

State Development, Infrastructure and Works Committee

Inquiry into e-mobility safety and use in Queensland 2025

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORT AND MAIN ROADS

Response to public submissions

The Department of Transport and Main Roads (TMR) has reviewed 1,106 submissions posted on the Committee's webpage. This represents all available submissions and excludes those not published or marked confidential.

Of the 1,106 submissions reviewed, approximately 15% referred only to Personal Mobility Devices (PMDs), such as e-scooters; 19% referred only to e-bikes; while 56% referred to multiple types of devices or "e-mobility" in general. Approximately 34% of submitters confirmed their support for e-mobility as a legitimate transport option. This is not to say that the remaining submissions were opposed to e-mobility. In the majority of cases the submission neither overtly supported nor opposed e-mobility.

In light of the number of submissions, TMR has analysed and responded to the key themes raised in the submissions rather than responding to each individual submission.

Key theme	Summary of Issue/s Raised	TMR Response
1. Registration	• Support: 36% • Opposed: 2% • Not referenced: 62% Supporters argue that registration could aid enforcement, reduce rider anonymity, and align e-mobility devices with similar registered vehicles, such as motorcycles and motorised mobility devices. Opponents, including Brisbane CBD and Brisbane West Bicycle User Groups, caution against adding unnecessary regulatory burdens on active transport users. Some submitters, including the Council on the Ageing Queensland, Zipidi, Pedal Group, and the Motor Trades Association Queensland, support a “tiered” or conditional registration scheme. This would classify devices by speed and weight, requiring conditional registration for those exceeding current specifications.	Registration is not required for compliant e-mobility devices in Queensland, consistent with other Australian jurisdictions. Non-compliant devices (e.g., overpowered e-bikes) are banned, with the non-compliance enforceable under unregistered vehicle offences. This minimises user burden while ensuring unsafe devices are prohibited. Queensland is the only state requiring registration for motorised mobility devices, like motorised wheelchairs. A registration scheme for e-mobility devices would only work with managed entry and active enforcement. While effective for road vehicles due to dealer-assigned plates, identifiers like Vehicle Identification Numbers (VIN), and high enforcement visibility, e-mobility devices enter Queensland through varied channels, limiting point-of-sale registration. Without stronger enforcement, offenders are unlikely to comply. Introducing a tiered registration system based on power and speed would likely be complex and costly, requiring certification, tamper-proof labelling, and regulatory oversight, including Commonwealth Government changes. This would also include significant system changes to the Transport Registration and Integrated Licensing System (TRAILS) which is a legacy system. Costs would likely fall on industry and consumers. Such a scheme could also discourage active transport, increasing emissions, congestion, and health issues. An alternative, suggested by Bicycle Industries Australia, is clear identification of non-compliant devices. Permanent, visible markings (e.g., “not for use on roads or public places”) could help enforcement officers and inform riders of restrictions.
2. Licensing	• Support: 28% • Opposed: 1% • Not referenced: 71%	Licensing is not required for compliant e-mobility devices in Queensland, consistent with other Australian jurisdictions. Non-compliant device users (e.g., overpowered e-bikes) can already face unlicensed vehicle offences.

Key theme	Summary of Issue/s Raised	TMR Response
	Supporters of a licensing scheme highlight benefits such as improved rider training, education, and enforcement, as well as addressing concerns about children lacking road rule knowledge. Opponents, primarily bicycle users, argue that licensing would place unnecessary regulatory burdens on active transport users. Queensland Health, the Council on the Ageing Queensland, and the Pedestrian Council of Australia support licensing as a way to ensure rider competency and ability. Other submitters, including Zipidi, Bicycle Industries Australia, and the Pedal Group, propose a tiered system. Under this model, high-speed and high-powered devices would require licensing, registration, and insurance, allowing them to access the road network as mopeds.	TMR's current approach to educating e-mobility riders has been through large scale campaigns, targeted social media, school-based education, and distribution of educational materials. Like registration, a licensing scheme would need active enforcement to deter unlicensed riding. Without it, only compliant riders are likely to follow the rules, while offenders would continue unlicensed. Introducing licensing could create barriers to e-mobility use, limiting access for groups like children and some people with disabilities. If pursued, leveraging existing schemes, such as learner licences (minimum age 16, road rules test), may be more practical than a bespoke e-mobility licence.
3. Compulsory Third Party (CTP) insurance	• Support: 21% • Opposed: 1% • Not referenced: 78% Those in support of CTP for e-mobility cited inadequate existing compensation for those injured, particularly children, the elderly and people living with a disability. The Insurance Council of Australia acknowledged the need for appropriate insurance coverage for injuries sustained in e-mobility device accidents but opposed a CTP insurance scheme due to the lack of registration. If a CTP scheme were expanded to e-mobility devices, the Insurance Council of Australia notes that a mechanism for collecting premiums would also need to be introduced, otherwise insurance premiums paid by motor vehicle owners would be negatively impacted. The Royal Automobile Club of Queensland noted that there are existing CTP insurance schemes for legal motorbikes, and any vehicle that does not comply with the definition of a motorbike should not be insured or registered. Furthermore, the Royal Automobile Club of Queensland does not find it necessary to require insurance for legal e-mobility devices, given existing	CTP insurance is not available for unregistered recreational vehicles like compliant e-mobility devices, consistent across Australia. However, other options exist, such as third-party insurance for share providers, emerging private products, and WorkCover for work-related injuries, including commuting. While TMR supports access to rehabilitation and compensation for injured persons, a CTP scheme has limitations. Queensland's fault-based CTP scheme generally excludes coverage for at-fault riders, leaving many e-mobility injuries uncovered. Introducing CTP would also need fair cost distribution. If many devices remain unregistered and uninsured, injury costs would fall on the Queensland Nominal Defendant, funded by levies on all vehicle registrations, increasing costs for motorists. The Motor Accident Insurance Commission, Queensland Treasury is best placed to provide further information on any potential CTP impacts and limitations.

