EDUCATION, ARTS AND COMMUNITIES COMMITTEE

Members present:
Mr NG Hutton MP—Chair
Ms W Bourne MP
Hon. DE Farmer MP
Miss AS Doolan MP
Ms KJ Morton MP
Ms CP McMillan MP

Staff present:
Ms L Pretty—Committee Secretary
Dr A Lilley—Assistant Committee Secretary

PUBLIC BRIEFING—INQUIRY INTO THE YOUTH JUSTICE (ELECTRONIC MONITORING) AMENDMENT BILL 2025

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

Wednesday, 14 January 2026

Brisbane

WEDNESDAY, 14 JANUARY 2026

_____

The committee met at 10.00 am.

CHAIR: Good morning, everyone. I declare open this public briefing for the committee's inquiry into the Youth Justice (Electronic Monitoring) Amendment Bill 2025. My name is Nigel Hutton. I am the member for Keppel and chair of the Education, Arts and Communities Committee. I take a moment to respectfully acknowledge the traditional custodians of the land on which we meet today, and pay our respects to elders past, present and emerging. Here with me in terms of committee members are: Corrine McMillan, deputy chair and member for Mansfield; Wendy Bourne, member for Ipswich West; the Hon. Di Farmer, member for Bulimba, who is substituting today for the Hon. Mick de Brenni, member for Springwood who is unable to be with us; and amongst the government members are Ariana Doolan, member for Pumicestone; and Kendall Morton, member for Caloundra.

This briefing is a proceeding of the Queensland parliament and is subject to the parliament's standing rules and orders. Only the committee and invited witnesses may participate in the proceedings. Witnesses are not required to give evidence under oath or affirmation, however I remind witnesses that intentionally misleading the committee is a serious offence. I also remind members of the public gallery that they may be excluded from the briefing at the discretion of the committee.

These proceedings are being recorded and broadcast live on the parliament's website. Media may be present and are subject to the committee's media rules and the chair's direction at all times. You may be filmed or photographed during the proceedings and images may also appear on the parliament's website or social media pages.

Please remember to press your microphones on before you start speaking and off when you are finished, and please turn your mobile phones off or to silent mode.

BOYD, Ms Hannah, Acting Director, Legislation, Department of Youth Justice and Victim Support

CONNORS, Ms Kate, Director-General, Department of Youth Justice and Victim Support

GILES, Ms Megan, Acting Deputy Director-General, Department of Youth Justice and Victim Support

MCMAHON, Ms Kate, Acting Senior Executive Director, Strategic Policy and Legislation, Department of Youth Justice and Victim Support

CHAIR: I now welcome representatives from the Department of Youth Justice and Victim Support. Good morning. I invite you to make an opening statement, after which our committee members will undoubtedly have some questions for you.

Ms Connors: Good morning. Thank you very much, Chair. I would also like to acknowledge the traditional owners of the land on which we meet and pay my respects to elders past and present. I thank the Education, Arts and Communities Committee for taking the time to hear from the department today. We appreciate the opportunity to answer questions on the Youth Justice (Electronic Monitoring) Amendment Bill 2025.

This bill amends section 52AA of the Youth Justice Act to make electronic monitoring a permanent option as a bail condition and allow the court to order it statewide. Currently, section 52AA of the Youth Justice Act allows the court, in certain circumstances, to impose on a grant of bail a condition that the child must wear a monitoring device while released on bail. This section was introduced in 2021 to facilitate a trial of electronic monitoring as a bail condition, and it included an expiry provision. This initial trial was limited to children within a prescribed geographical area who were at least 16 years old, charged with a prescribed indictable offence and who had been previously found guilty of an indictable offence.

As outlined in the independent evaluation report, initial uptake of the trial was low, and from 2021 to 2024, the former government made several changes to section 52AA to expand the eligible cohort. This included, in 2023, lowering the age to 15 and expanding the geographical locations to include three new trial locations and, in 2024, expanding to another five trial locations and expanding the offences captured by the trial.

