned** - Offender was warned. Warnings can be verbal or written

**Compliance**
An alternative to paying a traffic infringement fine or prosecuting for minor rectifiable offences (e.g. vehicle defects). Police waive prosecution if the offender (owner or driver) supplies evidence to the Police Infringement Bureau (PIB) that a defect has been remedied or a requirement has been met. Traffic compliance allows the offender to redirect the fine that would have been payable, into fixing the faults or problems that caused the offence. Any offender not rectifying the issue within the timeframe is

---

9 The Written Traffic Warning trial was introduced in July 2010, initially in Wellington and later in districts within the greater Auckland region. Roll-out to all districts commenced on 30 March 2014, but the required training material was not fully available until 18 June 2014.

10 The use of Police Compliance was not recorded on the police databases as an outcome until 2010.
subsequently entered into the infringement records. While similar to Police diversion, it is referred to as ‘traffic compliance’ to avoid confusion with Court-ordered diversion.

**Court Outcome Data**

**Imprisonment** - Sentenced to a custodial episode

**Home Detention** Other custodial - Home Detention is a sentence that requires an offender to remain at an approved residence at all times under electronic monitoring and close supervision by a probation officer. It can help offenders to maintain family relationships, keep working or actively seek work, attend training or rehabilitative programmes. Sentences may range in length from 14 days to 12 months

**Community Detention** - Community Detention (CD) is a community-based sentence that requires the offender to comply with an electronically-monitored curfew imposed by the court. Offenders can be sentenced to CD for up to six months. Curfews can total up to 84 hours per week. The minimum curfew period is two hours

**Intensive Supervision** - In October 2007 the new sentence of Intensive Supervision was introduced. This sentence is similar to supervision described below but involves a higher level of restriction and has a longer maximum term (24 months), and special conditions that may include residential programmes.

**Community work** - Offenders sentenced to community work complete a prescribed number of hours of work within the community. Community work sentences came into effect with the Sentencing Act 2002, and provide for a degree of reparation to the community.

**Supervision** - Offenders sentenced to supervision report regularly to a probation officer and, if ordered by the court, fulfil special conditions designed to address their risk of further offending. Supervision may include in-depth, focused interventions such as non-residential rehabilitative programmes, reintegration services, or counselling that addresses their offending. In October 2007, the maximum duration of supervision was cut from 24 to 12 months

**Monetary** - monetary penalties (fines and reparation)

**Deferment** - deferred sentences (i.e. to come up for sentence if called upon and suspended prison sentences)

**Other** - other sentences (e.g. a disqualification from driving or an order under section 34 of the Criminal Procedure (Mentally Impaired Persons) Act 2003 for treatment or care of the offender in a psychiatric hospital or secure facility)


**Youth Court Sentence** - What a Judge tells someone what they have to do. If a charge against an accused young person has been proven or if the accused young person has admitted a charge then, depending how serious the criminal offence is, the Youth Court Judge may make an order. This will say what tasks the person has to carry out to make up for their offending. Orders can include restitution or forfeiture, reparation, fine, supervision, community work, supervision with activity, and supervision with residence.
**Discharge without conviction** - A discharge without conviction is where you don’t receive a conviction despite pleading guilty or being found guilty after trial. The Court can use its discretion to discharge without conviction under section 106 of the Sentencing Act 2002. This will allow you to keep your criminal record clean.

**Collections Data - Resolutions of Police Infringements Referred to Collections in 2009 & 2012 by 2014**

This paper also follows up on the outcomes of the Police youth traffic infringements referred to Collections in the calendar year 2009 for Unlicensed and GDLS breach offences and 2012 for Drink driving offences. The fines will either have a resolution date or will remain outstanding.\(^{11}\) There are three outcomes, for the fines imposed in 2009 & 2012:

- Fines received or paid;
- Fines remitted;
- Fines outstanding.

Due to the fact that offence fines may be resolved by either payment, part payment, remittal or part remittal, the data on fine outcomes is best interpreted in amounts ($NZ) paid or remitted as opposed to individual offences.

**Remittance and Alternative Sentences**

A remittal is where a fine or part of a fine is cleared. Fines remitted may be replaced with alternative sentences such as community work. Other examples of when remittal may occur include if a person dies or when a deputy registrar makes a decision to remit small outstanding balances, such as those less than five dollars. In addition, registrars and deputy registrars have discretion to remit court costs and enforcement fees to encourage people to pay the original fines.

There are 3 types of remittal contained in the workbook that could be used:

- **Registrar** - Registrars have certain powers to remit low values or enforcement fees.
- **Late Payment** - where a fine was referred to Collections and the offender paid the original authority at a later date it’s remitted from Collections.
- **Judge** - When the fine is referred back to a Judge by a Registrar and the Judge makes a decision to remit. This is usually a court appearance and in a lot of instances occurs when an offender is due in court for other offences. For example, if an offender is sentenced to prison for another offence, the Judge may decide to remit existing fines for another offence.

---

\(^{11}\) As of date of data collection.
Alternative Sentence

After considering a report to a Judge, the Judge or Community Magistrate can order that the offender’s fines, or some of their fines, are converted to an alternative sentence. A Judge can also order giving further time to pay after considering an “on notice” application for re-sentencing. There are four alternative sentencing outcomes supplied in the data provided:

Community Work
Community work requires an offender to undertake unpaid work for the benefit of the community. Community work is managed by a probation officer at community probation.

Community Detention
Community detention requires an offender to undergo a curfew at specified times. During the curfew, the offender is connected to electronic monitoring equipment and cannot leave the curfew address named in the order, except in an emergency.

Home Detention
Home detention requires an offender to stay at the specified home detention address at all times. During the home detention, the person is connected to electronic monitoring equipment and cannot leave the address named in the order, except in an emergency or when authorised by their probation officer to attend work or for specific appointments.

Imprisonment (Warrant of Commitment)
After considering a report to judge, a judge can order that the offender’s fines, or some of their fines, be converted to a sentence of imprisonment. This is done by issuing a warrant of commitment. A warrant of commitment cannot be issued if:

- the fine was imposed in the Youth Court;
- the fine was imposed for a traffic offence not punishable by imprisonment;
- the offender was under 17 years and unmarried when the offence was committed.
National Data
National Youth Populations & Licensed Driving Populations

**Table 1: National Estimated Resident Population, 15-19 Years of Age by Year**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>316970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>317100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>314520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>312790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>312460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>313550</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The National Youth population has decreased by 1.1% from 2009-2014. Males account for, on average, 51% of this population from 2009-2014.

**Figure 2: National Youth Licensed Driving Populations by Licence Type and Year**

The total national ‘Learner licence’ driver population has decreased by 9.2% from 2009-2014. The total national ‘Restricted licence’ driver population has decreased by 36.5% from 2009-2014. The total national ‘Full licence’ driver population has decreased by 49.5% from 2009-2014. The total youth driver population has decreased by 28.2% from 2009-2014.
Males accounted for 52.7% of the youth licensed driving population from 2009-2014. Males accounted for 71.8% of the traffic offences researched for this paper\textsuperscript{12} where the gender could be identified.\textsuperscript{13}

**Total Youth Traffic Offences**

**Figure 4: National Total Youth Traffic Offences by Year**

Total national youth traffic offences fell every year from 2009-2013 and rose from 2013-2014. Total national youth traffic offences have decreased by 38.2% from 2009-2014.

\textsuperscript{12} Unlicensed, GDLS Breaches and Drink and Drug Driving.

\textsuperscript{13} The gender for 5.9% of the traffic offences under review for this paper could not be identified.
From 2009-2014; Total youth traffic offences have fallen by 38.2%, Unlicensed driving offences have fallen by 12.9%, GDLS Breach offences have fallen by 14.2% and Drink and Drug driving offences have fallen by 62.3%.
Unlicensed Driving Offences

‘Drove without appropriate driver licence’ Offences

Figure 6: National ‘Drove without appropriate driver licence’ Offences by Year

Drove without appropriate driver licence’ offences accounted for 2.2% of the total youth traffic offences in 2009 and 3.3% in 2014. The number of offences has decreased by 8.8% from 2009-2014.