Key theme	Summary of Issue/s Raised	TMR Response
	public liability and worker's compensation schemes. WorkCover Queensland highlighted a 1,135% increase in e-mobility injury claims since 2021.	
4. New or increased age limits	• Support: 17% • Opposed: 1% • Not referenced: 82% Supporters of age limits advocate for consistency across e-mobility types, with most suggesting a minimum age of 16 or 18 years. They argue stricter age limits would improve safety (as children may lack the cognitive ability to follow road rules), and would simplify rules for parents. Opponents, such as the Brisbane West Bicycle User Group, oppose age limits for legal e-bikes to maintain consistency with standard bicycles. Queensland Health, Kidsafe Queensland Inc, and the Australian Medical Association express concern about injuries among children under 16. They suggest that introducing a minimum age of 16 and requiring licences could reduce e-mobility-related injuries and fatalities in this age group.	Current personalised mobility devices (PMDs) age limits (16 unsupervised, 12–15 with adult supervision) aim to balance safety with family use; for example, to allow for use by tourists in group settings. Legal e-bikes, classified as bicycles, have no age limits in most states, except Victoria and WA (16+). Illegal devices, exceeding legal requirements, are treated as motorcycles and cannot be ridden on public roads or paths, with no age limits applied. TMR acknowledges these age limits can be confusing and may not meet community expectations. Any potential changes to age limits should consider impacts, such as reduced active transport use or inconsistencies with similar devices like bicycles and e-bikes. Enforcement of age limits is also challenging for children, as police rarely issue infringement notices against children, and prosecution of children is a last resort.
5. New or amended default speed limits for e-mobility devices (unsigned)	• Support: 15% • Opposed: 1% • Not referenced: 84% Those in support of reducing default speed limits, including peak bodies representing vulnerable path users and medical associations, referenced improved safety for vulnerable footpath users, such as elderly people or people with a disability. Comparisons were also drawn between PMDs, which have default regulatory speed limits, and e-bikes, which do not. Those opposed were predominately experienced PMD riders and motorcycle riders and were of the view that the current speed	Default speed limits provide a baseline without requiring signage. PMDs are limited to 12km/h on footpaths and shared paths, and 25km/h elsewhere. E-bikes are limited to 25km/h under motor assistance but, like bicycles, have no specific default speed limits. All devices must follow signed speed limits where applicable. The current PMD limits were introduced in 2022, and observational studies have generally shown quite high levels of compliance. Due to their small wheels and high centre of gravity, higher limits are not considered safe. E-bikes are designed to replicate normal human performance, with 25km/h being a sustainable human speed. E-bikes are not meant to replicate the performance of mopeds and other motorcycles.

Key theme	Summary of Issue/s Raised	TMR Response
	limits are satisfactory but require consistent enforcement. There were some suggestions to increase default speed limits for PMDs on roads, to reduce speed differentials with passing motor vehicles. Some submitters from the e-mobility industry preferred signed speed limits over default limits as this is how other vehicle speeds are mostly controlled and allows for nuance depending on the infrastructure and local risk factors.	Introducing a footpath speed limit for e-bikes would require a clear understanding of the issue to justify regulatory burden, as safety concerns may stem from illegal devices rather than compliant e-bikes.
6. Speed limit e-mobility devices by design	• Support: 13% • Opposed: 1% • Not referenced: 86% Supporters, including Zipidi, Sandy Bolton MP, the Australian College of Road Safety, and the Queensland Law Society, advocated for speed-limiting devices and penalties for tampering with them. Concerns were raised about some retailers advising consumers to follow state laws while also suggesting speed limiters could be disabled. Opposition primarily came from experienced riders and some industry representatives, who prefer higher-speed devices for more efficient commuting.	PMD speed limits are currently regulated through rider behaviour rather than device design. This approach, introduced in 2022, provides police with better tools to enforce PMD usage. Previously, requiring devices to be speed-limited by design made enforcement difficult, as any device capable of exceeding 25 km/h was no longer classified as a PMD under the road rules. E-bikes are speed-limited by motor assistance, which must stop once the rider exceeds 25 km/h. This complies with the EN15194 standard, recognised internationally as best practice. Modifying e-bikes to exceed this limit is illegal and enforceable as an unregistered, uninsured vehicle. Shared e-mobility devices, such as e-scooters, can be effectively speed-limited using geofencing technology under agreements with local governments. Introducing mandatory speed limiters for all PMDs would require national standards and cannot be implemented through state legislation without reintroducing enforcement challenges.
7. Increased e-bike power and speed limits	• Support: 8% • Opposed: 1% • Not referenced: 91% Some submitters advocated for higher-powered e-bikes, citing benefits for older riders, people with disabilities, and those transporting cargo. They propose increasing motor power to 500 watts and assisted speeds to 32 km/h to improve accessibility	Queensland's e-bike motor power (250 watts) and maximum assisted speed (25 km/h) requirements align with Commonwealth vehicle definitions and European standards (EN15194). This is consistent across all Australian jurisdictions except NSW, which currently has a 500-watt limit, but where a return to the 250-watt limit has been recommended by a recent Parliamentary Inquiry. The current limits strike a balance between ensuring e-bikes remain primarily pedal-powered and safe for use around other road users, while meeting riders' mobility needs. Increasing motor

Key theme	Summary of Issue/s Raised	TMR Response
	and usability. Others referenced "speed pedelecs," e-bikes capable of 45 km/h, which are regulated as mopeds in Europe and the United States, requiring registration, licensing, and insurance. Industry representatives, including Pedal Group and Foucault Dynamics, argue that the current 25 km/h and 250-watt limits do not reflect modern technology or international best practices. Bicycle Industries Australia and the Sunshine Coast Regional Council suggest that allowing higher-powered devices could reduce the use of illegal devices and create a safer, regulated environment for riders. Throughout other submissions there was support for a continued ban on e-bikes capable of motor assisted speeds of more than 25km/h. This includes the Royal Automobile Club of Queensland, City of Gold Coast and Get Around Caboolture.	power and assisted speeds could introduce significant safety risks, potentially requiring a more restrictive regulatory framework. For example, higher-powered devices may lose access to shared infrastructure, such as bike paths, due to increased crash risks. Introducing higher-speed e-bikes, such as speed pedelecs, would require national coordination. These devices would need to be approved by the Commonwealth Government at importation, include Vehicle Identification Numbers, and comply with national safety standards.
8. National harmonisation of e-mobility rules	- Referenced: 8% - Not referenced: 92% Most submitters that reference national harmonisation of e-mobility rules were in support. Lime, Neuron, and Foucault Dynamics, advocate for categorising all e-bikes as bicycles. Queensland Health highlights that harmonisation could enable the Australian Border Force to restrict the importation of non-compliant devices, ensuring only legal devices enter the country. Another key benefit, noted by Queensland Walks and others, is the convenience of consistent rules for riders in border areas, such as Coolangatta/Tweed Heads, who frequently travel between states.	TMR supports nationally, harmonised e-mobility laws. However, achieving harmonisation has historically proved difficult. Even with national model law for PMDs, the approach across jurisdictions varies widely. While harmonisation should be the goal and this would support industry and consumer understanding of rules as well as consistent importation controls, harmonisation should not limit Queensland addressing key safety issues as they emerge.
9. Importation issues	- Referenced: 8% - Not referenced: 92% Submitters, including Cairns Regional Council, Zipidi, Lime, Bicycle Queensland, Motor Trades Association Queensland, and	Responsibility for vehicle importation standards and approvals sits with the Commonwealth Government, who are best placed to provide further information on this issue.