In April 2025, the current government introduced the Youth Justice (Monitoring Devices) Amendment Act 2025 which extended the trial so that it would now expire on 30 April 2026. The explanatory notes for that amendment provide that that extension was to enable a substantive review of the trial to be completed. That independent evaluation of the trial has now been completed.

The key findings of the report were that electronic monitoring conditions were associated with high bail completion, reduced offending and fewer victims of crime. The amendments in this bill, to extend the use of electronic monitoring as a condition of bail for youths, are supported by those findings, and I will run you through those in more detail now.

The report considered outcomes from 114 orders for electronic monitoring, or electronic monitoring episodes, as they are called in the report, that were completed as at 30 June 2025. Some young people received multiple electronic monitoring orders.

The report found that electronic monitoring conditions were associated with high levels of bail completion. Of the 114 episodes considered, 72 per cent completed their bail conditions. The evaluation also found that electronic monitoring conditions were associated with reduced levels of reoffending. Those young people who were subject to an electronic monitoring order under the trial had a reoffending rate of 63 per cent. That rate was significantly lower than the comparison group whose reoffending rate sat at 81 per cent. Electronic monitoring devices were also associated with a lower frequency and severity of offending.

I should note that the report did highlight operational challenges and negative unintended outcomes of the trial. These included some technical issues, challenges with information-sharing between relevant departments and, in particular, it noted that there were challenges with unclear roles, responsibilities and training. The department acknowledges those challenges and has continued to work with Queensland Corrective Services and the Queensland police force to continuously improve our practice in relation to supporting and monitoring youth subject to electronic monitoring conditions.

I will now turn to the bill itself. This bill amends section 52AA of the Youth Justice Act to make electronic monitoring a permanent option as a bail condition and to allow the court to make it statewide. It will be achieved through removing the eligibility requirements that were imposed by the trial, including the age constraints, that the child has been charged with certain offences and had a specific offending history, and that the child lived in a certain geographical area. Importantly, the bill leaves courts with a broad discretion to consider the appropriateness of an electronic monitoring order in an individual case.

In making their decision, a court must have regard to the suitability assessment prepared by the Department of Youth Justice and Victim Support and any other matters the court considers relevant. Simplifying the matters a court must have regard to allows suitability assessments to address relevant factors on a case-by-case basis. However, a court may only impose, on a grant of bail to a child, a monitoring device condition if all of the following services are available in the area where the child lives: services necessary to support the effective operation of the monitoring device; services suitable to support the child's compliance with the condition; and services suitable to support the monitoring of the child. In practice, the department's representatives in court will advise the court if the required services are available. All of the other requirements on the court for imposing a bail condition will continue to apply. Thank you, members. We are happy to take any questions.

CHAIR: Thank you very much, Ms Connors.

Ms DOOLAN: I want to thank the department for the thorough briefing. Director-General, can you please outline how the Youth Justice (Electronic Monitoring) Amendment Bill 2025 will restore community safety?

Ms Connors: The evaluation report has provided clear evidence that electronic monitoring can be successful in supporting higher bail completion and reducing reoffending. The report findings have indicated to us it is effective as a condition of youth bail in Queensland and, by making it a permanent option for the court allowing it to be ordered across Queensland and removing the other eligibility criteria, that impact on reoffending will enhance community safety in Queensland. The bill ensures

the courts are able to make the most suitable and appropriate bail conditions for any youth in the system and it will also allow electronic monitoring to work in conjunction with other bail conditions such as curfews, but I will pass to Ms McMahon who will talk through the detail of how the bill works.

Ms McMahon: I will talk generally about what the bill does and then perhaps in a bit more detail. It does three general things. Firstly, it makes it permanent. It does that by removing the expiry provision. Those provisions in the Youth Justice Act currently expire on 30 April. The bill commences on a fixed date, and it is that date for that reason. Secondly, it makes it statewide, but that is subject to where the department advises the court that there are appropriate support services available. Thirdly, it opens up the cohort that it can apply to by amending the eligibility and the suitability criteria. I will talk a bit more specifically about how it does that.