Males accounted for 78.3% of ‘Drove Without Appropriate Driver Licence’ offences, where the gender could be identified.

Figure 7: National ‘Drove without appropriate driver licence’ Offences by Age, 2009-2014

From 2009-2014, 19 year olds accounted for 26.2% of the ‘Drove without appropriate driver licence’ offences.
Table 2: National ‘Drove without appropriate driver licence’ Offences by Police Outcome and Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Referred to Court Unpaid</td>
<td>3804</td>
<td>3104</td>
<td>2941</td>
<td>3310</td>
<td>3266</td>
<td>3163</td>
<td>19588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee Paid</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>2167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>1366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waived</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warned</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convicted in Court</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosecuted</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unresolved</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin Withdrawn</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>4504</td>
<td>3635</td>
<td>3604</td>
<td>4076</td>
<td>4153</td>
<td>4106</td>
<td>24078</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From 2009-2014, 90% of the ‘Drove without appropriate driver licence’ infringement offences were referred to Court unpaid. From 2009-2014, compliance accounted for 5.7% of the Police outcomes, 0.5% in 2011 and 11.9% in 2014.

Figure 8: National Paid v Referred to Court Unpaid Police Outcomes of ‘Drove Without Appropriate Driver Licence’ Offences by Year

In 2009, 90.1% of the ‘Drove without appropriate driver licence’ infringement offences that resulted in a fine were referred to Court unpaid. In 2014, 87.5% of the infringement offences that resulted in a fine were referred to Court unpaid.

14 Whilst the use of compliance began to be recorded in 2010 only 1 offence was recorded to result in compliance in 2010 so 2011 has been used as a comparison year as it would be a better comparison year regarding the use of compliance.
By 2014 62.8% of the fines referred to Collections for ‘Drove Without Appropriate Driver Licence’ offences had been paid.

‘Unlicensed Driver Failed To Comply With Prohibition’ Offences

‘Unlicensed Driver Failed To Comply With Prohibition’ offences accounted for 0.9% of the total youth traffic offences in 2009 and 1.1% in 2014. The number of offences has decreased by 23.1% from 2009-2014.

Males accounted for 76.4% of Unlicensed Driver Failed To Comply With Prohibition’ offences, where the gender could be identified.
Figure 11: National ‘Unlicensed Driver Failed To Comply With Prohibition’ Offences by Age, 2009-2014

From 2009-2014, 19 year olds accounted for 31.4% of the ‘Unlicensed Driver Failed To Comply With Prohibition’ offences.

Table 3: National ‘Unlicensed Driver Failed To Comply With Prohibition’ Offences by Police Outcome and Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convicted in Court</td>
<td>1175</td>
<td>1012</td>
<td>958</td>
<td>1012</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>6005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosecuted</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>1761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissed</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warned</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waived</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin Withdrawn</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unresolved</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1817</strong></td>
<td><strong>1600</strong></td>
<td><strong>1424</strong></td>
<td><strong>1463</strong></td>
<td><strong>1333</strong></td>
<td><strong>1398</strong></td>
<td><strong>9035</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From 2009-2014, 66.5% of the ‘Unlicensed Driver Failed To Comply With Prohibition’ offences were convicted in Court. From 2009-2014, prosecuted accounted for 19.5% of the Police outcomes.
Table 4: National ‘Unlicensed Driver Failed To Comply With Prohibition’ Number of Repeat Offences by Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Previous Convictions</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2958</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total number of repeat offences has fallen every year from 2009-2014.

Table 5: National ‘Unlicensed Driver Failed To Comply With Prohibition’ Cases by Court Outcome and Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monetary</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>3151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Proved</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>1049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discharge</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Court Discharge</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discharge Without Conviction</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>284</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Court Sentence</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imprisonment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Detention</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1079</td>
<td>1016</td>
<td>857</td>
<td>863</td>
<td>896</td>
<td>969</td>
<td>5680</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From 2009-2014, 55.5% of the ‘Unlicensed Driver Failed To Comply With Prohibition’ cases Court Outcomes were Monetary, 18.5% of the cases were not proved and only one case resulted in imprisonment.
GDFS Breach Offences – Learner Offences

Across all the Police districts the highest number of Learner driver offences were:

- ‘Learner licensee failed to display an "L" plate’
- ‘Learner Driver Unaccompanied’

‘Learner licensee failed to display an "L" plate’ Offences

*Figure 12: National ‘Learner licensee failed to display an "L" plate’ Offences by Year*

The total number of ‘Learner licensee failed to display an "L" plate’ offences has increased by 41.8% from 2009-2014. Males accounted for 68.3% of ‘Learner licensee failed to display an "L" plate’ offences where the gender could be identified.

*Figure 13: National ‘Learner licensee failed to display an "L" plate’ Offences by Age, 2009-2014*

From 2009-2014, 19 year olds accounted for 32.4% of the ‘Learner licensee failed to display an "L" plate’ offences.
Table 6: National ‘Learner licensee failed to display an "L" plate’ Offences by Police Outcome and year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Referred to Court Unpaid</td>
<td>5970</td>
<td>6956</td>
<td>5383</td>
<td>4451</td>
<td>5222</td>
<td>6609</td>
<td>34591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee Paid</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>1132</td>
<td>1093</td>
<td>1220</td>
<td>1504</td>
<td>1942</td>
<td>7296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>1251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waived</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warned</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convicted in Court</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosecuted</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unresolved</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warned</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin Withdrawn</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6644</td>
<td>8202</td>
<td>6571</td>
<td>5888</td>
<td>7325</td>
<td>9419</td>
<td>44049</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From 2009-2014, 82.6% of Learner licensee failed to display an "L" plate infringement offences were referred to Court unpaid. Compliance accounted for 5.7% of the Police outcomes, 0.2% in 2011 and 7.7% in 2014.

Figure 14: National Paid v Referred to Court Unpaid, Police Outcomes of ‘Learner licensee failed to display an "L" plate’ Offences by Year

In 2009, 93.6% of the ‘Learner licensee failed to display an "L" plate’ infringement offences that resulted in a fine were referred to Court unpaid. In 2014, 77.3% of the infringement offences that resulted in a fine were referred to Court unpaid.
‘Learner Driver Unaccompanied’ Offences

Figure 15: National ‘Learner Driver Unaccompanied’ Offences by Year

The total number of ‘Learner Driver Unaccompanied’ offences has decreased by 7.9% from 2009-2014. accounted for 67.3% of ‘Learner Driver Unaccompanied’ offences, where the gender could be identified.

Figure 16: National ‘Learner Driver Unaccompanied’ Offences by Age, 2009-2014

From 2009-2014, 19 year olds accounted for 31.8% of the ‘Learner Driver Unaccompanied’ offences.\(^{15}\)

\(^{15}\) Five fourteen year olds are recorded in the data for ‘Learner Driver Unaccompanied’ offences. Though an offence was recorded the age may have been incorrectly entered into the data.
Table 7: National ‘Learner Driver Unaccompanied’ Offences by Police Outcome and Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Referred to Court Unpaid</td>
<td>19001</td>
<td>15366</td>
<td>12117</td>
<td>10595</td>
<td>11866</td>
<td>14033</td>
<td>82978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee Paid</td>
<td>1591</td>
<td>2653</td>
<td>2617</td>
<td>3170</td>
<td>3863</td>
<td>4718</td>
<td>18612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>1083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waived</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convicted in Court</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warned</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosecuted</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unresolved</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin Withdrawn</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>21252</strong></td>
<td><strong>18246</strong></td>
<td><strong>14929</strong></td>
<td><strong>14022</strong></td>
<td><strong>16316</strong></td>
<td><strong>19571</strong></td>
<td><strong>104336</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From 2009-2014, 81.7% of Learner Driver Unaccompanied’ infringement offences were referred to Court unpaid. Compliance accounted for 1% of the Police outcomes, 0.2% in 2010 and 3.1% in 2014.

