

Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026

Submission No: 031
Submission By: Office of the Victims' Commissioner
Publication: Making the submission and your name public

Office of the Victims' Commissioner

Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026

Submission to the Education, Arts and
Communities Committee

8 October 2026

Introduction

The Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026 (the Bill) aims to strengthen justice responses to domestic and family violence, streamline Queensland Police Service (QPS) responses and improve court processes for victim-survivors by:

- expanding protections for victims-survivors when giving evidence in proceedings under the *Domestic and Family Violence Protection Act 2012* (DFVP Act) and establishing a framework to regulate access to sensitive evidence,
- creating new offences for repeated contraventions of Domestic Violence Orders (DVO) and Police Protection Directions (PPD) and increasing the penalty for breaching a PPD,
- expanding the electronic monitoring pilot that is currently limited to Caboolture and Townsville to the whole state, and
- abolishing Police Protection Notices (PPN) and removing many of the existing restrictions on issuing a PPD.

Domestic and family violence is a complex and persistent social and criminal justice challenge, with devastating and far too often lethal impacts on victims, families and communities.

I warmly support the amendments in the Bill that will improve protections for victim-survivors giving evidence in court and provide protection for sensitive information.

Systems abuse is a real and pervasive issue that is worthy of more serious recognition by legislators. We must continue to identify how and where perpetrators of violence use our justice system to intimidate and further abuse their victims and put a stop to it.

I support the objectives of increasing perpetrator accountability through the introduction of new offences which recognise an escalating pattern of behaviour. However, I am concerned that the complexity of these offences will encourage plea negotiations that may result in inconsistent responses across the state, reduced accountability for perpetrators and delay for victims.

I support in-principle the expansion of the electronic monitoring pilot statewide. However, I would like to better understand the justification for removing the requirement for courts to consider the victim's views and wishes before making an electronic monitoring device order. I would also like further information about the resourcing arrangements to provide the necessary support for victims across the whole of the state.

Providing QPS with the right tools is a vital part of Queensland's response to the scourge of domestic and family violence. I understand and support the objective of driving increased efficiency in the QPS response.

However, I hold concerns about implications for victims' safety with respect to some of the amendments that remove restrictions on the issuing of PPD. Court orders must remain as an important independent source of decision making for complex and high-risk matters. Further, independent oversight of these vastly expanded police powers and responsibilities will be vital to maintaining both community and victim-survivor support for these reforms.

I am concerned that if victim-survivors do not have confidence in the integrity of the QPS response, they may not seek help from police, to the detriment of their own safety and that of their families.

I support the recommendations made to this Committee by the Crime and Corruption Commission and urge the Committee to accept those recommendations and include them in their own recommendations to Parliament on this Bill.

This Committee will have the benefit of learning from the wisdom of frontline workers in the domestic and family violence sector and specialist lawyers who work alongside Police every day to protect victims of domestic and family violence.

I urge this Committee to listen to the suggestions for amendments put forward by frontline workers and advocacy organisations to strengthen this Bill.

I also ask the Committee to consider recommending to Parliament ways for involving frontline workers in the implementation and oversight of the reforms. Their expertise and experience in supporting victims are critical to ensuring reforms operate effectively to protect the safety of victims of domestic and family violence in Queensland.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'KC' followed by a long horizontal stroke.

Kate Connors

Victims' Commissioner

Note on language

I use the term 'victim' and 'victim-survivor' throughout this submission. I acknowledge some individuals may prefer 'victim' as it emphasises their experience of harm, while 'victim-survivor' acknowledges the ongoing impacts of crime and highlights the strength and resilience of individuals with lived experience. By incorporating both terms, I hope to honour these perspectives. I may also use the term 'victim' when referring to legislation as it is a term commonly used in legal frameworks.

Role of the Victims' Commissioner

The role of the Victims' Commissioner is established under the *Victims' Commissioner and Sexual Violence Review Board Act 2024 (Qld)* (VCSVRB Act). My role is to protect and promote the rights and needs of victims of crime. My statutory functions include:

- Providing information to victims of crime to help them navigate the criminal justice system
- Dealing with complaints under the Charter of Victims' Rights
- Conducting systemic reviews
- Listening to victims to hear about their own, lived experiences
- Advocating for victims' rights by making recommendations and providing advice to government and non-government entities about improvements to policy, practices, procedures and systems to uphold the rights of victims and better meet their needs.
- Monitoring the implementation of recommendations.