Currently, under the eligibility criteria, the young person has to be 15 years old, they have to live in a certain location and the court that they are charged in has to be in a certain location as well—and those are prescribed in great detail by postcode in the youth justice regulation—and also they have to be charged with a prescribed indictable offence and have previously been found guilty of an indictable offence, or charged with a prescribed indictable offence in the preceding 12 months. That existing test is pretty convoluted. Also, the definition of a 'prescribed indictable offence' is different in that section than it is elsewhere throughout the Youth Justice Act, and that often creates confusion and issues. This bill removes those eligibility requirements and that really brings this bail condition into alignment with other bail conditions in the Youth Justice Act which do not have those sorts of eligibility requirements around them.

Also, this provision sits in the general bail provisions in the Youth Justice Act, so all of the general bail tests still continue to apply. The conditions still have to be necessary to mitigate an unacceptable risk, and that is an unacceptable risk to community safety. There also cannot be what is called in the act 'undue management' and supervision. Basically, that means that the court can only impose a bail condition where it is necessary to mitigate the risk. The condition cannot be more onerous than necessary to mitigate that risk. Those general bail provisions still continue to apply to these cases.

The court will only be able to order it, though, where there are appropriate support services available, and those are things like available technology because this is a technology-based condition. If there is not sufficient mobile coverage to support it, then the court cannot impose it as a condition, and also things like bail support services.

The bill also amends the suitability assessment of the suitability criteria. Currently, the court has to consider a few things: whether the young person has the capacity to understand, whether they are likely to comply, and whether they have a parent or another person willing to support them. The bill removes those explicitly from the act and the court then only has to consider a suitability assessment which is written by the department and given to the court, and any other relevant factor.

In practice, those suitability assessments will still likely continue to address factors such as the young person's living arrangements, their access to electricity and a mobile phone, and the presence of a support person to assist them—those types of things. However, the amendments simplify that criteria in the legislation. So that is an explanation of the bill.

CHAIR: Thank you very much for that very thorough answer. Deputy Chair, you have a question?

Ms McMILLAN: Thank you, Chair. I defer to the shadow minister, the Hon. Di Farmer.

Ms FARMER: Thank you, to all of you, for the great work you do all of the time. Can you tell me what projections you have made about the number of young people who are likely to be fitted with EMDs in the future if this legislation is passed? Chair, if you do not mind, I will add to that. Given the evaluation report makes much—and stakeholders have pointed this out—that their evaluation was based only on one cohort and does not assess the 10-to-14-year-olds or any of the other criteria that has been introduced, if you have made those projections, how have you been able to do that without that information available?

Ms Connors: As you would be aware, any modelling that we have done is part of the cabinet-in-confidence process, so we are not able to speak to that modelling today. Of course, as always, we will be monitoring the implementation closely, however we are unable to speak to the modelling that we have today.

Ms FARMER: Am I able to ask if modelling has been done? I appreciate what your constraints are.

Ms Connors: Sorry, member, I think as you would be aware, that is probably within the policy work that I am not allowed to reveal today.

Ms MORTON: What supports have the government put in place to better allow youth offenders to comply with electronic monitoring bail conditions?

Ms Connors: I will ask Ms Giles from our operational part of the department to speak to that answer.

Ms Giles: There are a number of things that the department does to support young people when an electronic monitoring device condition is made. Firstly, at the discretion of the court, EMD, or electronic monitoring device, conditions are usually included in what we call a conditional bail program. That is a program that, at the request of the court, the department prepares for the court. It will have details including things like where the young person will live, how often they might report, what supervision and activities they will participate in while they are on bail and any curfew or other conditions that the court might like to consider. Those young people who are subject to a conditional bail program are supervised by Youth Justice staff, similar to how we supervise and case manage other young people on Youth Justice supervised court orders.

The other thing we do is we have youth co-responder teams. You will see from the 2025-26 budget papers that the government has announced increasing funding of $75 million over four years to deliver youth co-response models to target youth crime hotspots and enhance community safety. Youth co-responder teams are part of that youth co-response model. Co-responder teams are made up of police officers and Youth Justice officers and they respond in most locations on a 24-hour, seven-day-a-week basis to youth who are at risk of engaging in offending behaviour, and they work proactively with youth and families to tackle issues that may be contributing to their offending behaviour.