Figure 17: National Paid v Referred to Court Unpaid, Police Outcomes of ‘Learner Driver Unaccompanied’ Offences by Year

In 2009, 92.3% of the ‘Learner Driver Unaccompanied’ infringement offences that resulted in a fine were referred to Court unpaid. In 2014, 74.8% of the infringement offences that resulted in a fine were referred to Court unpaid.
‘Learner Driver ‘Other’ Offences

Figure 18: National Learner Driver ‘Other’ Offences by Year

The total number of Learner Driver ‘Other’ offences has increased by 58.1% from 2009-2014. Males accounted for 75.6% of Learner Driver ‘Other’ offences, where the gender could be identified.

Figure 19: National Learner Driver ‘Other’ Offences by Age, 2009-2014

From 2009-2014, 18 year olds accounted for 27.8% of the ‘Drove without appropriate driver licence’ offences.\(^{16}\)

---

\(^{16}\) The fourteen year olds represented in this data relate to aiding and abetting offences.
Table 8: National Learner Driver ‘Other’ Offences by Police Outcome and Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Referred to Court Unpaid</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>3041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee Paid</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>1208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warned</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waived</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convicted in Court</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosecuted</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unresolved</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin Withdrawn</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>921</td>
<td>1066</td>
<td>4418</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From 2009-2014, 71.6% of Learner Driver ‘Other’ infringement offences were referred to Court unpaid. Compliance accounted for 1.4% of the Police outcomes, 0.2% in 2010 and 2.6% in 2014.

Figure 20: National Paid v Referred to Court Unpaid Police Outcomes of Learner Driver ‘Other’ Offences by Year

In 2009, 86.2% of the Learner Driver ‘Other’ infringement offences that resulted in a fine were referred to Court unpaid. In 2014, 69.5% of the infringement offences that resulted in a fine were referred to Court unpaid.
By 2014 49.3% of the fines referred to Collections for Learner offences had been paid.
GDLS Breach Offences – Restricted Offences

Across all the Police districts the highest number of Restricted driver offences were:

- ‘Restricted Driver Unaccompanied Between 10pm And 5am’
- Restricted Driver Carries Unauthorised Passenger’

‘Restricted Driver Unaccompanied Between 10pm And 5am’ Offences

Figure 22: National ‘Restricted Driver Unaccompanied Between 10pm And 5am’ Offences by Year

The total number of ‘Restricted Driver Unaccompanied Between 10pm And 5am’ offences has decreased by 29.4% from 2009-2014. Males accounted for 77.2% of ‘Restricted Driver Unaccompanied Between 10pm And 5am’ offences, where the gender could be identified.

Figure 23: National ‘Restricted Driver Unaccompanied Between 10pm And 5am’ Offences by Age, 2009-2014

From 2009-2014, 18 year olds accounted for 31.3% of the Restricted Driver Unaccompanied Between 10pm And 5am’ offences.
### Table 9: National ‘Restricted Driver Unaccompanied Between 10pm And 5am’ Offences by Police Outcome and Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Referred to Court Unpaid</td>
<td>2480</td>
<td>2571</td>
<td>1830</td>
<td>1294</td>
<td>1013</td>
<td>1031</td>
<td>10219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee Paid</td>
<td>919</td>
<td>1651</td>
<td>1632</td>
<td>1253</td>
<td>1016</td>
<td>1252</td>
<td>7723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warned</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waived</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convicted in Court</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrew</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin Withdrawn</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosecuted</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unresolved</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3514</td>
<td>4264</td>
<td>3505</td>
<td>2659</td>
<td>2184</td>
<td>2480</td>
<td>18606</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From 2009-2014, 56.9% of Restricted Driver Unaccompanied Between 10pm And 5am’ infringement offences were referred to Court unpaid. Compliance accounted for 1.3% of the Police outcomes, 0.3% in 2010 and 5% in 2014.

**Figure 24: National Paid v Referred to Court Unpaid Police Outcomes of ‘Restricted Driver Unaccompanied Between 10pm And 5am’ Offences by Year**

In 2009, 70.3% of the ‘Restricted Driver Unaccompanied Between 10pm And 5am’ infringement offences that resulted in a fine were referred to Court unpaid. In 2014, 49.4% of the infringement offences that resulted in a fine were referred to Court unpaid.
‘Restricted Driver Carries Unauthorised Passenger’ Offences

**Figure 25: National ‘Restricted Driver Carries Unauthorised Passenger’ Offences by Year**

The total number of ‘Restricted Driver Carries Unauthorised Passenger’ offences has decreased by 46.3% from 2009-2014. Males accounted for 75.2% of ‘Restricted Driver Carries Unauthorised Passenger’ offences, where the gender could be identified.

**Figure 26: National ‘Restricted Driver Carries Unauthorised Passenger’ Offences by Age, 2009-2014**

From 2009-2014, 17 year olds accounted for 30.1% of the ‘Restricted Driver Carries Unauthorised Passenger’ offences.
Table 10: National ‘Restricted Driver Carries Unauthorised Passenger’ Offences by Police Outcome and year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Referred to Court Unpaid</td>
<td>12042</td>
<td>10352</td>
<td>7694</td>
<td>5423</td>
<td>4114</td>
<td>3780</td>
<td>43405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee Paid</td>
<td>4344</td>
<td>7032</td>
<td>6643</td>
<td>5343</td>
<td>4247</td>
<td>4672</td>
<td>32281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waived</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convinced in Court</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosecuted</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unresolved</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin Withdrawn</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16804</td>
<td>17589</td>
<td>14487</td>
<td>11098</td>
<td>8895</td>
<td>9024</td>
<td>77897</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From 2009-2014, 57.3% of ‘Restricted Driver Carries Unauthorised Passenger’ infringement offences were referred to Court unpaid. Compliance accounted for 1% of the Police outcomes, 0.1% in 2010 and 3.8% in 2014.

Figure 27: National Paid v Referred to Court Unpaid Police Outcomes of ‘Restricted Driver Carries Unauthorised Passenger’ Offences by Year

In 2009, 73.5% of the Restricted Driver Carries Unauthorised Passenger’ infringement offences that resulted in a fine were referred to Court unpaid. In 2014, 44.7% of the infringement offences that resulted in a fine were referred to Court unpaid.
Restricted Driver ‘Other’ Offences

**Figure 28: National Restricted Driver ‘Other’ Offences by Year**

The total number of Restricted Driver ‘Other’ offences has increased by 24.1% from 2009-2014. Males accounted for 78.1% of Restricted Driver ‘Other’ offences, where the gender could be identified.

**Figure 29: National Restricted Driver ‘Other’ Offences by Age, 2009-2014**

From 2009-2014, 18 year olds accounted for 30.8% of the ‘Learner licensee failed to display an “L” plate’ offences.\(^\text{17}\)

---

\(^{17}\) The fourteen year olds represented in this data relate to aiding and abetting offences.
Table 11: National Restricted Driver ‘Other’ Offences by Police Outcome and Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Referred to Court Unpaid</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>4061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee Paid</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>2759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waived</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warned</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convicted in Court</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin Withdrawn</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>994</td>
<td>1401</td>
<td>1239</td>
<td>1272</td>
<td>1044</td>
<td>1234</td>
<td>7184</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From 2009-2014, 59.5% of Restricted Driver ‘Other’ infringement offences were referred to Court unpaid. Compliance accounted for 1.9% of the Police outcomes, 0.3% in 2010 and 5.4% in 2014.

Figure 30: National Paid v Referred to Court Unpaid Police Outcomes of Restricted Driver ‘Other’ Offences by Year

In 2009, 73.5% of the Restricted Driver ‘Other’ infringement offences that resulted in a fine were referred to Court unpaid. In 2014, 49.3% of the infringement offences that resulted in a fine were referred to Court unpaid.
Figure 31: National Outcomes of Total Restricted Infringement fines referred to Collections in 2009 by 2014 by Percentage

By 2014 61.5% of the fines referred to Collections for Restricted offences had been paid.