Under section 6 of the VCSVRB Act, a victim includes a person who suffers harm because a criminal offence (including domestic violence) is committed against the person. This includes:

- people who have a criminal offence committed against them directly
- family members or dependants of a person who has a criminal offence committed against them
- people who are harmed because they helped another person who had a criminal offence committed against them
- witnesses of crimes.¹

The VCSVRB Act defines harm as including physical, psychological or emotional harm, damage to or loss of property, and financial or economic loss.² This definition recognises the range of impacts that a crime can have on an individual.

Victims' Commissioner's submission on the Bill

The objectives of the Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026 (the Bill) are to 'strengthen justice responses to persons using violence, streamline police responses to domestic and family violence (DFV), and improve the accessibility and safety of court processes for victim-survivors'.³

My submission focuses on the key features of the Bill:

- expanding protections for victims-survivors when giving evidence in proceedings under the *Domestic and Family Violence Protection Act 2012* (DFVP Act) and establishing a framework to regulate access to sensitive evidence,
- creating new offences for repeated contraventions of Domestic Violence Orders (DVO) and Police Protection Directions (PPD) and increasing the penalty for breaching a PPD,
- expanding the electronic monitoring pilot that is currently limited to Caboolture and Townsville to the whole state, and
- abolishing Police Protection Notices (PPN) and removing many of the existing restrictions on issuing PPD.

Greater protection for victims in court proceedings

The Bill proposes to amend the cross-examination provisions in Part 6A of the DFVP Act to broaden circumstances in which personal cross-examination is restricted and to expand the definition of 'protected witness'.

Clauses 40 and 41 of the Bill expand the protected witness regime so that victim-survivors remain protected in cross-order and subsequent DFV proceedings. The clauses also extend existing powers to prevent direct personal cross-examination by self-represented parties where that questioning could cause emotional harm, intimidation or facilitate systems abuse.

I warmly welcome these proposed amendments. Many victims have shared with me their experiences of systems abuse both in state-based proceedings and the Family Court. This form of abuse is also well documented in research literature.⁴ It is important that Parliament gives clear direction to the courts that there is an expectation that systems abuse is identified and minimised in proceedings involving domestic and family

violence. This is not only in the interests of preventing the secondary abuse of a victim-survivor, but also in the interests of justice – as the National Domestic and Family Violence Bench Book already recognises:

Where a self-represented perpetrator wishes to cross-examine the victim, the victim's capacity to give evidence or the quality of the victim's evidence in these circumstances may be compromised by the victim's fear of the perpetrator and, as a consequence, the probative value of the evidence may be diminished or negated.⁵

These new protections are further supported by proposed amendments at clauses 42 to 44 of the Bill to establish a new statutory regime for 'sensitive material' in DFV civil proceedings. The reforms create:

- a new category of protected evidence, (including statements made under section 93A of the *Evidence Act 1977* (Qld) and other sensitive recordings)
- remove any automatic entitlement for parties to access that material
- empower courts to control viewing and copying
- provide supervised access arrangements for self-represented parties
- restrict media access
- rely on existing criminal offences to deter unauthorised copying or dissemination.

New offences for repeated contraventions of PPD and DVO

Clauses 15 and 27 of the Bill propose the creation of new offences for repeated contravention of a PPD and a DVO respectively. The offences apply where a respondent commits three or more contraventions involving the same protected person within a 28-day period.

The reforms are intended to strengthen accountability for persistent non-compliance, recognise patterns of escalating domestic and family violence behaviour, and ensure that repeated breaches of protection measures are treated more seriously by the criminal justice system.

I am very supportive of the recognition of the seriousness of escalating behaviours. It is a pattern of repetitive abusive behaviour that is often presented in complaints and submissions to my office. I would also note that many complaints and submissions to my office, by victims of domestic and family violence, report either a slow or non-existent

response to reports of multiple breaches of protection orders from the Queensland Police Service (QPS). This means many victims simply give up and stop reporting breaches. Victim experiences shared with my office are validated by evidence discussed at the most recent parliamentary estimates hearings.⁶ The new offences must be accompanied by a sustained focus on improving the speed and quality of QPS responses to have the intended effect.