One of the key elements of the Youth Co-Responder Team's work is to undertake bail compliance checks on young people in their local area who are subject to bail conditions, including electronic monitoring device conditions. The way that they do that is they treat every interaction with the young person as an opportunity to re-engage with that young person, to check in with how they are going with their bail compliance, with addressing their offending behaviour, and to make sure that they understand the conditions that are placed on them by the court.

The other thing that the government has done is continued funding in bail support services across the state. You will also see in the 2025-26 budget papers that the government announced increased funding of $24.4 million over four years and $8.3 million ongoing for bail programs to support young people across the state with compliance with their bail conditions. Those services are delivered by non-government services in a contractual relationship with our department, and they work with young people and their families to provide supports which could range from addressing their criminogenic needs, their wellbeing needs and also re-engaging them with education or training and employment.

Ms FARMER: Thank you, Ms Giles, for taking us through the figures for the 2025-26 budget. Director-General, the evaluation report makes the very strong case that EMDs can only be successful with wraparound services, and there has been much suggestion that, in fact, it is the wraparound services that are likely to achieve the outcomes themselves. I am assuming that we are going to see many more young people fitted with EMDs. What preparations have been made for additional wraparound services, and if I could ask—

CHAIR: We will take one question at a time, member for Bulimba. I will remind you in regards to long preambles. I am very conscious that once or twice on our committee we have fallen into that trap, but we try not to. The question was in regards to the wraparound services and what preparations have been put in place.

Ms Connors: Those are subject to budget processes, so again, my apologies, but I will not be able to give an answer on that today because that will be part of the budget preparations. However, I will say that is baked into the legislation. I take your point around the wraparound services. That was very clear. That is a really unique part of Queensland's electronic monitoring regime and that is why the availability of services has been included in the legislation as part of the criteria for the court to order the electronic monitoring.

CHAIR: In regards to the evaluation report, the electronic monitoring report refers to an association between the use of electronic monitoring and higher bail completion rates, along with reduced offending. Can you speak to that, please?

Ms Connors: I will get Ms Boyd to answer that. She is our expert on the evaluation report.

Ms Boyd: The evaluation report compared data relating to a group of 114 episodes of youth with monitoring device orders, and then they compared that with data relating to a comparison group that did not have the orders. Overall, they found that there was a higher rate of successful completion of bail. Of the 114 youth with completed electronic monitoring device orders, 72 per cent resulted in a successful completion of the order. That means that they were sentenced or had their bail conditions varied or the court had their charges dismissed as having defined what was a completed order.

They also found that there was less reoffending by the EMD cohort. So, 81 per cent of the comparison group reoffended while only 63 per cent of the EMD group reoffended during the order. Then when they actually drilled down and looked at these groups more closely, they found that the EMD group were 24 per cent less likely to reoffend than the comparison group. Of those episodes where there were youth who offended, they offended less frequently. There was 7.4 offences during the bail order in the comparison group compared to only 4.4 offences on average in the EMD group. Then they also found that there was reduced seriousness of that offending when there was reoffending. In the comparison group, 26 per cent committed a serious offence while on bail, while only 14 per cent in the EMD group committed what was considered a serious offence while on bail.

Ms FARMER: Director-General, did the Expert Legal Panel who, I understand, are paid to advise the government on youth justice matters, provide any input to this bill?

Ms Connors: The Expert Legal Panel are paid to provide advice on the Making Queensland Safer laws. That is the extent of their role.

Ms DOOLAN: For the youth that are fitted with electronic monitoring devices, what initiative has the government put in place around schooling options for those children?

Ms Connors: Obviously there are no legislative barriers to youth participating in school and other programs while on bail, and that includes bail with an electronic monitoring condition. The department is certainly prioritising engagement in education, employment and training for all youths who are subject to supervised youth justice orders including bail programs.