Drink and Drug Driving Offences

Figure 32: National Drink and Drug Driving Offences by Year

The total number of Drink and Drug driving offences has fallen, significantly, every year and decreased by 62.3% from 2009-2014. Males accounted for 75.4% of Drink and Drug driving offences, where the gender could be identified.
From 2009-2014, 19 year olds accounted for 40.8% of the Drink and Drug driving offences.

Table 12: National Drink and Drug Driving Offences by Police Outcome and Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convicted in Court</td>
<td>7512</td>
<td>6453</td>
<td>5472</td>
<td>3879</td>
<td>3027</td>
<td>2385</td>
<td>28728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referred to Court Unpaid</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>1827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee Paid</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>1135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosecuted</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissed</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waived</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin Withdrawn</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unresolved</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warned</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>8136</td>
<td>6893</td>
<td>6395</td>
<td>5194</td>
<td>4022</td>
<td>3069</td>
<td>33709</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From 2009-2014, 85.2% of Drink and Drug driving offences were convicted in Court, 92.3% in 2009 and 77.7% in 2014.

Table 13: National Drink and Drug Driving, Number of Repeat Offences by Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Previous Convictions</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1655</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1333</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>865</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>6761</td>
<td>1463</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8399</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total number of repeat offences has fallen, significantly, every year from 2009-2014.
In 2011, 59.1% of the Drink Driving infringement offences that resulted in a fine were referred to Court unpaid. In 2014, 59.4% of the infringement offences that resulted in a fine were referred to Court unpaid.

By 2014 67.6% of the fines referred to Collections for Drink Driving offences had been paid.

---

18 2012 was chosen as the year to follow up on Drink Driving infringements, as the infringement offence was not introduced until late 2011.
Table 14: National Drink and Drug Driving Cases by Court Outcome and Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monetary</td>
<td>4569</td>
<td>3926</td>
<td>3398</td>
<td>2436</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td>1597</td>
<td>18026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Work</td>
<td>1416</td>
<td>1247</td>
<td>1041</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>5163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Proved</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>1041</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>1076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Court Discharge</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Detention</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Court Sentence</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discharge Without Conviction</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imprisonment</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Detention/ Other Community</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensive Supervision</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discharge</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7170</td>
<td>6179</td>
<td>5271</td>
<td>3753</td>
<td>3021</td>
<td>2241</td>
<td>27635</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From 2009-2014, 65.2% of Drink and Drug driving case Court outcomes were monetary, 18.7% resulted in community work and 0.6% of the cases resulted in imprisonment.

Unlicensed Driving and GDLS Breach Remittal Outcomes

The total national amount of monetary fines imposed for collection for all the GDLS and Unlicensed driving infringement offence fines referred to Collections in 2009 was $18,897,072.

By 2014, $7,680,946 of the fines referred to Collections were remitted. Of the total amount of monies remitted 59.1% were replaced with Community Work, 2.7% with Community Detention, 0.9% with Home Detention and 3.3% with imprisonment. 24.4% of the total amount of monies remitted were remitted by Judge, 7.3% by Registrar and 2.3% were late payments.

Drink Driving Remittal Outcomes

The total national amount of monetary fines imposed for collection for all the Drink Driving infringement offence fines referred to Collections in 2012 was $137,693.

By 2014, $16,606 of the fines referred to Collections were remitted. Of the total amount of monies remitted 55.1% were replaced with Community Work, 2.1% with Community Detention and 3.6% with imprisonment. 21.5% of the total amount of monies remitted were remitted by Judge and 17.7% by Registrar.
National Averages

Unlicensed Driving Offences

*Figure 36: Number of ‘Drove Without Appropriate Driver Licence’ Offences by Police District and Year*

The total national number of ‘Drove Without Appropriate Driver Licence’ offences has decreased by 8.8% from 2009 (4504 offences) to 2014 (4106 offences).

The national average percentage of ‘Drove Without Appropriate Driver Licence’ offences, when expressed as a percentage of the total number of traffic offences, has increased by 40% from 2009 (2.2%) to 2014 (3.3%).

The national average percentage, in 2014, of ‘Drove Without Appropriate Driver Licence’ offences, when expressed as a percentage of the total number of traffic offences is 3.3%. In 2014, the Police districts: Eastern (5.2%), Bay Of Plenty (5.1%), Counties Manukau (4.7%), Auckland (3.9%), Northland (3.8%) and Waikato (3.7%) were above the national average percentage.
From 2009-2014, 90.4% of all ‘Drove Without Appropriate Driver Licence’ offences, resulted in an infringement fee outcome.

From 2009-2014, 90% of all Drove Without Appropriate Driver Licence’ offences, that resulted in an infringement fee, were referred to Court unpaid.

The national average of fines referred to Court unpaid for ‘Drove Without Appropriate Driver Licence’ offences has decreased by 1% from 2009 (89.9%) to 2014 (89.2%).

In 2014 the national average of fines referred to Court unpaid for ‘Drove Without Appropriate Driver Licence’ offences was 89.2%. The Police districts: Northland (95.8%), Eastern (94.5%), Bay Of Plenty (91.8%), Central (91.4%), Waikato (90.7%), Wellington (90.3%) and Waitemata (89.4%) were above the national average.
The national average of ‘Drove Without Appropriate Driver Licence’ fines referred to Collections in 2009 by amounts paid by 2014 was 61.2%. The Police districts: Tasman (43.4%), Bay Of Plenty (53.2%), Northland (57.4%), Eastern (57.6%) and Canterbury (60.7%) were below the national average.
The total national number of ‘Unlicensed Driver Failed To Comply With Prohibition’ offences has decreased by 23.1% from 2009 (1817 offences) to 2014 (1398 offences).

The national average percentage of ‘Unlicensed Driver Failed To Comply With Prohibition’ offences, when expressed as a percentage of the total number of traffic offences, has increased by 33% from 2009 (0.9%) to 2014 (1.2%).

In 2014 the national average percentage, of ‘Unlicensed Driver Failed To Comply With Prohibition’ offences, when expressed as a percentage of the total number of traffic offences is 1.2%. In 2014, the Police districts: Counties Manukau (2.7%), Auckland (1.9%), Northland (1.6%) and Eastern (1.5%) were above the national average percentage.
Figure 40: Number of Repeat ‘Unlicensed Driver Failed To Comply With Prohibition’ Offences by Police District and Year

The total national number of repeat ‘Unlicensed Driver Failed To Comply With Prohibition’ offences has decreased by 48.4% from 2009 (653 offences) to 2014 (334 offences).

The national average percentage of repeat ‘Unlicensed Driver Failed To Comply With Prohibition’ offences, when expressed as a percentage of the total number of traffic offences, has remained the same from 2009 (0.3%) to 2014 (0.3%).

In 2014 the national average percentage, of repeat ‘Unlicensed Driver Failed To Comply With Prohibition’ offences, when expressed as a percentage of the total number of traffic offences is 0.3%. In 2014, the Police districts: Counties Manukau (0.9%), Auckland (0.4%) and Northland (0.4%) were above the national average percentage.
The total national number of GDLS ‘Learner’ offences has increased by 5.1% from 2009 (28583 offences) to 2014 (30056 offences).

The national average percentage of GDLS ‘Learner’ offences, when expressed as a percentage of the total number of traffic offences, has increased by 69% from 2009 (14.5%) to 2014 (24.5%).

In 2014 the national average percentage of GDLS ‘Learner’ offences, when expressed as a percentage of the total number of traffic offences was 24.5%. In 2014, the Police districts: Northland (32.2%), Eastern (30.2%), Counties Manukau (29.3%), Central (25.9%) and Bay Of Plenty (25.5%) were above the national average percentage.
From 2009-2014, 96.2% of all GDLS ‘Learner’ offences, resulted in an infringement fee outcome.