Key theme	Summary of Issue/s Raised	TMR Response
	Bicycle Industries Australia, support stricter import approvals to prevent illegal, high-speed devices from entering Australia. This view was also echoed by the University of Queensland Micromobility Research Cluster at the public hearing on 22 July 2025. The Pedestrian Council of Australia and Queensland Walks advocate for only allowing devices certified against stringent safety standards and incapable of modification, to be imported and sold in Australia. Queensland Walks reiterated this position in their submission and at the same public hearing. Zipidi further suggests that importers should be required to upload proof of certification and safety compliance to the Commonwealth's ROVER portal to enhance oversight.	TMR is working with the Commonwealth Government and other jurisdictions to understand what enhancements are possible.
10. Concerns about minors riding e-mobility devices dangerously and committing offences	- Referenced: 36% - Not referenced: 64% Many submitters raised concerns about youth offenders, citing their lack of maturity, road rule knowledge, and respect. Many submitters called for stricter penalties for youth offenders. Fraser Coast Regional Council and Kidsafe Queensland Inc support restricting minors under 16 to low-speed, low-power PMDs and using geofencing technology to enforce these limits. Council on the Ageing Queensland suggests that all riders under 18 should require supervision. At the public hearing on 23 July 2025, AMPDbros highlighted that young riders are likely to bypass technological restrictions on devices over time. Bicycle Queensland, at the hearing on 22 July 2025, expressed concerns about youth offenders accessing high-powered throttle e-bikes, posing significant safety risks to other road and path users.	TMR is concerned about the number of incidents involving children on e-mobility devices. TMR is rolling out enhanced communication and education specifically targeted at young people. This includes presentations about rules and safe riding delivered in schools as well as partnering with the Department of Education to distribute educational materials to parents and children. Enforcement is the responsibility of the Queensland Police Service who manage youth offenders in conjunction with existing laws and procedures.

Key theme	Summary of Issue/s Raised	TMR Response
11. Concerns about pedestrian safety on footpaths	- Referenced: 49% - Not referenced: 51% Community members and groups who mention pedestrian safety highlight the speed and distance to other vulnerable road and path users at which devices are ridden. Lack of warning or noise from devices approaching from behind is acknowledged as particularly hazardous. Submitters note several solutions to improving pedestrian safety. A large majority seek restricted use of devices to bike lanes or roads only, while others suggest a total ban from footpaths – either permanently or until infrastructure upgrades are implemented. Other suggestions include the implementation of exclusion zones for e-devices in some areas, particularly high-traffic, mixed mode areas. In their submission, and at the public hearing on 23 July 2025, the City of Gold Coast raised concerns about the difficulty in protecting pedestrians from e-mobility devices. Current shared infrastructure designs are unable to fully separate e-mobility from cyclists and pedestrians, leading to an increase in risk for pedestrians.	TMR is committed to maintaining a regulatory framework that prioritises pedestrian safety, as the most vulnerable group on pathways, while balancing the mobility needs of e-mobility riders. Under current rules, riders must give way to pedestrians on footpaths, crossings, and shared paths and a speed limit of 12km/h applies to PMDs on footpaths and shared paths. However, there is no specific regulatory speed limit for bicycles – instead, riders must follow signed speed limits on paths and roads. Local governments have the flexibility to implement additional measures to address pedestrian safety concerns. They can introduce stricter speed limits or install signage to restrict e-mobility device use in areas with high pedestrian traffic. Banning e-mobility devices from footpaths may transfer the risk from interactions with pedestrians to interactions with motor vehicles, this would in turn transition the e-mobility rider to become the most vulnerable user on the roads. Care must be taken not to create negative safety outcomes or discourage the shift towards active transport. TMR acknowledges that both geofencing technologies and infrastructure improvements could enhance pedestrian safety. These measures would involve substantial costs, resources, and time to implement. TMR supports further investigation into the feasibility of technological and infrastructure solutions to improve pedestrian safety, while recognising the challenges associated with their implementation.
12. Concerns about e-mobility rider safety	- Referenced: 19% - Not referenced: 81% Submitters raised significant concerns about rider safety, particularly the lack of safety equipment being worn and the dangers of riding on road networks due to insufficient safe alternatives. Many submissions highlighted growing injury numbers. In their submission, and at the public hearing on 24 July 2025, the	TMR is concerned with the high numbers of e-mobility riders being injured and notes the number of injuries is increasing significantly year on year. Current rules require riders to wear helmets and follow speed limits. TMR communications and education also focus on broader rider safety equipment and safe riding behaviours. It is noted that more is needed to reduce the risk of e-mobility rider injuries including consideration of enhanced device design,

Key theme	Summary of Issue/s Raised	TMR Response
	University of the Sunshine Coast highlighted that inadequate pathways and signage compromise rider safety, leading riders to prioritise perceived safety over legal compliance. These concerns were echoed by the submission provided by Sandy Bolton MP, Member for Noosa. Queensland Health and the Queensland University of Technology expressed concerns about the high risk of injuries, particularly facial and head injuries from e-scooter crashes. The Queensland University of Technology identified contributing factors such as rider inexperience, risky behaviours, and impaired riding due to alcohol or drug use. The Queensland University of Technology Australian Centre for Health Law Research, the Royal Automobile Club of Queensland, and the Australian College of Road Safety emphasised the need to review design standards for stand-up e-scooters. They noted that current designs increase the risk of instability and over-the-handlebar crashes, which often result in serious injuries.	import controls, active enforcement, rider education, and improved infrastructure.
13. Impacts on the healthcare system	- Referenced: 7% - Not referenced: 93% Submitters expressed significant concerns about the strain e-mobility device injuries are placing on the healthcare system. Many community members highlighted the increasing costs to taxpayers and the diversion of time and resources from other healthcare sectors, particularly due to youth injuries linked to a lack of safety equipment. The Queensland Family & Child Commission raised concerns about hospital capacity and the pressure on healthcare services. Queensland Health, the Queensland Nurses and Midwives Union, the Royal Australasian College of Surgeons, and the Royal Automobile Club of Queensland emphasised the growing number of patients requiring treatment and rehabilitation for e-mobility-related injuries, noting the associated costs to health services and individuals.	TMR acknowledges the growing burden e-mobility injuries place on the healthcare system, particularly due to the prevalence of facial and head injuries, which carry a higher risk profile compared to other types of injuries. Younger patients represent the majority of hospital admissions, with the lack of safety equipment identified as a significant contributing factor to the severity of injuries. Addressing the healthcare impacts of e-mobility accidents will require a multi-faceted approach covering regulation, education, enforcement, device design and importation, and infrastructure.