Importantly, too, the government has also provided funding to establish and expand specialised schools to provide targeted support to youth who would be within this cohort. There will be four crime prevention schools—on the Gold Coast, Townsville, Ipswich and Rockhampton—and they are to re-engage youth from years 7 to 12 who have disengaged from mainstream education and have needs that cannot be accommodated in a conventional setting. They will operate under the Special Assistance Schools model. Then there are two Youth Justice schools that will be run by Ohana for Youth that will be established in South East Queensland and North Queensland. They have $40 million in Queensland government funding. Those Youth Justice schools will include particular project-based curriculum, specialist teachers, extracurricular activities, and 12 hours of daily supervision five days a week, and they are aimed at enhancing educational outcomes and reducing reoffending for high-risk youth offenders who are on Youth Justice orders, including bail orders and community service orders.

Ms FARMER: Director-General, can you confirm whether there are any bail support services who have their funding confirmed after June this year?

Ms Connors: As was announced in the budget, the government has committed to bail programs. We are working with providers on what those bail programs look like in the context of our other program offerings, such as Staying on Track. All of those decisions are subject to budget decisions.

Ms FARMER: Chair, is it okay to ask for clarification?

CHAIR: Yes.

Ms FARMER: Thank you. In terms of the answer to that specific question, is there any organisation that is confirmed to continue providing bail support after June this year? It is obviously very critical to—

CHAIR: I apologise, member for Bulimba. An opportunity for clarification is not to repeat the question nor to provide a post-event statement. We will move to the next question. Member for Caloundra?

Ms McMILLAN: Point of order, Chair. I would suggest that the member for Bulimba did not receive an appropriate answer to the question she asked which was well within the realm of the committee, and I ask that the member be heard.

CHAIR: Thank you very much, Deputy Chair. I will take some advice. On this occasion, recognising that I had given quite a bit of leniency in terms of the relevance of the original question to the legislation we have before us and the briefing paper that we have, I will say there is no point of order and refer to the member for Caloundra.

Ms MORTON: What are the key proposed amendments that will strengthen youth justice electronic monitoring in Queensland?

Ms McMahon: As I outlined in the first question I answered, the key amendments in the bill are making it permanent—so, removing that expiry provision—expanding it statewide and then also the amendments to the eligibility and suitability criteria which opens it up to a broader cohort of youth offenders. As set out in the statement of compatibility, the purpose of the amendments in general is to improve community safety. Those are the key amendments in the bill.

Ms FARMER: Director-General, you have referred to the fact that the EMDs can only be deemed suitable if the locations lend themselves to it, both in terms of technology and wraparound support services. Are you able to provide the committee—and I am happy to take this as a question on notice—on what those locations are?

Ms Connors: I will let Ms Giles answer that question.

Ms Giles: Whilst there is some known knowns around where there is technology coverage at any given time, the provisions in the bill have been crafted to provide flexibility so that at any point in time there may be changes to that availability. I appreciate the member's question, but it would be very difficult for the department to say with some certainty where those locations are permanently because that could change, depending on weather events or other things that might be happening from time to time, and the bill is intended to give the court discretion and to be able to put the best order in place for an individual young person.

Ms FARMER: Chair, with respect, and I do not want to be a troublesome panellist, but could I seek clarification? You referred to technology, but also the location of services. Is it possible, reiterating the question, to get the list of locations where currently there are not wraparound services and/or technological availability?

Ms Connors: Yes, we will be able to take that on notice.

Ms FARMER: Thank you so much.

CHAIR: Can you please outline for the committee how many youths were ordered to wear an electronic monitoring device in the first year of the trial and how this bill differs?

Ms Connors: As outlined in the evaluation report on page 16, there have been a number of legislative changes since the trial was first introduced in 2021. In 2021, a two-year trial of electronic monitoring was introduced as a bail condition for youths aged 16 and 17 with a prescribed indictable offence, and there were five locations in the regulation—Townsville, North Brisbane, Moreton, Logan and Gold Coast. In 2023 it was expanded to include 15-year-olds and another two years of the trial with Toowoomba, Cairns and Mount Isa added as locations. Then in 2024, there were further prescribed indictable offences added to the list and a further five locations—South Brisbane, Ipswich, Fraser Coast, Mackay and Rockhampton. Your question was to the number of times the conditions were ordered over that period?