From 2009-2014, 79.3% of all GDLS ‘Learner’ offences, that resulted in an infringement fee, were referred to Court unpaid.

The national average of fines referred to Court unpaid for GDLS ‘Learner’ offences has decreased by 18.7% from 2009 (91.9%) to 2014 (74.7%).

In 2014 the national average of fines referred to Court unpaid for GDLS ‘Learner Licence’ offences was 74.7%. The Police districts: Northland (83.3%), Canterbury (80.6%), Eastern (80%), Southern (79%), Central (78.6%), Tasman (78.3%), Waikato (78.2%) and Bay Of Plenty (77.7%) were above the national average.
The national average of GDLS ‘Learner’ fines referred to Collections in 2009 by amounts paid by 2014 was 49.2%. The Police districts: Southern (31.5%), Tasman (37.1%), Northland (37.7%), Wellington (39.4%) and Canterbury (43.8%) were below the national average.
The total national number of GDLS ‘Restricted’ offences has decreased by 40.2% from 2009 (21312 offences) to 2014 (12738 offences).

The national average percentage of GDLS ‘Restricted’ offences, when expressed as a percentage of the total number of traffic offences, has decreased by 4.8% from 2009 (10.5%) to 2014 (10%).

In 2014 the national average percentage of GDLS ‘Restricted’ offences, when expressed as a percentage of the total number of traffic offences was 10%. In 2014, the Police districts: Tasman (12.9%), Southern (12.5%), Wellington (11.5%), Bay Of Plenty (11.1%), Canterbury (10.9%), Waikato (10.8%), Waitemata (10.8%) and Central (10.6%) were above the national average percentage.
From 2009-2014, 96.9% of all GDLS ‘Restricted’ offences, resulted in an infringement fee outcome.

From 2009-2014, 57.2% of all GDLS ‘Restricted’ offences, that resulted in an infringement fee, were referred to Court unpaid.

The national average of fines referred to Court unpaid for GDLS ‘Restricted’ offences has decreased by 37.4% from 2009 (72.8%) to 2014 (45.6%).

In 2014 the national average of fines referred to Court unpaid for GDLS ‘Restricted’ offences was 45.6%. The Police districts: Central (51.1%), Northland (49.8%), Wellington (49.4%), Canterbury (49.3%), Bay Of Plenty (46.2%), Waikato (46.1%) and Tasman (46%) were above the national average.
Figure 46: Outcomes of GDLS ‘Restricted’ Fines Referred to Collections in 2009 by 2014, by Police District

The national average of GDLS ‘Restricted’ fines referred to Collections in 2009 by amounts paid by 2014 was 60.3%. The Police districts: Bay Of Plenty (23.5%), Southern (48.8%), Wellington (52.3%), Tasman (53.6%) and Northland (58.5%) were below the national average.
Drink and Drug Driving Offences

Figure 47: Number of Drink and Drug Driving Offences by Police District and Year

The total national number of Drink and Drug driving offences has decreased by 62.3% from 2009 (8136 offences) to 2014 (3069 offences).

The national average percentage of Drink and Drug driving offences, when expressed as a percentage of the total number of traffic offences, has decreased by 38.1% from 2009 (4.2%) to 2014 (2.6%).

In 2014 the national average percentage of Drink and Drug driving offences, when expressed as a percentage of the total number of traffic offences was 2.6%. In 2014, the Police districts: Auckland (3.5%), Eastern (3.3%), Bay Of Plenty (2.8%) and Northland (2.7%) were above the national average percentage.
The total national number of repeat Drink and Drug driving offences has decreased, significantly, by 84.9% from 2009 (2503 offences) to 2014 (377 offences).

The national average percentage of repeat Drink and Drug driving offences, when expressed as a percentage of the total number of traffic offences, has decreased, significantly, by 76.9% from 2009 (1.3%) to 2014 (0.3%).

In 2014 the national average percentage of repeat Drink and Drug driving offences, when expressed as a percentage of the total number of traffic offences was 0.3%. In 2014, the Police districts: Auckland (0.4%), Counties Manukau (0.4%), and Waitemata (0.4%) were above the national average percentage.
From 2011-2014, 15.9% of all Drink and Drug driving offences, resulted in an infringement fee outcome.

From 2011-2014, 61.7% of all Drink Driving offences, that resulted in an infringement fee, were referred to Court unpaid.

The national average of fines referred to Court unpaid for Drink Driving offences has decreased by 2.8% from 2012 (63.3%) to 2014 (61.5%).

In 2014 the national average of fines referred to Court unpaid for Drink Driving offences was 61.5%. The Police districts: Bay Of Plenty (67.5%), Northland (66.7%), Eastern (65.6%), Central (65.5%) and Counties Manukau (65.3%) were above the national average.
The national average of Drink Driving fines referred to Collections in 2012 by amounts paid by 2014 was 68%. The Police districts: Northland (54.1%), Canterbury (57.8%), Tasman (60.5%), Bay Of Plenty (62.1%), Eastern (63.1%), Wellington (63.9%) and Waikato (67.9%) were below the national average.
Information Sharing and Data Limitations

As with Phase 1 of this project the engagement and cooperation of the government agencies and departments involved in this project was vital. Without the oversight and input of the Reference Group this comprehensive review of the relevant data on youth traffic offending and offenders in New Zealand over the period 2009-2014 would not have been possible.

The expertise and knowledge of the analysts involved from all the agencies was also vital in identifying the most relevant datasets that would provide the most useful information. Anomalies in the data were resolved by these analysts. Regular meetings of these analysts, to identify where different agencies may be able to data share more effectively, would be of great benefit.

While there were no major barriers to the identification of datasets and access to data, the key observed limitations to the data reviewed were as follows.

The data from the Police informed on offences and not offenders. Data on repeat offences of GDLS Breach infringements was not available. The NZ Police are currently unable to link these offences to offenders to record repeat offences. It may be worthwhile for future researchers to explore the possibility of tracking repeat offending for offences incurring demerit points (e.g. GDLS breaches), through the NZTA driver licence database, which accumulates demerit points by offender. This was not explored due to time, cost and the perceived difficulty of interrogating this complex database.

Compliance figures do not record the total use of compliance, only those with positive outcomes. Those who do not comply are simply passed on to be dealt with through the usual system. The use of Police Compliance was not recorded on the police databases as an outcome until 2010.

The NZ Police does not gather any data on ethnicity at offence detection for traffic infringement offences and the NZTA does not hold ethnicity data on the licensed driving population.

Whilst it would have been ideal to have the youth licensed driving population data by Police District the New Zealand Transport Agency were unable to provide this information by this format.

The New Zealand Police Force have initiatives and policing enforcement practices in place, particularly with regards to traffic offending, that are not just national but are unique to their individual districts. The supply of information by Police district is of great benefit in informing such policies. Fortunately the NZ Police were able to provide LDP data by Police District although this data was not able to be broken down by licence type (Learner, Restricted, Full) as the NZTA LDP data was.

The LDP data from the Police also included all licence types and the LDP data from NZTA only Class1 (car). This equated to a 0.6% difference on average between the two sets of LDP data. The Police LDP data was only used in the Police district section of this paper and the NZTA LDP data was only used as national data in the national section of this paper so there was no conflict between these two sets of datum.

On reviewing the GDLS Learner Driver Breaches it occurred to the researchers that the national 60% increase (Fig 12), from 2012-2014, of ‘Learner licensee failed to display an “L” plate’ (L514 offence code) offences and the national 39.6% increase (Fig 15), from 2012-2014, of ‘Learner Driver Unaccompanied’ (L504 offence code) offences may be linked. It was asked; could Learner licensees not displaying an ‘L’ plate also be incurring the ‘Learner Driver Unaccompanied’ infringement offence at the same time? The rationale was that the reason for not displaying an ‘L’ plate was not that the driver had not simply
forgotten and was otherwise driving in accordance with all the lawful restrictions imposed by the Learner Licence, but that; The driver was wilfully trying to avoid detection of the ‘Learner Driver Unaccompanied’ offence by not displaying that they were Learner drivers. This does not mean that there may not have been an increase in the ‘Learner licensee failed to display an "L" plate’ offences but the researchers believed it was necessary to further investigate any links.