Key theme	Summary of Issue/s Raised	TMR Response
	In their submission, and at the public hearing on 23 July 2025, the Gold Coast North Chamber of Commerce & Industry Inc echoed these concerns, while the Gold Coast Hospital and Health Service reported that e-mobility injuries are now the fastest-growing emergency-related transport injury group.	
14. Improved safety equipment for e-mobility riders	- Referenced: 19% - Not referenced: 81% Many submitters advocated for enhanced rider safety equipment, with suggestions including motorcycle-style gear such as gloves, boots, high-visibility clothing, full-face helmets, and motorcycle jackets. However, some submitters raised concerns that such gear, while protective, could encourage risky behaviour due to a sense of invulnerability, or hinder rider identification. Submitters including Ario, Lime, the Gold Coast North Chamber of Commerce & Industry Inc, Attwood Marshall Lawyers, the Council on the Ageing Queensland, and the Royal Automobile Club of Queensland highlighted the importance of safety equipment in their submissions. Helmet non-compliance was frequently noted as a key issue. Attwood Marshall Lawyers suggested that shared device operators, such as Lime and Neuron, should take greater responsibility for ensuring helmet compliance among their users. To address visibility concerns, the Gold Coast North Chamber of Commerce & Industry Inc proposed introducing high-quality helmets in bright safety colours with added reflective stripes. They also recommended that riders aged 12–16 wear mandatory reflective vests to improve visibility and safety.	PMD riders are required to wear an approved bicycle or motorcycle helmet while riding. Riders are particularly vulnerable to injuries in crashes, including facial and head trauma. Although it is not mandatory for riders to wear protective, high-visibility, or reflective clothing, TMR strongly encourages its use to enhance visibility and reduce risks, especially when riding at night. Similarly, TMR supports encouraging the use of protective gear such as wrist guards, elbow pads, and knee pads, particularly for new PMD riders. However, it is not thought practical or appropriate to mandate this through regulation. While such equipment can reduce the severity of injuries, mandating motorcycle-style gear could deter casual riders and reduce accessibility, especially for short-distance or low-speed travel. Additionally, there is the potential for increased risk-taking behaviour due to a perceived sense of invincibility.
15. Full-faced helmets	- Referenced: 3% - Not referenced: 97% Submissions were divided on the use of full-faced helmets for e-mobility riders. Supporters, including health organisations such as the Queensland Injury Surveillance Unit, Queensland Nurses and	E-mobility riders are permitted to wear any approved helmet, including full-faced helmets. While their use is not mandatory, TMR supports riders choosing full-faced helmets if it enhances their perception of safety and comfort. The primary issue with safety equipment is not the adequacy of current protective gear but the lack of compliance in its use. Although full-faced helmets offer higher levels of protection,

Key theme	Summary of Issue/s Raised	TMR Response
	Midwives Union, the Royal Automobile Club of Queensland, and the Australasian College of Road Safety, highlighted the high incidence of facial injuries among hospitalised riders. The Royal Automobile Club of Queensland, in particular, raised concerns about the low stability and safety of stand-up devices and traditional helmets, advocating for mandatory full-faced helmets and seated devices only. These views were echoed by the Jamieson Trauma Institute. Opposition to mandatory full-faced helmets came from organisations such as Lime, Neuron, and Foucault Dynamics, who argued at the public hearing on 22 July 2025 this could discourage helmet use, reduce uptake of shared devices, and deter active transport. Some individual submissions also opposed full-faced helmets suggesting that making PMD riders resemble motorcycle riders could encourage riskier behaviour.	mandating their use may result in reduced overall compliance among riders. TMR's currently priority is ensuring all riders wear a helmet.
16. Improved safety technology for e-mobility devices	- Referenced: 5% - Not referenced: 95% Submitters proposed various safety technologies to enhance the safety of e-mobility devices, particularly privately owned devices. Recommendations included anti-tampering devices to prevent speed limiter modifications, horns or similar warning devices, front and rear lights, artificial noise for silent devices, geofencing to restrict access or speed, identification chips to record speed, and visible speedometers. Submitters noted that many of these features, except artificial noise, are already required for shared devices. Several submitters, including the Fraser Coast Regional Council, advocated for extending geofencing technology to private devices to limit speed or access, similar to shared devices. The Royal Automobile Club of Queensland supported continued use of geofencing for shared devices but cautioned against using it to restrict where private riders can travel, as this could infringe on human rights. The Australasian College of Road Safety recommended that	Warning devices, lights, and certain safety specifications are already mandatory for PMDs and e-bikes. For example, devices with handlebars must be equipped with a bell or similar warning device, a working brake, and must be free of sharp protrusions. Riders are also required to use lights and reflectors at night or in poor visibility conditions. Advanced technologies such as geofencing for speed or access restrictions are currently limited to shared devices and are not applicable to private devices. Additional safety technology requirements for shared devices would need to be implemented at the local government level as councils manage the shared schemes.