CHAIR: Yes.

Ms Connors: In the first year of the trial, four EMD conditions were ordered; in the second, there were 13; in the third, there were 34; and in the fourth, there were 71. In the report which considers data up to June 2025, at the time, 139 electronic monitoring conditions had been ordered and 114 completed orders. This bill, as Ms McMahon has outlined, simplifies the legislation and extends the coverage to the entire state and removes the eligibility criteria, so it allows the court to order the condition when it is appropriate.

Ms FARMER: Director-General, many submitters expressed concern that young people experiencing any of a range of constraints, such as FASD, intellectual disability, developmental immaturity, lack of stable accommodation, and absence of a parent or guardian to assist with compliance, that they will actually be able to manage the EMDs. As the CEO, will you take these matters into consideration when advising the courts on suitability?

Ms Connors: As the member would be aware, we have not had a chance to look at the submissions this morning, but to take your question, obviously part of any suitability assessment will be a consideration of the individual circumstances of that child, and, as with any bail condition, ability to comply with the bail condition is a key consideration.

Ms DOOLAN: Can you speak about any observed changes to youth offender behaviour on electronic monitoring orders?

Ms Connors: We have some examples of specific incidences where the electronic monitoring device has resulted in positive outcomes. I will be a bit vague about dates and locations because, as you know, I am prohibited under law from identifying these youths, but we do have some examples we can share with the committee.

In 2022, a 16-year-old youth in the South East was fitted with an electronic monitoring device after several periods in detention. The court granted bail with conditions, including residential arrangements and locality restrictions, and the youth complied. This case demonstrated that even an offender, as in this case, who had a history of detention and serious offending was effectively managed in the community with electronic monitoring, reducing recidivism and breaking the cycle of crime for that young person.

We have an example from 2024: a 16-year-old youth in the South East successfully completed two months of bail with electronic monitoring until sentencing, and the magistrate noted in that sentencing that the young person had had a very high level of compliance while under that condition. Another 16-year-old in the South East remained compliant with their electronic monitoring conditions for nine weeks until sentencing.

This year, despite facing very serious charges, a 17-year-old was granted conditional bail with an electronic monitoring device and a curfew. That youth complied with all conditions until sentencing, but also re-engaged with school and actively participated in rehabilitation services. That was another example of how electronic monitoring can support young offenders to make those positive changes.

Ms FARMER: Director-General, the evaluation report refers to the fact that Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander young people and young people with mental health issues are likely to show much lower numbers of the reduced reoffending reported for EMDs. How does the department propose to address that?

Ms Connors: I will pass that question to Ms McMahon.

Ms McMahon: The statement of compatibility acknowledges that as well, especially in respect to the First Nations cohort. There is a finding in the report that the reduction in reoffending is lesser for the First Nations cohort and children experiencing mental health issues. However, I will point out on that that it is still a positive outcome because it is a reduction in reoffending in comparison to the non-EMD group, if that makes sense. Even though that reduction in reoffending is lesser than it is in other cohorts, the report still demonstrates that there is less offending for those children subject to that condition than not. It is just that it is not as good of an outcome as it is for young people that are not part of those cohorts.

Also, on the First Nations cohort, the views on cultural safety in the evaluation report are very mixed. Some stakeholders said that they felt First Nations children may be excluded because of the criteria, so their participation rates were perhaps lower because of that, but then other stakeholders said it can support connection to family and community, and avoid remand, so it can be a positive thing. I think there are mixed stakeholder views about the application of it to the First Nations cohort in the report.

Ms Connors: As the member would be aware, electronic monitoring is a bail condition. It is one aspect of the programs and supports that we provide for young people either with disability or First Nations young people in the department. We also have other programs and services and tailored bail support services—all of those kind of things. None of the suite of services that we have for First Nations young people in the department are different or changed. Electronic monitoring is just one of the bail conditions that the court can impose.