The Police were asked whether for a driver who was committing both an ‘L’ plate offence and a ‘Learner Driver Unaccompanied’ offence at the same time, would the officer issue infringements for one, the other, or both offences. The Police advised that this was at the discretion of the individual officer at the point of detection – an officer could issue a single infringement for either offence, or two infringements (i.e. for each offence committed).

To get a better understanding of this the Police were asked if it was possible to link these ‘double’ (L514 & L504 offence code) offences (two offences issued at the same incident). Whilst offences and offenders could not be linked, these ‘double’ offences could. When this data was reviewed it showed that nationally, from 2009-2014, 23.5% of the combined L514 & L504 number of offences were ‘double’ infringement offences. Further, the data showed that 15.9% of all total national, 2009-2014, GDLS Breach infringements were ‘double’ offence infringements. Whilst this data was not included in the paper at the national or Police district level, it would be desirable to investigate this further.

Unlicensed, GDLs Breach and Drink and Drug Driving - Key Findings

Unlicensed Driving

‘Drove without appropriate driver licence’ Offences

- ‘Drove without appropriate driver licence’ offences accounted for 2.2% of the total youth traffic offences in 2009 and 3.3% in 2014. The number of offences has decreased by 8.8% from 2009-2014. 19 year olds account for 26.2% of these offences
- Males accounted for 78.3% of the offences, where the gender could be identified
- The national average percentage, in 2014, of ‘Drove Without Appropriate Driver Licence’ offences, when expressed as a percentage of the total number of traffic offences is 3.3%. In 2014, the Police districts: Eastern (5.2%), Bay Of Plenty (5.1%), Counties Manukau (4.7%), Auckland (3.9%), Northland (3.8%) and Waikato (3.7%) were above the national average percentage
- From 2009-2014, 90.4% of all ‘Drove Without Appropriate Driver Licence’ offences, resulted in an infringement fee outcome
- The national average of fines referred to Court unpaid for ‘Drove Without Appropriate Driver Licence’ offences has decreased by 0.8% from 2009 (89.9%) to 2014 (89.2%), from 2009-2014, 90% of all Drove Without Appropriate Driver Licence’ offences, that resulted in an infringement fee, were referred to Court unpaid
- By 2014 62.8% of the fines referred to Collections for ‘Drove Without Appropriate Driver Licence’ offences, in 2009, had been paid
‘Unlicensed Driver Failed To Comply With Prohibition’ Offences

- ‘Unlicensed Driver Failed To Comply With Prohibition’ offences accounted for 0.9% of the total youth traffic offences in 2009 and 1.1% in 2014. The total national number of ‘Unlicensed Driver Failed To Comply With Prohibition’ offences has decreased by 23.1% from 2009 (1817 offences) to 2014 (1398 offences). 19 year olds account for 31.4% of these offences
- Males accounted for 76.4% of the offences
- In 2014 the national average percentage, of ‘Unlicensed Driver Failed To Comply With Prohibition’ offences, when expressed as a percentage of the total number of traffic offences is 1.2%. In 2014, the Police districts: Counties Manukau (2.7%), Auckland (1.9%), Northland (1.6%) and Eastern (1.5%) were above the national average percentage
- From 2009-2014, 66.5% of the ‘Unlicensed Driver Failed To Comply With Prohibition’ offences were convicted in Court

Repeat offences

- The total national number of repeat ‘Unlicensed Driver Failed To Comply With Prohibition’ offences has decreased by 48.4% from 2009 (653 offences) to 2014 (334 offences)
- The national average percentage of repeat ‘Unlicensed Driver Failed To Comply With Prohibition’ offences, when expressed as a percentage of the total number of traffic offences, has remained the same from 2009 (0.3%) to 2014 (0.3%)
- In 2014 the national average percentage, of repeat ‘Unlicensed Driver Failed To Comply With Prohibition’ offences, when expressed as a percentage of the total number of traffic offences is 0.3%. In 2014, the Police districts: Counties Manukau (0.9%), Auckland (0.4%) and Northland (0.4%) were above the national average percentage

GDLS Breach Offences – Learner Offences

- Across all the Police districts the highest number of Learner driver offences were: ‘Learner Driver Unaccompanied’ and ‘Learner licensee failed to display an "L" plate’

‘Learner licensee failed to display an "L" plate’

- The total number of ‘Learner licensee failed to display an "L" plate’ offences has increased by 41.8% from 2009-2014
- Males accounted for 68.3% of “Learner licensee failed to display an "L" plate’ offences where the gender could be identified
- From 2009-2014, 19 year olds accounted for 32.4% of the ‘Learner licensee failed to display an "L" plate’ offences
- From 2009-2014, 82.6% of Learner licensee failed to display an "L" plate’ infringement offences were referred to Court unpaid. Compliance accounted for 5.7% of the Police outcomes, 0.2% in 2011 and 7.7% in 2014
In 2009, 93.6% of the ‘Learner licensee’ failed to display an “L” plate infringement offences that resulted in a fine were referred to Court unpaid. In 2014, 77.3% of the infringement offences that resulted in a fine were referred to Court unpaid.

‘Learner Driver Unaccompanied’

- The total number of ‘Learner Driver Unaccompanied’ offences has decreased by 7.9% from 2009-2014. From 2009-2014, 19 year olds accounted for 31.8% of the ‘Learner Driver Unaccompanied’ offences.
- Males accounted for 67.3% of ‘Learner Driver Unaccompanied’ offences, where the gender could be identified.
- From 2009-2014, 81.7% of Learner Driver Unaccompanied’ infringement offences were referred to Court unpaid. Compliance accounted for 1% of the Police outcomes, 0.2% in 2010 and 3.1% in 2014.
- In 2009, 92.3% of the ‘Learner Driver Unaccompanied’ infringement offences that resulted in a fine were referred to Court unpaid. In 2014, 74.8% of the infringement offences that resulted in a fine were referred to Court unpaid.

Learner Driver ‘Other’ Offences

- The total number of Learner Driver ‘Other’ offences has increased by 58.1% from 2009-2014. From 2009-2014, 18 year olds accounted for 27.8% of these offences.
- Males accounted for 75.6% of Learner Driver ‘Other’ offences, where the gender could be identified.
- From 2009-2014, 71.6% of Learner Driver ‘Other’ infringement offences were referred to Court unpaid. Compliance accounted for 1.4% of the Police outcomes, 0.2% in 2010 and 2.6% in 2014.
- In 2009, 86.2% of the Learner Driver ‘Other’ infringement offences that resulted in a fine were referred to Court unpaid. In 2014, 69.5% of the infringement offences that resulted in a fine were referred to Court unpaid.