Key theme	Summary of Issue/s Raised	TMR Response
	speed limiters and anti-tampering devices be installed at the manufacturing stage and suggested banning hand-throttles on e-bikes to improve safety.	
17. Improved e-mobility device design	- Referenced: 3% - Not referenced: 97% Submitters proposed various design improvements for e-bikes and PMDs to enhance safety and minimise risks. Many submitters emphasised the need to reduce the overall size and weight of devices, citing concerns about the severity of injuries and potential damage in collisions. Some also suggested that PMDs and e-bikes should undergo roadworthiness assessments, similar to light and heavy vehicles, before being used. The Spring Hill Community Group, under the auspices of Brisbane Reside, highlighted that heavier devices increase injury severity during incidents, while the Royal Automobile Club of Queensland and Jamieson Trauma Institute strongly advocated for hired e-scooters to adopt sit-down designs to address the rising number of over-the-handlebar crashes. Similarly, the Queensland Injury Surveillance Unit and Queensland Family & Child Commission raised concerns about the small wheel sizes of e-scooters, which make them unsuitable for uneven terrain and increase the risk of crashes. Ario suggested that their three-wheeled e-scooter design could mitigate these risks. Conversely, Zipidi and the Australian Electric Vehicle Association argued against strict design specifications based on size, recommending instead that PMDs be regulated by speed and weight to allow for modernisation and the inclusion of additional safety features.	Queensland's current approach to regulating PMDs by dimensions serves two key purposes. Firstly, it ensures that devices are appropriately sized for use across various infrastructure types, including footpaths and public transport, as well as for parking. Secondly, it creates a clear distinction between PMDs and other motorised recreational devices, such as quad bikes, which are not suitable for public use. For e-bikes, Queensland's design regulations align with Commonwealth standards, which historically follow the EN15194 standard, recognised as international best practice. TMR acknowledges the need to adapt the regulatory framework to keep pace with evolving e-mobility technology. TMR has previously engaged Griffith University to conduct market research and evaluate emerging trends in PMD design. This research recommended increasing the maximum length and width of PMDs to accommodate larger wheel sizes, which improve stability and reduce the risk of crashes associated with smaller wheels. While seated-only PMDs offer greater stability and reduced risk for riders, implementing this design change for shared devices would be a matter for local governments to consider. Ultimately e-mobility device design is best regulated nationally through standards to drive consistency across Australia and stand the best chance of being adopted by industry. Bespoke Queensland requirements are unlikely to be considered in the global e-mobility marketplace.
18. Concerns about e-mobility riders not following existing road rules	- Referenced: 49% - Not referenced: 51% Submitters broadly agree that better enforcement, clearer	TMR supports the safe and compliant use of e-mobility devices, recognising their value as an accessible transport option amid rising cost-of-living pressures. However, as with any emerging technology, regulatory approaches must be regularly reviewed to

Key theme	Summary of Issue/s Raised	TMR Response
	communication, and simplification of road rules are key to improving compliance. Concerns about helmet non-compliance were raised by Queensland Health, the Australian Lawyers Alliance, and the Queensland University of Technology, who linked the lack of helmet use to a significant number of injuries. The Australian Lawyers Alliance, University of the Sunshine Coast, and Maurice Blackburn Lawyers emphasised that limited community understanding of road rules contributes to non-compliance. Riders often lack clarity on where devices can be used, what constitutes a legal device, and whether modifications are permissible. The University of the Sunshine Coast specifically called for simplifying the road rules and language to improve rider comprehension. Regarding risk-taking behaviour, the University of the Sunshine Coast and the Queensland Nurses and Midwives Union noted that e-scooter riders are more likely to engage in risky behaviours compared to e-bike riders. Vision Australia also highlighted growing concerns about riders deliberately engaging in risky behaviour, which poses safety risks to other road and path users. Several submitters pointed to the "fragmented" regulatory landscape across Australian jurisdictions as a barrier to compliance. Differences in road rules between states, particularly in border areas like Coolangatta/Tweed Heads, create confusion for riders and complicate enforcement.	ensure they remain effective. Simplifying the rules, particularly in alignment with national harmonisation, could help address confusion raised by submitters about inconsistencies across Australian jurisdictions. However, TMR notes that rule amendments alone may not deter risky behaviours, such as riding without helmets, speeding, or carrying passengers. Any changes must be paired with significant communication and education as well as targeted enforcement to be effective. While enforcement is the responsibility of the Queensland Police Service, TMR acknowledges that resource constraints may limit their capacity to increase enforcement activities.
19. Battery and fire safety risks	- Referenced: 8% - Not referenced: 92% Submitters expressed significant concerns about the risks associated with lithium-ion batteries in e-mobility devices, particularly regarding storage, charging, and safe disposal. The Fire Protection Association Australia and the Waste Recycling Industry Association Queensland highlighted the need for better education, increased funding for councils, and new regulations for safe charging in buildings. They also emphasised the importance of publicising disposal locations and reducing	TMR acknowledges submitter views, and that lithium-ion battery safety is regulated in Queensland by the Electrical Safety Office within the Office of Industrial Relations, Department of State Development, Infrastructure and Planning.

Key theme	Summary of Issue/s Raised	TMR Response
	costs to make proper disposal more accessible. The Queensland Fire Department raised concerns about the link between e-scooters and battery fires, recommending that Queensland consider adopting recent battery safety regulations introduced in New South Wales to improve standards and reduce fire risks. Similarly, the Queensland University of Technology Australian Centre for Health Law Research supported harmonising battery standards across Australia to enhance user confidence. The Office of National Rail Safety Regulator noted that several international jurisdictions have banned certain e-mobility devices from trains due to battery fire risks. New South Wales and Victoria are reportedly considering similar measures.	
20. Need for increased and enhanced enforcement	- Referenced: 37% - Not referenced: 63% Submitters expressed strong concerns about enforcement of e-mobility regulations, with many citing a lack of visible police presence and instances of riders engaging in illegal behaviour without consequences. There was broad support for expanding police powers, with submitters advocating for the Queensland Police Service to confiscate, impound, or destroy non-compliant devices without issuing infringements first. To address enforcement resourcing challenges, submitters such as the Local Government Association Queensland and the Royal Automobile Club of Queensland suggested involving local council officers, school officers, and TMR-employed Transport Inspectors in confiscating devices and issuing infringements. Submitters also called for a centralised reporting system to allow community members to report unsafe or illegal e-mobility behaviour to local or state authorities. Some submitters like the Royal Automobile Club of Queensland and Sunshine Coast Regional Council recommended using	TMR acknowledges submitter concerns regarding enforcement of e-mobility regulations, including calls for expanded police powers, greater use of enforcement technology, and involvement of local council officers and Transport Inspectors. Enforcement of road rules and related offences is the responsibility of the Queensland Police Service. TMR supports the Queensland Police Service in their efforts and encourages further exploration of resourcing and technology solutions to address non-compliance effectively. If considered appropriate TMR would also support investigating alternative enforcement personnel options such as Transport Inspectors.