I am also concerned about the myriad of options this creates for a prosecutor and how this will impact implementation of these reforms based on what victims are telling me about current police responses to multiple breaches in time frames. The Bill provides that the prosecutor can choose only one of the following options: :

- prosecute three or more individual contraventions of the PPD or DVO separately or;
- prosecute under one of the new 'multiple breach offences'

A prosecutor would not be able to choose both because this would offend the current protections in the Criminal Code against being punished twice for the same offence⁷.

If one of the contraventions of the PPD or DVO is also an indictable offence, the perpetrator could also be prosecuted separately for each single contravention, under the new offences and/or for the indictable offence.⁸ These overlapping options will create fertile ground for significant charge and plea negotiations and, potentially, inconsistent approaches by prosecutors and prosecuting bodies across the state.

I am concerned this may result in serious indictable offences being prosecuted as mere contraventions. With final prosecution being delayed or adjourned while waiting for accumulated evidence of contraventions to be obtained. This would result in victims being left with long periods of uncertainty.

Under the Charter of Victims' Rights, victims have the right to be treated with respect, courtesy, compassion, and dignity. They also have a right to be informed about each major decision made about the prosecution (including the reasons for the decision) and the sentence imposed.⁹ In combination, these rights place an obligation on QPS and prosecutors to ensure that those reasons are clearly explained to victims and understood by them.

The Director of Public Prosecutions Guidelines (the Director's Guidelines) emphasise the importance of consultation with victims in charge negotiations.¹⁰

I also note that the Director's Guidelines apply to the prosecution of all indictable offences in Queensland. As both of the proposed offences are indictable, the Director's

Guidelines will apply even when those offences are prosecuted by the QPS Police Prosecution Corps in the Magistrates Court, where the new offences will frequently be disposed of summarily.

However, the experience of victims who have contacted my office indicates that the Director's Guidelines are not always followed, and there can be significant regional variations in practice.

I would urge the Committee to recommend to Parliament that the Department of Families, Seniors, Disability Services and Child Safety, the Department of Justice and Queensland Police Service work together with the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions' (ODPP) and the Domestic and Family Violence and Sexual Violence Peaks to develop further guidance to support the implementation of these reforms.

This guidance should be incorporated into the ODPP's Domestic and Family Violence Handbook and the QPS Operational Procedures Manual, and be supported by additional training,¹¹ for QPS and prosecutors.

These measures would help ensure victims' rights are upheld, and that victim safety is supported consistently across the state.

Given that clause 2 of the Bill provides for commencement upon proclamation, ideally this would take place before the commencement date for the new offences.

Expanding the electronic monitoring pilot

Clause 56 of the Bill proposes to significantly expand Queensland's Electronic Monitoring Pilot by extending its operation from Townsville and Caboolture to all Magistrates Courts across the state. I support this expansion in principle because of the potential to increase safety for victims and provide them with greater peace of mind.

I am concerned however that clause 9 of the Bill proposes that courts actively consider imposing Monitoring Device Conditions (MDC) in appropriate cases, while removing the requirement for the court to consider the aggrieved's views and wishes when determining whether MDC should be imposed.

Victim agency and control is important. Victims are experts about threats to their own safety and survival. They know the risks posed to them by their perpetrator intimately.

The explanatory notes give little guidance on the reasons for this change, simply stating:

'This will allow the court greater discretion to determine on the facts whether imposing an MDC on the respondent is appropriate and necessary to prioritise the safety of the victim-survivor, without having to consider further subjective considerations'.¹²

I urge the Committee to seek further details about what has prompted this amendment. If there is evidence from the current pilot about why it is necessary, it is important to share that with victims and better explain why it is proposed to remove a victim's agency from the legislation.

I also urge the Committee to recommend to Parliament that the expanded pilot should not commence until complimentary support service responses have been resourced appropriately across the state. This support will be even more crucial if MDC are imposed in circumstances where victims are concerned that it poses a risk to their safety or the safety of affected children.