Learner overview

- The total national number of GDLS ‘Learner’ offences has increased by 5.1% from 2009 (28583 offences) to 2014 (30056 offences).
- The national average percentage of GDLS ‘Learner’ offences, when expressed as a percentage of the total number of traffic offences, has increased by 69% from 2009 (14.5%) to 2014 (24.5%).
- In 2014 the national average percentage of GDLS ‘Learner’ offences, when expressed as a percentage of the total number of traffic offences was 24.5%. In 2014, the Police districts: Northland (32.2%), Eastern (30.2%), Counties Manukau (29.3%), Central (25.9%) and Bay Of Plenty (25.5%) were above the national average percentage.
- From 2009-2014, 96.2% of all GDLS ‘Learner’ offences, resulted in an infringement fee outcome.
- From 2009-2014, 79.3% of all GDLS ‘Learner’ offences, that resulted in an infringement fee, were referred to Court unpaid.
- The national average of fines referred to Court unpaid for GDLS ‘Learner’ offences has decreased by 18.7% from 2009 (91.9%) to 2014 (74.7%)
- By 2014 49.3% of the fines referred to Collections for Learner offences, in 2009, had been paid

GDLS Breach Offences – Restricted Offences
- Across all the Police districts the highest number of Restricted driver offences were: ‘Restricted Driver Carries Unauthorised Passenger’ and ‘Restricted Driver Unaccompanied Between 10pm And 5am’

‘Restricted Driver Unaccompanied Between 10pm And 5am’
- The total number of ‘Restricted Driver Unaccompanied Between 10pm And 5am’ offences has decreased by 29.4% from 2009-2014. From 2009-2014, 18 year olds accounted for 31.3% of the Restricted Driver Unaccompanied Between 10pm And 5am’ offences
- Males accounted for 77.2% of ‘Restricted Driver Unaccompanied Between 10pm And 5am’ offences, where the gender could be identified
- From 2009-2014, 56.9% of Restricted Driver Unaccompanied Between 10pm And 5am’ infringement offences were referred to Court unpaid. Compliance accounted for 1.3% of the Police outcomes, 0.3% in 2010 and 5% in 2014
- In 2009, 70.3% of the ‘Restricted Driver Unaccompanied Between 10pm And 5am’ infringement offences that resulted in a fine were referred to Court unpaid. In 2014, 49.4% of the infringement offences that resulted in a fine were referred to Court unpaid

‘Restricted Driver Carries Unauthorised Passenger’
- The total number of ‘Restricted Driver Carries Unauthorised Passenger’ offences has decreased by 46.3% from 2009-2014. From 2009-2014, 17 year olds accounted for 30.1% of these offences
- Males accounted for 75.2% of ‘Restricted Driver Carries Unauthorised Passenger’ offences, where the gender could be identified
- From 2009-2014, 57.3% of ‘Restricted Driver Carries Unauthorised Passenger’ infringement offences were referred to Court unpaid. Compliance accounted for 1% of the Police outcomes, 0.1% in 2010 and 3.8% in 2014
- In 2009, 73.5% of the Restricted Driver Carries Unauthorised Passenger’ infringement offences that resulted in a fine were referred to Court unpaid. In 2014, 44.7% of the infringement offences that resulted in a fine were referred to Court unpaid
Restricted Driver ‘Other’ Offences

- The total number of Restricted Driver ‘Other’ offences has increased by 24.1% from 2009-2014. From 2009-2014, 18 year olds accounted for 30.8% of the Restricted Driver ‘Other’ offences
- Males accounted for 78.1% of Restricted Driver ‘Other’ offences, where the gender could be identified
- From 2009-2014, 59.5% of Restricted Driver ‘Other’ infringement offences were referred to Court unpaid. Compliance accounted for 1.9% of the Police outcomes, 0.3% in 2010 and 5.4% in 2014
- In 2009, 73.5% of the Restricted Driver ‘Other’ infringement offences that resulted in a fine were referred to Court unpaid. In 2014, 49.3% of the infringement offences that resulted in a fine were referred to Court unpaid

Restricted overview

- The total national number of GDLS ‘Restricted’ offences has decreased by 40.2% from 2009 (21312 offences) to 2014 (12738 offences)
- The national average percentage of GDLS ‘Restricted’ offences, when expressed as a percentage of the total number of traffic offences, has decreased by 4.8% from 2009 (10.5%) to 2014 (10%)
- In 2014 the national average percentage of GDLS ‘Restricted’ offences, when expressed as a percentage of the total number of traffic offences was 10%. In 2014, the Police districts: Tasman (12.9%), Southern (12.5%), Wellington (11.5%), Bay Of Plenty (11.1%), Canterbury (10.9%), Waikato (10.8%), Waitemata (10.8%) and Central (10.6%) were above the national average percentage
- From 2009-2014, 96.9% of all GDLS ‘Restricted’ offences, resulted in an infringement fee outcome
- From 2009-2014, 57.2% of all GDLS ‘Restricted’ offences, that resulted in an infringement fee, were referred to Court unpaid
- The national average of fines referred to Court unpaid for GDLS ‘Restricted’ offences has decreased by 37.4% from 2009 (72.8%) to 2014 (45.6%)
- In 2014 the national average of fines referred to Court unpaid for GDLS ‘Restricted’ offences was 45.6%. The Police districts: Central (51.1%), Northland (49.8%), Wellington (49.4%), Canterbury (49.3%), Bay Of Plenty (46.2%), Waikato (46.1%) and Tasman (46%) were above the national average
- By 2014 61.5% of the fines referred to Collections for GDLS ‘Restricted’ offences, in 2009, had been paid

Unlicensed Driving and GDLS Breach Remittal Outcomes

- The total national amount of monetary fines imposed for collection for all the GDLS and Unlicensed driving infringement offence fines referred to Collections in 2009 was $18,897,072.
- By 2014, $7,680,946 of the fines referred to Collections were remitted. Of the total amount of monies remitted 59.1% were replaced with Community Work
Drink and Drug Driving

- The total number of Drink and Drug driving offences has fallen, significantly, every year and decreased by 62.3% from 2009-2014. From 2009-2014, 19 year olds accounted for 40.8% of the Drink and Drug driving offences
- Males accounted for 75.4% of Drink and Drug driving offences, where the gender could be identified
- From 2009-2014, 85.2% of Drink and Drug driving offences were convicted in Court, 92.3% in 2009 and 77.7% in 2014
- The total number of repeat offences has fallen, significantly, every year from 2009-2014
- In 2011, 59.1% of the Drink Driving infringement offences that resulted in a fine were referred to Court unpaid. In 2014, 59.4% of the infringement offences that resulted in a fine were referred to Court unpaid

Drink and Drug Driving Overview

- The total national number of Drink and Drug driving offences has decreased by 62.3% from 2009 (8136 offences) to 2014 (3069 offences). 19 year olds accounted for 40.8% of the Drink and Drug driving offences
- Males accounted for 75.4% of Drink and Drug driving offences
- The national average percentage of Drink and Drug driving offences, when expressed as a percentage of the total number of traffic offences, has decreased by 38.1% from 2009 (4.2%) to 2014 (2.6%)
- In 2014 the national average percentage of Drink and Drug driving offences, when expressed as a percentage of the total number of traffic offences was 2.6%. In 2014, the Police districts: Auckland (3.5%), Eastern (3.3%), Bay Of Plenty (2.8%) and Northland (2.7%) were above the national average percentage
- From 2011-2014, 15.9% of all Drink and Drug driving offences, resulted in an infringement fee outcome
- From 2011-2014, 61.7% of all Drink Driving offences, that resulted in an infringement fee, were referred to Court unpaid
- The national average of fines referred to Court unpaid for Drink Driving offences has decreased by 2.8% from 2012 (63.3%) to 2014 (61.5%)
- In 2014 the national average of fines referred to Court unpaid for Drink Driving offences was 61.5%. The Police districts: Bay Of Plenty (67.5%), Northland (66.7%), Eastern (65.6%), Central (65.5%) and Counties Manukau (65.3%) were above the national average
Drink and Drug Driving Collections

- By 2014 67.6% of the fines referred to Collections for Drink Driving offences had been paid
- The national average of Drink Driving fines referred to Collections in 2012 by amounts paid by 2014 was 68%. The Police districts: Northland (54.1%), Canterbury (57.8%), Tasman (60.5%), Bay Of Plenty (62.1%), Eastern (63.1%), Wellington (63.9%) and Waikato (67.9%) were below the national average

Repeat Offences

- The total national number of repeat Drink and Drug driving offences has decreased, significantly, by 84.9% from 2009 (2503 offences) to 2014 (377 offences)
- The national average percentage of repeat Drink and Drug driving offences, when expressed as a percentage of the total number of traffic offences, has decreased, significantly, by 76.9% from 2009 (1.3%) to 2014 (0.3%)
- In 2014 the national average percentage of repeat Drink and Drug driving offences, when expressed as a percentage of the total number of traffic offences was 0.3%. In 2014, the Police districts: Auckland (0.4%), Counties Manukau (0.4%), and Waitemata (0.4%) were above the national average percentage

Drink Driving Remittal Outcomes

- The total national amount of monetary fines imposed for collection for all the Drink Driving infringement offence fines referred to Collections in 2012 was $137,693
- By 2014, $16,606 of the fines referred to Collections were remitted. Of the total amount of monies remitted 55.1% were replaced with Community Work
Discussion

This is a comprehensive review of the relevant data on youth Unlicensed, GDLS Breach and Drink and Drug driving offences and offending in New Zealand, over the period 2009-2014. It documents and organises a unique and detailed set of data within the context of the relevant regulation and legislative information. The report has been able to focus on the overlapping areas of licensing, offending and offenders. This could only have been undertaken with a collaborative and supportive association with all relevant government departments involved.