Key theme	Summary of Issue/s Raised	TMR Response
	enforcement technology, such as machine learning cameras to track and address non-compliant behaviour more effectively.	
21. Need for more separated infrastructure	- Referenced: 21% - Not referenced: 79% Submitters emphasised the importance of improved infrastructure to enhance safety and compliance for e-mobility riders. Organisations such as Queensland Health and the Queensland University of Technology highlighted that separated infrastructure would reduce crash risks and improve road rule compliance by creating a safer environment with greater distance from other road users. Several submitters, including the University of the Sunshine Coast, noted that current signage is confusing and inconsistent, particularly regarding speed limits and "where to ride" rules. For example, at the public hearing on 24 July 2025, Get Around Caboolture raised concerns about the rule permitting riders only on roads signed at 50km/h without a median strip, which often forces riders onto footpaths. While the Australian Medical Association Queensland supports fully separated infrastructure for riders and pedestrians, they recommend prioritising high-risk areas, such as those near schools and hospitals, as an initial focus.	TMR acknowledges the growing demand for dedicated infrastructure to support increased e-mobility use and improve safety, particularly for vulnerable users on shared paths. While TMR supports calls for improved and separated infrastructure, it notes that such upgrades involve significant costs. Currently, legally compliant e-bikes are permitted wherever bicycles can ride unless explicitly prohibited, while PMDs are allowed on footpaths, shared paths, bike paths, and certain local streets with a speed limit of 50km/h or less and no dividing line or median strip. Given this, footpaths remain critical links in the network to ensure PMD riders can travel practically, given their limited on-road access.
22. Shared e-mobility devices create parking issues and block footpaths	- Referenced: 8% - Not referenced: 92% Submitters raised concerns about the dangers and inconvenience caused by improperly parked e-mobility devices on footpaths, which create hazards for pedestrians and cyclists. Many submitters emphasised the need for investment in parking solutions to improve safety and accessibility for all path users. Brisbane City Council highlighted its efforts to address parking issues through operating agreements with shared device providers, which include restrictions on parking locations. Brisbane City Council has also implemented designated parking	TMR acknowledges the importance of addressing parking issues for shared e-mobility devices, particularly when devices are left on footpaths in unsafe or inconvenient locations, impacting path users, including those who are vision impaired. Parking primarily occurs on local government-owned infrastructure, such as footpaths, making local governments best placed to assess community needs and enforce parking compliance. TMR supports consistency across councils through its e-Mobility Safety Reference Group, which regularly discusses parking issues and solutions. This group has also developed detailed guidelines to help councils standardise parking solutions, available on the TMR website.

Key theme	Summary of Issue/s Raised	TMR Response
	areas, including marked parking hubs in the Brisbane central business district, to encourage appropriate parking behaviour. Pedestrian and disability advocacy groups, such as Queensland Walks and Vision Australia, called for dedicated parking infrastructure for e-mobility devices. Queensland Walks further recommended that shared device operators be required to establish designated parking areas as part of their agreements with local councils. Several submitters, including Queensland Walks, also advocated for the introduction of parking fines and penalties by state and local governments, as well as shared device operators. Additionally, the Royal Automobile Club of Queensland and Queenslanders with a Disability Network suggested better use of geofencing technology by shared scheme operators to ensure proper parking and penalise non-compliance.	TMR recommends that local governments implement parking compliance measures through operating agreements with shared device providers. Local government officers already have powers to issue parking fines for motor vehicles, and similar enforcement could be applied to e-mobility devices. Given current resourcing constraints, it is likely not practical for police to take on enforcement responsibilities for e-mobility parking.
23. Need for more education for e-mobility riders	- Referenced: 26% - Not referenced: 74% Submitters strongly supported improved education to enhance e-mobility safety and compliance. Suggestions included comprehensive public awareness campaigns, mandatory rider safety training and testing, and school-based education to teach children road rules, safe riding practices, and the consequences of unsafe behaviour. This was supported by organisations such as University of the Sunshine Coast, the Australian Lawyers Alliance, Brake Driver Awareness, Engineers Australia, Australasian College of Road Safety, and Sandy Bolton MP. Several submitters, including Queensland Tourism Industry Council, Queensland Family and Child Commission, Queensland Disability Network, Vision Australia, and Dr Terry Goldsworthy, emphasised the importance of inclusive education campaigns. They recommended tailored messaging for those who are culturally and linguistically diverse and First Nations communities, as well as tourists and visitors, using diverse languages and mediums to ensure accessibility.	TMR is committed to improving community awareness and understanding of e-mobility road rules through a range of educational initiatives. These include distributing educational materials and partnering with the Queensland Police Service to deliver e-mobility education in schools, shopping centres, and other high-use areas. TMR has also collaborated with agencies such as Queensland Police Service, the Office of Fair Trading, and the Department of Education to address issues like retail enforcement and school policies. TMR also currently provides road safety grants to a number of organisations who provide school-based education on e-mobility rules and safety. These programs are currently voluntary. TMR through StreetSmarts also regularly provides information about riding e-mobility devices across a range of digital and social platforms such as Facebook, Instagram, Snapchat, Tik Tok, Reddit, Twitch, YouTube, programmatic audio (Spotify) and X (Twitter), with a reach of between 1 and 2 million road users each month. While mandatory training and testing for young riders may be effective, implementing such programs in schools would require

Key theme	Summary of Issue/s Raised	TMR Response
	There were also calls for shared device operators to take greater responsibility for rider education. Submitters suggested that operators use their apps to implement mandatory training or testing before riders can unlock and use devices, as noted by the University of Queensland during the public hearing on 22 July 2025.	further consideration by Department of Education. TMR also supports developing targeted messaging for specific communities, such as those who are culturally and linguistically diverse and First Nations groups, where evidence suggests a higher risk of misunderstanding the rules. However, education campaigns should primarily focus on young people, particularly males aged 15–24, based on injury statistics. Regarding shared device operators, TMR supports exploring additional responsibilities for rider training, such as integrating training modules and competency checks into their apps. However, as shared operating agreements are managed by local governments, implementing such measures would require collaboration at the local level and may involve legislative complexities. While training is a valuable tool for improving rider competency, its effectiveness depends on integration into a broader enforcement framework to ensure compliance.
24. Need for more or better-connected data	- Referenced: 4% - Not referenced: 96% Submitters, including universities and agencies, emphasised the importance of greater data capture to enable detailed analysis and evidence-based policy recommendations. Many organisations supported collecting more comprehensive hospital and injury data, including at-fault rider demographics, as well as data categorised by device type, ownership, purpose, and legality. It was also suggested that data be standardised and shared across jurisdictions, hospitals, insurers, and agencies, potentially through an established Open Data Specification, to improve collaboration and policy outcomes.	TMR recognises the importance of high-quality data collection to support evidence-based policy decisions for e-mobility safety. While data on enforcement, injuries, and crashes is typically gathered by agencies such as TMR, Queensland Police Service, and Queensland Health, resource and system constraints within these agencies pose challenges to full data integration. TMR supports exploring ways of better collecting and integrating data, noting that there may be significant challenges to overcome.