Removal of restrictions on issuing PPD and expansion of PPD scheme

A key feature of the Bill is the expansion of the Police Protection Direction (PPD) framework. PPDs were first implemented in Queensland from 1 January 2026. They enable QPS to provide on-the-spot, 12-month direction to a person using violence that is not required to be reviewed by a court. Two review processes are available on application: a QPS review and a court review.

The conditions of PPDs are similar, but less expansive, to those contained in domestic violence orders (DVOs). Currently the QPS officer issuing the PPD must reasonably believe it would not be more appropriate to apply to the court for a DVO.¹³

DVOs are orders that can be made by the court. They last for 5 years (unless otherwise stated by the court) and can include more comprehensive protections, such as monitoring devices and behavioural interventions.¹⁴

Police Protection Notices (PPNs) are an existing mechanism similar to PPDs, but subject to court review.¹⁵

Media reporting has suggested there has been little take up of PPDs. For example, by May 2026, 801 PPDs had been issued compared with 6,505 PPNs.¹⁶ The domestic violence support sector has confirmed that this trend has continued, and in some regions of Queensland, there have been no PPDs issued.

There has been no evaluation of the current PPD settings, noting that an evaluation was set to occur as soon as practicable after 1 January 2027, being one year after its commencement.¹⁷ It is unclear whether the amendments proposed in this Bill have been driven by the operational experience of QPS officers using the 2025 amendments. The Bill proposes removing the power of QPS to issue PPNs and simplifying the protection regime into two broad forms of intervention:

- PPDs, issued by QPS and
- DVOs, made by a court.

It also establishes a mechanism whereby certain PPDs must be filed in the court and are taken to be applications for a DVO, reflecting the intention that more complex matters continue to receive judicial oversight.

The Bill removes a number of existing restrictions on the use of PPDs, extends the duration of PPDs from 12 months to 3 years and introduces new arrangements regarding when matters proceed to court. The Bill also removes the existing police review process for PPDs. These changes are intended to support police efficiency to respond to domestic and family violence incidents and reduce administrative burden for police.¹⁸

Limited consultation with key stakeholders and the risk of unintended consequences

Police are a vital part of our frontline response to domestic and family violence in Queensland. However, police cannot and do not fight on this frontline alone. Alongside police are specialist domestic and family violence support workers, some of whom are now embedded workers within QPS stations. As well as specialist lawyers, for example Women's Legal Service Queensland and North Queensland Women's Legal Centre, who provide advice and legal representation to victims of domestic and family violence. I believe that this Bill would have benefitted from a consultation process that included DFV specialist support workers and lawyers working on the frontline prior to coming to Parliament. The opportunity for this vital consultation now falls to the Committee process which has the benefit of their professional practical experience.

I have had the benefit of reading some of the written submissions from important support services and the legal service sector which identify several opportunities, risks and unintended consequences which may not have been considered during the Bill's drafting. Their suggestions for amendment and implementation support are worthy of serious further consideration by this Committee because this is an area of law reform

where the stakes could not be higher, an unintended consequence could literally mean the difference between life and death.

I have identified some key risks which resonate with issues my office has identified through its complaint and client engagement service but in large part I defer to the submissions of these frontline services and urge serious consideration by the Committee of their advice to you.

Involvement of the court protects victims and provides police with important support in high-risk matters

I acknowledge and respect the clear policy decision of the Government to make police issued orders a much larger part of the domestic and family violence response in this state. However, it is important that applications to the court for protection do not come to be seen as merely an administrative burden. Court involvement in civil domestic and family violence orders is an important part of our system's response which provides independent protection to victims, an important site for support referral for both victims and perpetrators of violence and can support police decision making.

Without any evidence from the roll out of PPDs this year, I can only speculate why some frontline police may prefer to have their decision confirmed through a court process by making a PPN, rather than a PPD. It is important to consider that some of that decision could be because:

- domestic and family violence incidents are highly emotionally charged; there may have been the use of drugs and alcohol; both parties may make allegations that the other is the aggressor and in the moment, it is very difficult to make an assessment of who the person most in need of protection is
- police are usually keenly aware that they are responding to an incident, and do not always have information about the patterns of behaviour which would better identify the person most in need of protection
- police may be able to de-escalate a situation by explaining to a respondent of a PPN that although they may disagree with the decision, they will have an opportunity to put their views to a Magistrate in due course
- while they do their best, police can find it difficult to explain the ongoing requirements of the protection mechanism in the heightened moment of the incident. Respondents are much more likely to adhere to requirements when they are explained in court by magistrates.