Ms MORTON: Have you had any feedback from the trial participants on the impact that the EMDs have had on reducing reoffending?

Ms Boyd: In completing their evaluation report, Nous conducted interviews with young people and their families and received some feedback directly from those young people. If you look at page 29 of the evaluation report, that has some particular findings and outcomes from that qualitative data. They found that young people said they feared if they offended while wearing an EMD they would be caught immediately. They also said that it may reduce their contact with peers who encouraged them to offend due to those own peers' fears of surveillance and things. Then they also said that it served as a physical reminder of their bail conditions and the surveillance that they were under. Those are the sort of examples of how having the EMD condition and the bracelet on the ankle changed the behaviour, as was demonstrated in the report.

Ms FARMER: Director-General, referring to the young people I mentioned in my question earlier, those who are fitted with EMDs, but their ability to actually manage the EMD is quite limited—I think the term is 'pinged'—if they are pinged because they just were unable to manage the EMD, will they be charged with breach of bail?

Ms Connors: Ms Giles is able to answer that question.

Ms Giles: There are a number of different types of alerts that can be received by Corrective Services, QPS and ourselves in relation to electronic monitoring devices. Not all of those alerts will translate into a breach of bail offence. As the member would appreciate, sometimes those alerts might relate to the charge on the device being low and, in response, a co-responder team or a general duties police team might attend the young person's residence and remind them to keep the charge up on their device. It may indicate that there is a fault or something that needs a technical solution to the device. It simply might have been a false alarm. Not all alerts or, as the member says, a ping, will result in a breach of bail offence for the young person. Obviously, when we have co-responder teams regularly attending a young person's residence, the purpose of that, as I have already outlined, is to remind them of their conditions and support them to comply. There are also a number of other supports, including the bail support services that I have already spoken to that might be in place to support a young person in terms of compliance with their orders. To answer the question, not all alerts result in a breach of bail offence.

Ms Boyd: To add to Ms Giles' answer, this is also found in the data in the report. At page 32, it goes through some of this data and it found that 59 episodes of EMD orders recorded a breach of bail with only 22 resulting in a revocation. That was in the context of thousands of alerts, and thousands of confirmed alerts. The report identifies that this suggests that that discretion was often applied to find other solutions other than a breach of bail.

Ms DOOLAN: What is the justification for removing the requirements of section 52AA(1) (f) for electronic monitoring under the proposed bill?

Ms McMahon: That is the removal of what is currently very prescriptive in terms of what needs to be in the suitability assessment. The bill changes that to say that the court just has to consider the suitability assessment itself and any other relevant matter. Really, the rationale for that is just simplification—it is simplifying the legislative criteria—and also flexibility. The suitability assessments can then address, on a case-by-case basis, whatever are the most appropriate factors in that particular child's case. As I said at the outset, in practice we would think, though, that those suitability assessments would, in the vast majority of cases, continue to address those factors in any event, including the likelihood of compliance of the child with the order. As Ms Connors was saying, in the vast majority of cases that will be a highly relevant, though not a determinative, factor for the court. That is the rationale.

CHAIR: Members, I will remind the department in regards to the question taken on notice, and I will seek the member for Bulimba's affirmation that I have it right. The department is taking on notice that it will provide, where possible, locations in Queensland where there are currently not the technology or wraparound services available to suit the use of EMDs.

Ms Connors: Yes, noting that that would only be a point in time, as Ms Giles said.

CHAIR: Yes. For the advice of the department, that response will be required for the purposes of our inquiry by the close of business on Monday, 19 January 2026.

Ms Connors: Thank you.

CHAIR: With that, ladies and gentlemen, that concludes this briefing. I thank everyone today who has participated. Thank you to our Hansard reporter. Thank you to each of you for the time you have taken and for the very thorough answers you have given. A transcript of these proceedings will be available on the committee's webpage in due course. I now declare this public briefing closed.

The committee adjourned at 10.45 am.