Key theme	Summary of Issue/s Raised	TMR Response
25. Increased penalties and consideration of driver licence sanctions	A small proportion of submitters suggested strengthening penalties to deter non-compliant behaviour, including applying demerit points for e-mobility offences to riders of all ages. These views were supported by the Queensland Law Society. Some submitters further proposed that accruing demerit points should result in the loss of a driver's licence or delay children from obtaining one.	TMR supports penalties for e-mobility offences that are proportionate to the severity and risks associated with the behaviour. Several PMD penalties were increased significantly in 2022. Increased penalties will only be effective if combined by significant enforcement to ensure the perception of being caught and penalised is high. Currently, users of illegal e-bikes can face fines exceeding \$1,580 and three demerit points for certain offences. These penalties can also apply to individuals who permit the use of illegal devices, such as parents allowing children to ride them in public spaces. Implementing a demerit point scheme for e-mobility offences would require implementation of a driver licensing system. This is complex and would require careful consideration to balance impacts. Any consideration of penalties for juvenile offenders must consider the broader youth justice landscape and approach to policing. Increasing financial penalties is likely to be ineffective for this cohort and delaying when they may be able to apply for their driver licence may impact their employability.
26. Regulation of retailers	A small number of submissions supported regulating retailers to improve consumer awareness and compliance. Many suggested requiring retailers to provide informational and educational materials at the point of sale, a view supported by the University of Queensland, Neuron, the Australian Lawyers Alliance, Zipidi, Maurice Blackburn Lawyers, Motor Trades Association Queensland, and Caravan Parks Association Queensland. Some submitters, including the Royal Automobile Club of Queensland and Dr Terry Goldsworthy, advocated for requiring retailers to hold motor dealer licences to sell high-powered devices intended for private property use. Additionally, submitters proposed penalties for retailers selling illegal devices or modification kits that make devices non-compliant for public use. Suggestions included random	TMR supports the consideration of mandatory educational materials being provided at the point of sale but notes challenges with ensuring compliance. Requiring retailers to provide such materials may be difficult to enforce without additional resources for regular audits by the Queensland Office of Fair Trading, which is responsible for regulating local retailers. Larger-scale issues across jurisdictions would fall under the Australian Competition and Consumer Commission. Under consumer law, it is already an offence for retailers to make false or misleading claims when selling products. For example, a retailer falsely claiming an illegal e-bike is road-legal could face significant penalties, including fines of up to \$50 million for corporations. To address this, TMR has recently contacted approximately 200 e-bike retailers across Queensland to raise

Key theme	Summary of Issue/s Raised	TMR Response
	inspections and enforcement by the Office of Fair Trading.	awareness of the rules and potential enforcement actions. The Office of Fair Trading is best placed to provide further information regarding the regulation of retailers and sale of consumer products in Queensland.
28. Private vs Shared devices	A small number of submitters expressed differing views on regulating private and shared e-mobility devices. Ario and Beam suggested separate regulatory frameworks to account for differences in technology. Some submitters, including the Queensland University of Technology and Brisbane West Bicycle Users Group, argued that shared devices are more dangerous due to inexperienced riders being more likely to engage in risky behaviour. Conversely, others, such as Neuron, Sunshine Coast Regional Council, Beam, Logan City Council, Brisbane South Bicycle Users Group, and Ario, highlighted that private devices pose greater risks due to the lack of technological constraints like geofencing, speed limiting, and remote parking features, which are standard on shared devices.	Queensland's e-mobility framework does not differentiate between private and shared devices. Introducing separate rules for private and shared devices may increase complexity and community confusion, particularly given existing challenges in understanding e-mobility road rules. TMR does not regulate shared schemes or providers, as this responsibility lies with local governments. Local governments are well-placed to manage shared devices through operating agreements, including measures such as geofencing and helmet locks, to address safety risks associated with less experienced riders.
29. Food delivery riders	A small number of submitters raised concerns about food delivery riders engaging in unsafe behaviours, such as speeding, careless riding, and using illegal devices. The Queensland Law Society suggested that food delivery companies should be required to ensure the devices used by their riders comply with Queensland's legal requirements and are properly maintained.	TMR does not administer separate e-mobility rules specifically for food delivery riders. However, in the same way that all riders are required to ensure their devices are legal, companies providing food delivery services are required to ensure that the devices used by their riders comply with Queensland's legal requirements for PMDs and e-bikes. Food delivery companies likely have existing obligations under Workplace Health and Safety legislation to ensure the safety of operations, including the provision of safe and legal equipment and suitable training.



3 JUNE 2025

Department of
Transport and Main Roads

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to you in relation to the sale and use of illegal e-bike devices in Queensland and the significant consequences for industry if misrepresenting their products.

The Department of Transport and Main Roads (TMR) has become aware of a significant increase in illegal devices, purporting to be legal e-bikes, being marketed, sold and used in Queensland. This issue is causing substantial community concern and tragically there have been serious injuries and fatalities.

A Queensland Parliamentary Inquiry has recently commenced to examine e-mobility safety in Queensland and one of the key aspects of this inquiry will be the importation, sale and use of illegal e-bike devices. More information about the inquiry can be found at www.parliament.qld.gov.au/Work-of-Committees/Committees/Committee-Details?cid=272&id=4522

As an organisation involved in the importation, wholesale or retail of e-bikes in Queensland, it is your responsibility to know the rules and requirements.

Under Queensland law, a legal e-bike must:

- Be predominately pedal powered.
 - The motor can only provide assistance to a pedalling rider.
 - Throttle control is only permitted up to 6km/h, after which the motor can only operate if the rider is pedalling.
- Have a motor with a maximum continuous power rating of 250 watts.
 - Higher powered motors are never legal, even if limited to a lower output by software locking, or similar.
- Be capable of a maximum of 25km/h while the motor is operational.

TMR recommends that consumers look out for e-bikes that comply with the European Standard for Power Assisted Pedal Cycles (EN15194) as a clear indication that it is legal for use in Queensland. For information about legal e-bike requirements in Queensland visit <https://streetsmarts.initiatives.qld.gov.au/electric-bikes>

Any device that exceeds the requirements above, is considered a motorcycle and is illegal for use in public places, such as roads and paths, unless compliant with vehicle registration requirements.

I am aware that there are illegal e-bikes being marketed and sold in Queensland as legal for use in public places. This misleading practice exposes consumers to considerable risk and could be illegal under consumer law.