The primacy of court processes and court review can empower police to pursue action in circumstances where they would have otherwise been reluctant to do so. The availability of automatic court review provides an important safeguard and can give decision-makers greater confidence in exercising their powers.

I am concerned that in some circumstances, removing this court oversight and extending the timeframe of PPDs to 3 years may have the unintended consequences. In some cases, it could result in of police either not pursuing any direction or issuing an order with excessive conditions due to the heavy burden, now placed squarely on police's shoulders, of potentially getting the decision wrong.

I have heard from domestic and family violence support service providers that it is often through attendance at court that they can connect with victim-survivors to provide them with additional services and safety planning. Court attendance is also an opportunity to engage with perpetrators of violence and encourage them to engage with behavior change and prevention programs or help them understand what an order means. Service providers are concerned that if a PPD is made for 3 years and there are no robust referral processes, support services would not have the opportunity to engage with or be able to support these victims. This is a safety risk.

The Committee should consider recommending that the Bill be accompanied by the development of strong shared service models, whereby domestic and family violence service providers are involved from the initial incident to support police and provide safety planning to victim-survivors. District Domestic and Family Violence Co-ordinators embedded within QPS may be well-placed to work with local service providers to determine the best approach for communities, with commensurate funding for service providers to assist.¹⁹

Additional consideration should be given to establishing alternative ongoing information-sharing and referral pathways to prevent silos and administrative burden on police in managing referrals and information gathering. This would need to be codesigned with domestic and family violence support service providers and adequately resourced.

Suggested amendments to proposed new section 100EA (When application for protection order or variation of protection order must be made)

Currently, the PPD framework is to be used only in circumstances when it would be appropriate not to bring the matter before a court.²⁰ Police are also required to have considered whether it would be more appropriate to take action that involves an application for a DVO before issuing a PPD.²¹

The proposed Bill removes these requirements.²² Instead, there are mandatory filing requirements for certain higher-risk or more complex circumstances, such as where there are: existing DVOs; family law intersections; child protection matters; matters where there are cross-directions.²³

As noted, I wholeheartedly support the amendments in this Bill which aim to reduce systems abuse in the court, but systems abuse occurs from the earliest stages of the criminal justice process and this Bill removes many of the restrictions on PPDs that acted as safeguards against that abuse at the investigation stage.

I am concerned that the circumstances in which a PPD must be filed with the court are currently too narrow and pose potential risks to the safety of children and victims and community confidence in police integrity.

As noted above, I am highlighting these issues because they are prominent in matters brought to my office, they are not the only issues of concern. I again urge the Committee to consider the issues raised in the submissions of other frontline services.

Where children are named as an aggrieved or a respondent or a protected person the PPD should be required to be filed in the court

My governing legislation specifies that I must carry out my functions independently and in the public interest, having particular regard to the vulnerability of victims who have characteristics that make them particularly vulnerable to harm. This includes children.²⁴

It is well documented that children struggle to be recognised as victims of domestic violence in their own right and obtain the support they require.²⁵

My office works with child advocates like Kids of Purple²⁶ to help children who are victims of domestic and family violence understand their rights under the Charter and supports them to self-advocate where possible. However, the younger the child the more challenging this is. In my view, these victims are too vulnerable to be the subject of protection orders without court oversight.

The proposed Bill allows for PPDs to be issued in circumstances where a person is subject to a DVO, or when there are orders made under the *Family Law Act 1975 (Cth)* the *Child Protection Act 1999 (Qld)*. To the extent possible, the respondent to the PPD must comply with both the PPD and the DVO, but where there is inconsistency, the DVO prevails. The Bill also provides that where a PPD is inconsistent with Family Law or Child Protection orders, the PPD has no effect to the extent of the inconsistency.²⁷

The proposed Bill further addresses the interaction between PPDs and family law or child protection arrangements by requiring a PPD to be filed with the court if it would interact or be inconsistent with such orders, would restrict contact between a respondent and their child or there is a related court proceeding on foot.²⁸ The Bill does not appear to create an ongoing obligation to reassess complexities after the PPD has been issued.

