



# MCIA MEMBER CONSULTATION TOOLKIT

IMPROVING MOPED AND  
MOTORCYCLE TRAINING,  
TESTING AND LICENSING

**DATE:**  
APRIL 2026

# MCIA MEMBER CONSULTATION - TOOLKIT

## Improving Moped and Motorcycle Training, Testing and Licensing

### Introduction

---

As announced in the Road Safety Strategy, the Government is consulting on significant changes to motorcycle and moped licensing, training and testing. This is a key moment for the sector and builds on long-standing industry calls for reform.

A high volume of responses will strengthen the collective voice of the industry and help ensure reforms reflect real-world use of powered two-wheelers (PTWs).

Licensing reform is not just a road safety issue. It directly affects customer access, vehicle sales, workforce mobility, and any future transition to low and zero emission vehicles. If the system becomes more complex or restrictive, customers and riders will not disappear, but they will move towards illegal or unregulated alternatives, undermining both safety and enforcement, and ultimately, negatively impacting the number of mopeds and motorcycles on the road in future years.

This consultation is therefore a key opportunity to ensure the licensing system supports safe, legal uptake of PTWs, rather than creating barriers that limit access. MCIA will be submitting a detailed response, and we strongly encourage members to submit their own.

The consultation can be found [here](#).

### How to Respond

---

Responses can be submitted via the [online questionnaire](#).

Alternatively, written responses can be sent to the DVSA Policy Team at [consultations@dvs.gov.uk](mailto:consultations@dvs.gov.uk).

### How to Use This Toolkit

---

- Copy and paste the suggested responses below directly into your submission, or adapt them where relevant to reflect your business experience.
- Include a short introduction explaining your role in the sector. For example:

[Business name] is responding as a [manufacturer / retailer / training provider / dealer] within the UK moped and motorcycling / L-Category sector. We support improvements to road safety, but licensing reform must also improve accessibility, support economic activity, and avoid unintended displacement into illegal or unregulated vehicles.

- Where possible, include brief, real-world examples from your business to strengthen your submission. For example:
  - Customer drop off or lost sales linked to licensing complexity or cost
  - Common questions or confusion from customers about CBT, progression, or licence categories
  - Impact of licensing barriers on entry level vehicle demand (e.g. 50cc / 125cc segments)
  - Growth in customer interest in electric models and any barriers created by current licensing rules
  - Observed shift towards illegal or non-compliant e-bikes affecting your business or local market
  - Challenges customers face accessing training or tests (e.g. waiting times, travel distances)
  - Use of PTWs for delivery or commuting in your area
  - Any internal data or trends (even anecdotal) that show how licensing affects uptake or progression.

## **Consultation Questions – Suggested Responses**

---

### **Q1: Do you agree or disagree that riders who complete CBT on an automatic machine should be restricted to ride automatic-only machines?**

We agree that riders who complete CBT on an automatic machine should be restricted to automatic-only PTWs, as they have not demonstrated competence in manual transmission skills.

However, riders who complete CBT on a manual machine should be permitted to ride both manual and automatic vehicles, as manual training inherently demonstrates a broader skill set.

This approach is clear, proportionate, and aligns entitlement with demonstrated competence.

### **Q1a: If you agree, how should a learner rider, whose CBT entitlement is restricted to riding automatic motorcycles only, be able to upgrade that entitlement to allow them to ride manual motorcycles?**

A short, focused “upgrade” course should be introduced for riders moving from automatic to manual machines.

This should concentrate solely on clutch control and gear selection.

A full CBT retake would be disproportionate, duplicative, and unnecessary given the rider has already demonstrated core roadcraft. This approach also avoids unnecessary cost and complexity for customers, particularly for first-time riders entering the market.

### **Q2: Do you agree or disagree that DVSA should introduce the motorcycle theory (including hazard perception) test or training to the CBT process?**

We support the introduction of theory and hazard perception testing as part of the CBT process. Strengthening knowledge and hazard awareness at an early stage is an important step in improving road safety outcomes.

However, this should be developed as a single, unified theory and hazard perception test across PTWs, cars and vans, rather than separate tests for each mode.

Many PTW collisions involve other road users. A unified approach would improve mutual awareness and understanding across all road users, which is critical to reducing incidents.

A unified system would reduce duplication, add efficiencies into the regime, lower costs, and create a consistent baseline of knowledge across the transport system.

### **Q2a: If you agree, how should the motorcycle theory and hazard perception test or training form part of the CBT process?**

The theory and hazard perception test should ideally be completed before an individual applies for a provisional licence, ensuring a consistent baseline of road knowledge across all users entering the system.

Once completed, it should not need to be repeated when moving between vehicle categories, as this would create unnecessary duplication and cost.

**Q3: Do you agree or disagree that DVSA should introduce a progressive access training course to upgrade a rider's licence without the need to complete a further test carried out by a DVSA examiner?**

We support the introduction of progressive access training as an alternative to repeated DVSA testing.

The current system does not effectively encourage progression, with many riders remaining on CBT rather than advancing their skills.