The Office of Fair Trading investigate complaints relating to false or misleading claims about products and significant penalties apply. This includes fines of up to \$50 million for a corporation and \$2.5 million for an individual. For more information about your obligations under consumer law go to www.qld.gov.au/law/laws-regulated-industries-and-accountability/queensland-laws-and-regulations/business-advice-rights-and-responsibilities/avoid-using-unfair-business-practices-against-consumers/avoid-making-false-claims-about-products-or-services

In addition to any criminal penalties, supplying illegal e-bikes under false or misleading claims may expose businesses to civil liability claims. Police are increasingly seizing illegal devices when used in public places and consumers may seek damages from the supplier if misled during the purchasing process.

I trust this information is of assistance and will support your business in correctly representing the legality of all e-bikes marketed and sold in Queensland. For any questions, please contact TMR at [REDACTED].

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Joanna Robinson". The signature is written in a cursive style, with the first name "Joanna" and the last name "Robinson" clearly legible.

Joanna Robinson
General Manager (Land Transport Safety & Regulation)



COMMUNIQUE FOR INFRASTRUCTURE AND TRANSPORT MINISTERS' MEETING

Monday 11 August 2025

Infrastructure and Transport Ministers met today in Melbourne, Victoria.

Improving Interoperability of Rail Systems

Ministers agreed to the European Train Control Systems as the future technology pathway for National Network for Interoperability (NNI). In addition, they agreed that any future digital train control and signalling system introduced on the NNI is to comply with ETCS mandatory standards. This will improve productivity by providing more efficient access to rail networks by operators. Ministers also agreed a new Rail Industry Safety and Standards Board will become the industry led technical standards setting body, and endorsed progress on the National Pathway for streamlining rollingstock approvals.

Ministers endorsed a national approach to the procurement of passenger rolling stock to maximise local industry participation, grow manufacturing capability, and strengthen supply chain resilience. Ministers also agreed to consider a package of reform options to implement elements of the National Rail Procurement and Management Strategy, including nationally harmonised standards for manufacturing rolling stock.

A better Way to Set Heavy Vehicle Charges – Including a Forward-Looking Cost Base

Ministers agreed a preferred heavy vehicle charge increase of 6 per cent for 2026-27 under the current Pay As You Go charging model, noting the dissent of Queensland and the non-participation of Western Australia and the Northern Territory. Ministers asked the National Transport Commission (NTC) to undertake public consultation on the proposed increase for 60 days, consistent with the *Fuel Tax Act 2006* (Cth). Alongside this, Ministers agreed, as a matter of priority, the NTC consult on a forward-looking cost base model as an alternative way to set heavy vehicle charges.

Decarbonisation of Transport and Infrastructure

Ministers noted the progress of the Infrastructure Decarbonisation Working Group and Decarbonisation of Transport Working Group under their respective work plans. Ministers agreed to develop a national decarbonisation policy framework for whole of life carbon. This framework, supported by a flexible approach to national implementation, will support carbon reduction across every phase of a transport infrastructure project, from early planning to operation and end-of-life.

Heavy Vehicle Licensing Update

Ministers considered the NTC's report on licensing and accreditation arrangements for heavy vehicle drivers. Ministers also noted Austroads is implementing the ITMM-agreed reforms to the National Heavy Vehicle Driver Competency Framework.

Updating the National Voluntary Guidelines for Stevedore Landside Charges

Ministers endorsed the NTC to update the National Voluntary Guidelines for landside stevedore charges to include a new requirement for stevedore operators to implement price changes annually on 1 January. Ministers also agreed the NTC will work with jurisdictions to include empty container park operators in the Guidelines with similar requirements as stevedore operators. These changes will improve transparency of landside pricing and charging behaviour, maximising freight productivity as it looks to improve the efficiency of Australia's container freight supply chains.

Ministers also agreed the Infrastructure and Transport Senior Officials' Committee will establish a working group to explore options and recommended next steps in response to findings by the Australian Competition and Consumer Commission concerning stevedore charges.

Personal Mobility Devices

Ministers observed that personal mobility devices bring a range of benefits to the Australian community, but also new risks that must be managed. Ministers noted work underway under the Australian Consumer Ministers Network to examine the safety of the lithium-ion batteries use in personal mobility devices and ongoing discussions between Commonwealth, State and Territory transport officials to identify and explore broader safety management options. To improve rider and pedestrian safety, Ministers agreed to work together to develop an integrated regulatory framework to be led by Western Australia, with support from the NTC and all other jurisdictions. A draft framework will be considered by Infrastructure and Transport Ministers later this year.

Construction and Transport Productivity

Ministers were provided an update from the Minister for Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Local Government, on the Australian Government's productivity agenda in transport and infrastructure construction. The Minister outlined challenges, reform priorities and proposed idea for increasing productivity across the construction and transport sectors.

Next Meeting

Ministers look forward to meeting again in the second half of 2025.



ITMM ATTENDEES

The Hon Catherine King MP (Commonwealth)	Minister for Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Local Government
The Hon Jenny Aitchison MP (New South Wales)	Minister for Roads; Minister for Regional Transport
The Hon John Graham MLC (New South Wales)	Special Minister of State; Minister for Transport; Minister for the Arts; Minister for Music and the Night-time Economy
The Hon Gabrielle Williams MP (Victoria)	Minister for Transport Infrastructure; Minister for Public and Active Transport
The Hon Melissa Horne MP (Victoria)	Minister for Ports and Freight; Minister for Roads and Road Safety; Minister for Health Infrastructure
The Hon Brent Mickelberg MP (Queensland)	Minister for Transport and Main Roads
The Hon Tom Koutsantonis MP (South Australia)	Minister for Infrastructure and Transport; Minister for Energy and Mining; Leader of Government Business in the House of Assembly
The Hon Rita Saffioti MLA (Western Australia)	Deputy Premier; Treasurer; Minister for Transport; Minister for Sports and Recreation
Ms Cynthia Heydon (as an observer obo the Hon Kerry Vincent and the Hon Eric Abetz) (Tasmania)	Deputy Secretary Transport, Tasmanian Department of State Growth
The Hon William Yan MP (Northern Territory)	Treasurer; Minister for Logistics and Infrastructure; Minister for Housing Construction
Mr Chris Steel MLA (obo Ms Tara Cheyne MLA) (Australian Capital Territory)	Acting Manager of Government Services, Attorney-General, Minister for Human Rights, Minister for City and Government Services, Minister for the Night-time Economy