In evaluating the Bill, the Committee may wish to consider what happens where police do not identify the complexity or the interaction with family law becomes apparent only later. In such circumstances, it appears that the aggrieved or respondent would need to use the existing pathways to seek a court review.²⁹ In my view this is an unacceptable burden to place on victim-survivors and their children.

Overall, navigating the interactions between court orders and PPDs is likely to be confusing and challenging for victim-survivors and respondents. These challenges will be exacerbated if they are not supported by domestic and family violence support services. For example, a victim-survivor may align their conduct with a condition of a PPD such as a no-contact condition, however if the respondent has contact in line with a parenting order to access a child, there could be considerable issues because the victim may not understand or appreciate that the family court order prevails. Confusion and misunderstanding could escalate already dangerous situations and cause further violence. The safest approach is for vulnerable children to have these protection orders filed with the court.

I urge the Committee to recommend an amendment to proposed new section 100EA that requires any PPD where a child is named as an aggrieved, respondent or a person protected person to be filed with the court.

PPD where a serving police officer is named as the aggrieved or respondent

The Bill proposes to remove the current restriction on a PPD being issued when a serving police officer is either the aggrieved or the respondent.

Thirty per cent of complaints to my office are about the QPS and a significant amount of complaints we receive concern domestic and family violence. There is significant cross over. In addition to a complaints function, my functions relate to identification of

systemic issues and as part of those functions my office receives submissions from victims about adverse experiences in the criminal justice system. We have received reports of adverse experiences involving serving police officers as perpetrators of domestic and family violence.

I have read the submission to this Committee on this Bill from the Crime and Corruption Commission (CCC) dated 2 October 2026. Based on what victims have told me, through both my complaint and client engagement function and my systemic function, I support the findings and recommendations of that submission and urge the Committee to recommend to Parliament that:

- the restriction on PPDs being able to be made where a named party is a serving police officer be reinstated and it be added to the mandatory circumstance in which a PPD must be filed with the Court in new section 100EA;
- that operational policy advice, guidance and training be put in place before the commencement date for this legislation in consultation with the CCC; and
- that the statutory review provision explicitly require the involvement of the CCC in that review; and
- that current work on the establishment of independent Police Integrity Unit recommended by the *Commission of Inquiry into Queensland Police Service responses to domestic and family violence* be prioritised by the Government so that this unit can be established as soon as possible to enhance victim and community confidence in police integrity. Noting that through my engagement with victims, I regularly hear that independence is a key factor in whether a person feels comfortable raising concerns about their treatment by public institutions.

Changing circumstances and ongoing needs for protection

I ask the Committee to consider how victims will manage situations where family circumstances change after the PPD is issued.

In circumstances where the parties reconcile or want to resume contact, the parties would need to apply to the court.³⁰ There is risk that if parties are unable to easily vary conditions of a PPD, they may reconcile in breach of the conditions.³¹ The proposed Bill does not appear to establish a process for reassessing protection needs prior to expiry or upon expiry.

There appears to be a gap for victims who still require protection when a PPD expires. The Explanatory Notes indicate that where protection beyond 3 years is required, 'the Bill retains existing pathways under the DFVP Act into court processes' and 'a court review

of the PPD enables the court to consider the protective needs of the parties at the time of the review'.³²

I have heard from victims that a significant burden is placed on them when applications to court are required to be at their behest. Many victim-survivors do not have the time, resources or support to undertake these processes. For DVOs initiated by police and under the existing PPN framework, there is automatic court oversight, and although this remains significant and stressful for victims, it is a process that they are not required to initiate.

Placing the responsibility on victim-survivors to commence a further court process may create a protection gap and shift the burden of maintaining protection onto victims themselves. I urge the Committee to make inquiries into what additional investments in social and legal support will be required to assist victim-survivors navigate these processes.