A structured, training-led progression model would improve rider competence over time while making progression more accessible, reducing cost and administrative burden.

This will help move riders out of repeated CBT cycles and into safer, more advanced riding. This is particularly important given the low levels of progression beyond CBT combined with the massive rise of the gig-economy workforce.

This approach reflects how competence develops in practice – through experience and structured upskilling – rather than repeated entry-level testing.

**Q3a: If you agree, do you agree or disagree that only a qualified DAS instructor should provide progressive access training?**

Progressive access training should be delivered by qualified Direct Access Scheme (DAS) instructors within Approved Training Bodies.

These instructors are already responsible for assessing rider competence and are well placed to deliver enhanced training and progression, provided appropriate standards and oversight are maintained.

**Q4: Do you agree or disagree with the introduction of mandatory syllabuses for these other types of approved training should they be introduced?**

*Automatic to Manual upgrade course:*

We support the introduction of a structured syllabus for automatic-to-manual upgrade training.

This will ensure consistency, maintain safety standards, and provide clarity for both riders and training providers.

*A progressive access training course:*

A structured syllabus for progressive access training is essential to ensure that progression routes deliver meaningful skill development.

This should not replicate CBT but instead build on existing competencies and prepare riders for full licence standard.

**Q4a: Do you agree or disagree with the proposed minor revisions that we are suggesting to the CBT syllabus?**

Agree – we support the proposed minor revisions to the CBT syllabus.

**Q4b: Do you agree or disagree with taking the approved training course (CBT) syllabus out of legislation?**

We support removing the CBT syllabus from legislation to allow for more responsive and timely updates.

However, robust safeguards must be in place to ensure changes are evidence-based and subject to proper stakeholder consultation.

**Q5: Do you agree or disagree that there should be changes made to the way in which motorcycle instructors qualify?**

We support improvements to instructor qualifications and quality assurance processes to ensure consistent, high-quality training across the sector.

As training becomes more central to progression, it is essential that instructors are appropriately qualified and supported.

**Q5a: If you agree, which of these options do you support?**

We support a more integrated qualification framework.

We also support additional qualifications for instructors involved in progression or “down-training” activity to improve consistency.

**Q5b: Do you agree or disagree that existing motorcycle instructors who hold the authorisation to down-train other motorcycle instructors should retain this authorisation once the new qualification assessment is introduced?**

Existing instructors who are already authorised to down-train others should retain this authorisation.

This will maintain training capacity and avoid disruption during implementation of any new system.

**Q6: Do you agree or disagree that the validity period of the CBT certificate should be changed from the current two year period?**

We do not support changing the CBT validity period from two years in isolation.

The core issue is not the duration of CBT, but the absence of a clear and structured progression pathway within the system.

Instead, we support a progressive model where:

- CBT is completed and valid for two years
- Followed by an advanced ‘CBT Plus’, focused on advanced skills and roadcraft, valid for a further two years
- Followed by a full AM or A1 licence assessment.

This approach focuses on upskilling riders over time, rather than simply repeating the same entry-level training, and is more likely to improve competence and safety outcomes.

Reform should therefore prioritise progression and skill development, not restrict access or reduce flexibility.

**Q6b: Should we require a minimum time period after a CBT certificate expires before allowing someone to take another CBT course?**

We strongly oppose introducing a waiting period before retaking CBT.

Riders still need to travel for work and daily life. Restricting access to legal mobility is unlikely to improve safety outcomes and risks pushing riders into illegal or unregulated alternatives, including illegal e-bikes.

This would undermine both road safety and enforcement.

Riders should be encouraged to progress through licensing, rather than forcing otherwise compliant riders out of the legal system. Government should implement a CBT Plus-style regime, whereby the rider would be upskilled after two years of riding on CBT and then progress to a full licence – as per Q6.

**Q7: Do you agree or disagree with implementing a digital platform for CBT?**

We strongly support the implementation of a digital CBT platform.

A centralised system, like the MOT platform, would improve compliance, reduce fraud, and provide better data for policymakers and enforcement bodies.

Digitalisation would also improve efficiency for training providers and riders.

**Additional Points**

---

You may also wish to highlight:

- Impact of licensing complexity on customer conversion or sales.
- Test availability and DVSA capacity constraints.
- A single-event test, rather than the separate Module 1 and Module 2, should be pursued.
- Impact on younger riders or workforce mobility.
- Growth of illegal e-bikes and effect on your business.
- Importance of PTWs for affordable transport and delivery/logistics.
- Impact of licensing system on customer uptake of electric variants.
- Government already possesses the powers required to deliver meaningful reform through secondary legislation.

**Final Steps**

---

- Introduce your business and why this consultation is relevant to your interests.
- Copy and amend the answers above.
- Supplement using your own experiences, or those of your business – even if examples are brief, they will still add weight to the submission.
- Include a closing paragraph or conclusion which summarises the arguments made previously:
  - Licensing reform must improve safety while also improving access.
  - If the system is too complex or restrictive, riders will be pushed towards illegal alternatives.
  - Reform must encourage progression, improve training quality, and make the system more accessible and efficient.