This is an exhaustive and in-depth review of offence statistics related to youth, aged 14-19 years, over the period 2009-2014.

Obtaining these data and completing the associated analyses has been a major task. As with Phase 1 of this project, the collaborative involvement of government agencies was critical to Phase 2. Recognition needs to be given to all those involved who have achieved this. It is hoped that this ‘Whole of government’ involvement in the project will continue and grow as the project progresses.

Overall Traffic Offending – Significant decreases

Whilst not part of the specific research involved in this paper, it is noteworthy that the total national youth traffic offences have decreased by a noteworthy 38.2% from 2009-2014. It would be of benefit to explore the factors involved in this decrease in more detail, as this kind of decrease is exceptional internationally and deserves greater explanation in particular to identify the contribution if any, from the relatively innovative interventions that New Zealand has initiated, particularly for youth offending, across the justice spectrum.

Increased Minimum Licence Age – no perverse consequences on unlicensed driving

The introduction, in August 2011, of the legislative change raising the minimum Learner licensing age from 15 to 16 years of age has not resulted in an large increase of ‘Drove without appropriate driver licence’ offences for the 15-19 age group, and the majority of districts are continuing a downward trend in unlicensed driving that starts at our data gathering year in 2009.

Drink driving offences – significant decreases

The total number of Drink and Drug driving offences has fallen, significantly, every year and decreased by 62.3% from 2009-2014 as has the repeat offending which has also decreased, significantly, by 84.9% from 2009 to 2014. It could be suggested that the introduction of zero alcohol legislation for youth introduced in August 2011 has reinforced the downward trend that we see at the start of our data gathering in 2009.

Restricted licence offences – decreased offending

We are seeing a decreasing number of offences for all the GDLS ‘Restricted Driver’ Breaches and significantly more infringement fines paid than referred to Court unpaid. The national average of fines referred to Court unpaid for GDLS ‘Restricted’ offences has decreased by 37.4% from 2009 (72.8%) to 2014 (45.6%). This is a positive trend that would be useful to duplicate elsewhere, and deserves further investigation.

Learner licence offences - significantly increased offending
GDLS ‘Learner Driver’ Breaches are increasing. The national average percentage of GDLS ‘Learner’ offences, when expressed as a percentage of the total number of traffic offences, has increased by 69% from 2009 (14.5%) to 2014 (24.5%). District patterns vary but there appears to be an increase after 2011, when the Restricted test was made more difficult.

There are more females involved in Learner offences than in other types of driver licence offending (Unlicensed, or Restricted).

The vast majority of Learner licence offenders do not pay their fines before referral to Collections. This is in stark contrast to Restricted licence offenders.

The national average of fines referred to Court unpaid for GDLS ‘Learner’ offences has decreased by 18.7% from 2009 (91.9%) to 2014 (74.7%). Whilst this is not as great a reduction in fines referred to Court as the GDLS ‘Restricted Driver’ Breach offences, this is also significant and worthy of further investigation as to the factors involved in decisions to pay fines on time.

Conversely the national average of fines referred to Court unpaid for ‘Drove Without Appropriate Driver Licence’ offences has decreased by only 1% from 2009 (89.9%) to 2014 (89.2%), from 2009-2014. It may be of benefit to investigate the usefulness of the infringement response for this offence.

Age and offending

As the age increases in the data so do the number of offences, though 18 year olds account for the majority of Restricted Driver Unaccompanied Between 10pm And 5am’ offences and Learner and Restricted Driver ‘Other’ offences. ‘Restricted Driver Carries Unauthorised Passenger’ offences peak at 17 year olds and decline as the age increases.

Regional variation

A key purpose of the paper was to not only identify priority offences but also districts. The Police districts Bay Of Plenty and Eastern appear most frequently in Police Districts above the national averages across all offences covered by this paper.

Ethnicity data

Ethnicity data is limited to a tiny subset of the data, being only recorded for Court appearances. In this instance, only for repeat unlicensed driving and for drink driving over the 0.03 BAC limit. Given the caveat of the small samples there are distinctly different ethnicity patterns between the drink driving and unlicensed driving Court offences. Whilst complete analysis of the data was not a priority, the findings are suggestive and we strongly recommend further investigation to determine if there are systemic settings for entering the driver licence system that bias against deprivation, location and/or cultural metrics. For example, from the ethnicity data in Auckland Police District 2009-2014, Pacific ethnicity accounted for 14.3% of the total youth population, but 51.1% of the ‘Unlicensed Driver Failed To Comply With Prohibition’ cases. The entire ethnicity data should be reviewed to identify over-representation by ethnicity populations. Indeed it would be desirable that the entirety of the data contained within this paper be thoroughly analysed.

Compliance

For some cases of driver licence offending, Police are able to offer compliance; for example a person driving unsupervised on a Learner licence can avoid a fine by obtaining their Restricted licence, requiring
them to demonstrate (or increase) their road safety skills and competence. For all such driver licence offences, compliance outcomes have increased significantly (albeit from a very low base). We recommend investigating further the factors that have supported increased compliance outcomes.

Recommendations for Further Research

Districts

A key purpose of this paper was to identify priority districts regarding the offences covered by this paper. The paper identifies that the Police districts Bay Of Plenty and Eastern appear most frequently in districts that are above the national average offence percentages and should be the focus of any signature programmes or initiatives for attempted reductions, and more positive outcomes, regarding the offences and offending covered by this paper.

As above note recommended research on: decrease in traffic offending; increased Learner licence offending; ethnicity issues; and increase in compliance outcomes.

Other Recommendations

- **Police Data**
  The NZ Police should investigate the linking of offenders and offences regarding traffic infringement offences

- **GDLS ‘Double’ Infringement Data**
  Whilst this data was not included in the paper at the national or Police district level, it would be desirable to investigate this further

- **NZTA Data**
  The New Zealand Transport Agency should investigate the ability to produce Licensed Driving Population and other driver data by Police district

- **Infringements**
  Effectiveness of infringement based response for unlicensed driving need to be investigated, particularly given the significant differences between Restricted driver licence fine payment rates, and Learner and unlicensed driver fine payment rates.

- **Data integration and integrity**
  A reference group of data analysts should be established from relevant stakeholders/agencies and meetings set up to discuss data limitations, ability to data share effectively and any planned upgrades to data systems. A detailed review of the data within this paper and proposed hypotheses would also be desirable

- **Literature Review**
  As was the recommendation of Phase 1; an International literature review of initiatives/interventions used to tackle youth driving offending should be undertaken so as to assist agencies develop responses to the data gathered here, and design interventions that may be more effective than current penalties.
• **Road Safety** While this research did not investigate crash and injury data, per Police district, the relation between offending and injury data would be of benefit to better understand the importance of offences and penalties on road safety outcomes, and interventions that deal with underlying motivations for the unsafe road behaviours displayed by these offences.

• **Fiscal and economic analysis of penalties**
  It would be desirable for a fiscal and economic study of the infringement based response for youth traffic offences to be carried out by the Ministry of Transport, to estimate the total cost of the downstream justice sector outcomes and possible alternatives.
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