Concerns about the removal of police review of PPDs

The Bill removes the existing police review framework for PPDs.³³ The Explanatory Notes explain that the process has been administratively burdensome and that courts are the more appropriate forum for resolving contested matters.³⁴

For many victim-survivors, particularly those experiencing trauma, coercive control or financial disadvantage, a police review may be a more accessible pathway than commencing court proceedings. The removal of this mechanism means victim-survivors who have concerns about misidentification, inadequate protective conditions or other police decisions will be increasingly reliant on navigating court processes to seek a review.

This is particularly important given the Bill expands the use of PPDs, removes a number of existing restrictions on their issue and extends their duration to 3 years. As greater reliance is placed on police decision-making, it is important that victim-survivors retain access to review mechanisms that are timely, accessible and capable of correction before further harm occurs.

The Committee may wish to consider whether the removal of police review strikes an appropriate balance between administrative efficiency and the need to retain review mechanisms.

Retaining gender centred review when a PPD is issued to a female

While not contained in legislation, I understand that it is QPS operational policy that PPDs issued to female respondents are subject to Gender Centred Review.³⁵ Some

support service providers have indicated that this review process is working well in their region.

I strongly support this safeguard remaining in place and would urge the Committee to consider ways it could be further strengthened or embedded, potentially through its inclusion in legislation or the QPS Operational Procedures Manual. Engagement with the sector about what is working and how successes could be replicated may be beneficial. This is particularly pertinent given the removal of provisions facilitating administrative review by police of PPDs.

Evaluation and review

Clause 52 of the Bill amends section 192A of the DFVP Act to provide for a review of the PPD provisions one year after their commencement. I support the purpose of this amendment to ensure the substantially revised PPD framework, including expanded powers to issue PPDs, mandatory filing provisions, removal of PPNs and extension of PPD duration, operates for a full year before formal evaluation occurs. This should facilitate a stronger evidence base for assessing PPD effectiveness, impacts on courts and police operations, and whether the framework remains appropriate. However, I urge the Committee to consider whether the effectiveness of the 2 new criminal offences introduced by this Bill should be included in the review given their close alignment with this reform and the concerns I have raised about their implementation.

I ask the Committee to consider recommending to Parliament that a process evaluation of the PPD reforms in this Bill occur concurrently with the reforms' implementation.

A process evaluation focuses on the operation and implementation of a reform, including whether it is functioning as intended and being applied consistently. It differs from an outcome evaluation, which focuses on whether reform has achieved its intended objectives. A process evaluation can occur concurrently with implementation whereas an outcome evaluation generally occurs after implementation has been embedded.

I would support both evaluation methods for this reform.

Evaluation of the PDD framework should focus on:

- process: whether PPDs processes are occurring as intended including whether there are unintended consequences resulting from the process, and how this effects safety risk for victim-survivors
- outcomes: whether victim-survivors are safer, more supported, and able to access protection when they need it.

I urge the Committee to recommend to Parliament that a 'Process Evaluation Implementation Committee' be established immediately upon passage of this Bill with representatives from the QPS, Department of Families, Seniors, Disability Services and Child Safety, the Department of Justice, the Office of the Victims' Commissioner, Department of Youth Justice and Victim Support, the Crime and Corruption Commission, the Domestic and Family Violence Support Sector and legal stakeholders primarily involved in the provision of representation and legal advice to victims of domestic and family violence.

This Committee should provide advice to the relevant Ministers and Directors-General about the implementation of these reforms and report quarterly. The evaluation review questions and metrics should be developed in consultation with the Process Evaluation Implementation Committee. The evaluation should centre on the primary question of 'has the PPD framework improved safety outcomes for victim-survivors?'

Endnotes

- ¹ Victims' Commissioner and Sexual Violence Review Board Act 2024 (Qld) ('VCSVRB Act') s 6.
- ² Victims' Commissioner and Sexual Violence Review Board Act 2024 (Qld) ('VCSVRB Act') s 6.
- ³ Explanatory notes, Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026 (Qld) 1.
- ⁴ Ellen Reeves, Kate Fitz-Gibbon, Silke Meyer, and Sandra Walklate, 'Incredible Women: Legal Systems Abuse, Coercive Control, and the Credibility of Victim-Survivors', (2025) Vol. 31(3-4) 767–788, *Violence Against Women*, <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/10778012231220370>.
- ⁵ Australian Institute of Judicial Administration, 'Cross-examination', (August 2025), National Domestic And Family Violence Bench Book, <https://dfvbenchbook.aija.org.au/article/1080309>.
- ⁶ ABC News, 'Queensland police take four hours to reach life-threatening domestic violence call-out', (24 July 2026), <https://www.abc.net.au/news/2026-07-24/qld-domestic-violence-police-data/106955282>.
- ⁷ Explanatory notes, Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026 (Qld) 6-8, Statement of Compatibility Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026 (Qld), 19-20.
- ⁸ *R v CDO* [2025] QCA 56.
- ⁹ *Victims' Commissioner and Sexual Violence Review Board Act 2024*, Schedule 1.
- ¹⁰ State of Queensland, Department of Justice, *Director's Guidelines* (September 2026) 11.6, https://www.publications.qld.gov.au/ckan-publications-attachments-prod/resources/14407a5c-e40f-4301-b64c-28ce0dc94ba5/odpp_directorsguidelines_29092026.pdf?ETag=e0d280b1f6af077ea429848d01d27e05
- ¹¹ Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions Queensland, *Domestic and Family Violence Prosecution Handbook* (September 2026).
- ¹² Explanatory notes, Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026 (Qld) 38.
- ¹³ Explanatory notes, Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026 (Qld) 2. See *Domestic and Family Violence Protection Act 2012 (Qld)*, s 100S and s 100B(1)(d).
- ¹⁴ *Domestic and Family Violence Protection Act 2012 (Qld)*, s 37
- ¹⁵ *Domestic and Family Violence Protection Act 2012 (Qld)*, Part 4, Division 2.
- ¹⁶ See Courier Mail, Qld to expand police DFV powers with on-the-spot directions | The Courier Mail (16 September 2026) <https://www.couriermail.com.au/truecrimeaustralia/police-courts-qld/qld-government-to-expand-police-protection-directions-boosting-powers-against-domestic-violence-offenders/news-story/115f30826d8fe9e335e77cb754543151>
- ¹⁷ *Domestic and Family Violence Protection Act 2012 (Qld)*, s 192A.
- ¹⁸ Explanatory notes, Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026 (Qld) 2.
- ¹⁹ QPS Website, <https://www.police.qld.gov.au/domestic-violence/domestic-violence-resources>
- ²⁰ *Domestic and Family Violence Protection Act 2012 (Qld)*, s 100A.
- ²¹ *Domestic and Family Violence Protection Act 2012 (Qld)*, 100B(1)(d).
- ²² Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 20206, clause 13 and 14.

²³ Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 20206, clause 17, inserting new s 100EA.

²⁴ Victims' Commissioner and Sexual Violence Review Board Act 2024, s 11(2)(c).

²⁵ Australia's National Research Organisation for Women's Safety. (2018). *Research summary: The impacts of domestic and family violence on children* (2nd ed.; ANROWS Insights 11/2018). Sydney, NSW: ANROWS. https://anrows-2019.s3.ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/19030333/ANROWS_Impacts-on-DFV-on-Children.2ed.pdf
https://anrows-2019.s3.ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/19030333/ANROWS_Impacts-on-DFV-on-Children.2ed.pdf.

²⁶ Kids of Purple, <https://www.kidsofpurple.org.au/>.

²⁷ Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026, clause 17, new s 100EA.

²⁸ Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026, clause 17, new s 100EA.

²⁹ *Domestic and Family Violence Protection Act 2012 (Qld)*, s 100Z.

³⁰ Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 20206, clause 29, which inserts s 100S which allows the police commissioner to correct errors in PPDs.

³¹ Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 20206, Clause 48, Insertion of a new s 177AB.

³² Explanatory notes, Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026 (Qld) 14.

³³ Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 20206, clause 30, omits, Part 4 Division 4 (Police review of a direction).

³⁴ Explanatory notes, Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026 (Qld) 15.

³⁵ Minister for Police and Emergency Services, The Honourable Dan Purdie and Minister for Families, Seniors and Disability Services and Minister for Child Safety and the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence, The Honourable Amanda Camm, JOINT MEDIA STATEMENT: A Fresh Start for Queensland: Landmark Domestic and Family Violence reforms introduced to Parliament ahead of DFV Prevention Month (30 April 2025)
<https://statements.qld.gov.au/statements/102478>.