



# **STATE DEVELOPMENT, INFRASTRUCTURE AND WORKS COMMITTEE**

Mr JJ McDonald MP—Chair  
Ms JM Bush MP  
Mr TA James MP  
Mr D Kempton MP  
Mr SR King MP  
Mr BJ Mellish MP

**Staff present:**

Ms S Galbraith—Committee Secretary  
Ms R Duncan—Assistant Committee Secretary

## **PUBLIC HEARING—INQUIRY INTO THE TRANSPORT AND OTHER LEGISLATION (MANAGING E-MOBILITY USE AND PROTECTING OUR COMMUNITIES) AMENDMENT BILL 2026**

### **TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS**

**Friday, 24 April 2026**

**Brisbane**

## FRIDAY, 24 APRIL 2026

---

**The committee met at 8.47 am.**

**CHAIR:** I declare open this public hearing for the committee's inquiry into Transport and Other Legislation (Managing E-mobility Use and Protecting our Communities) Amendment Bill 2026. I am Jim McDonald, member for Lockyer and chair of the committee. With me here today is Ms Jonty Bush, member for Cooper and deputy chair; Mr Terry James, member for Mulgrave; Mr David Kempton, member for Cook; Mr Shane King, member for Kurwongbah; and Mr Bart Mellish, member for Aspley.

The purpose of today's hearing is to assist the committee with its examination of the Transport and Other Legislation (Managing E-mobility Use and Protecting Our Communities) Amendment Bill 2026. This hearing 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, but I remind witnesses that intentionally misleading the committee is a serious offence. I also remind members of the public that they may be excluded from the hearing at the direction 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 turn your mobile phones off or onto silent mode. Please remember to press your microphone on before you start speaking and off when you are finished.

**McCANNA, Mr Christopher, Manager, Transport and Infrastructure Planning, Logan City Council.**

**REILLY, Mr Daryl, Executive General Manager, Transport Operations, Logan City Council**

**SUHARTO, Mr Sonny, Senior Road Safety Officer, Transport Operations, City of Gold Coast (via videoconference)**

**WISE, Mrs Renee, Manager, Transport Operations, City of Gold Coast (via videoconference)**

**CHAIR:** I now welcome representatives from the City of Gold Coast and Logan City Council. Good morning, everyone. Would you like to make a brief opening statement before the committee has questions for you?

**Mr Suharto:** I would first like to thank the committee for inviting the City of Gold Coast to be a witness at today's public hearing. The city's opening statement today is based on the content of our submission. The preparation of our submission was informed by consultation with the city's transport operations, transport planning, and planning and regulation departments. There are four major things I would like to address here.

The first is in relation to access to infrastructure. The 10-kilometre e-mobility footpath speed limit is not supported. If speed limits were introduced, appropriate technical guidance for e-mobility speed limits on footpaths needs to be developed by the Queensland government with rigour, data and evidence based in consultation with stakeholders such as local governments, Queensland Police Service, road safety practitioners, academia, e-mobility advocacy groups and cycling advocacy groups. This will assist in determining credible, defensible and enforceable e-mobility footpath speed limits and provide updated guidance for signage on-path and on-road pavement markings.

While the city suggests an unsigned 20-kilometre speed limit, this also inquires investigative rigour to determine if it is an acceptable and credible footpath speed limit. The city has a 1,940 kilometres of footpath network. Under the proposed bill, if a speed limit higher than the default speed

limit is required, significant time would be needed for prioritisation, speed limit review and approval. If signage and pavement markings are required, funding also needs to be considered by the state for installation.

In terms of crash data, we are finding that more e-mobility conflicts with motor vehicles than pedestrians are evident within the crash data. Available crash records for the Gold Coast from 1 January 2022 to 31 December 2024 reveal that fatal and serious injury crashes involving e-mobility devices are as follows: in terms of on-road environments, 65 fatal and serious injury crashes were found, with PMD or e-scooters having one fatality and 46 hospitalisation crashes, e-bikes had 15 hospitalisations and e-skateboards had three hospitalisations. On road related areas such as footpaths, there were 20 fatal and serious injury crashes found, with PMDs and e-scooters having 12 hospitalisations, e-bikes had one fatal and seven hospitalisations, and e-skateboards had zero. In 2025 on the Gold Coast there were two on-road e-bike fatalities.

The second is in relation to licensing requirements and age threshold. Many people do not need or cannot obtain a driver's licence, including seniors and people with a disability who will lose their mobility and independence. The 16-plus age limit restricts younger teenagers who use legal e-bikes for school commutes. An age threshold of 12 is more logical, aligning with the transition to secondary school when independent commuting typically begins.

Thirdly, the City of Gold Coast has looked at issues to manage pathway safety. At footpath locations with high pedestrian activity, the city has trialled banning of all devices with signage. On the Oceanway, static and electronic signage treatments are installed to encourage path users to slow down. Both have resulted in negligible compliance and have not been successful.

Finally, noncompliant e-motorbikes in our transport system remain the City of Gold Coast's biggest concern. The city calls for reforms and action at Commonwealth government level through the importation and enforcement processes for noncompliant e-mobility devices. From observations from customer complaints, onsite inspections, on road and off road, and public engagement events, it is clear that rider behaviours from e-motorbike and e-bikes capable of travelling at high speeds are still prevalent on our transport network, and these are our key concern.

**CHAIR:** Thanks, Sonny. We will now go to Daryl.

**Mr Reilly:** I would like to thank you for the opportunity to be able to present today on behalf of Logan City Council on this important bill. Logan is one of the fastest growing cities in Australia. It is also the youngest and most culturally diverse community in Queensland. E-mobility presents an opportunity for a substantial shift in the degree of freedom people have to move around our city and to choose transport modes other than driving. Just this week, council adopted its ambitious goals to guide the way our city shape and mobility evolves over the next 50 years. In the transport space, Logan aspires that, by 2075, 60 per cent of our peak hour trips will actually be made using public transport or active transport. E-mobility is an important transport option as we pursue that goal.

Council supports aspects of the draft legislation, particularly those measures aimed at addressing the impacts of electric motorbikes and other unsafe personal mobility devices. This is consistent with council's longstanding efforts to prevent unregistered motorbikes in council's parks and on our roads. Electric motorbikes represent the same issue, just using a different power source. In both instances it is unregistered motorbikes being ridden illegally, and we support the bill promoting illegal electric motorbikes being prohibited in our public spaces.

In contrast, council, however, has concerns with aspects of the bill which are unnecessarily restrictive and will discourage the use of legal personal mobility devices and legal electric pedal-assisted bikes, which we would reference as true e-bikes. The proposed default speed of 10 kilometres per hour on shared paths and footpaths is concerning. The constraint will act to direct more users of legal e-mobility devices onto our roadways and away from the 175 kilometres of safe shared paths council has invested in over many decades. Actively promoting 25-kilometre limited e-mobility devices to integrate into general traffic in 50- and 60-kilometre speed environments rather than using infrastructure purposely built for the use of bikes does not align with the aspirations of the bill to improve overall safety for the community.

Council is concerned also that the proposed licensing requirements will have inequitable impacts on our young people, on people from low socio-economic backgrounds and on people who have disabilities or health issues who are unable to secure a driver's licence but who are capable of safely riding an e-bike. E-bikes and personal mobility devices provide an important opportunity for these people to have equity and independence. We want them to have every chance to be active and inclusive members of our community, and restricting their access to independent mobility impacts on that outcome.

We welcome aspects of the draft bill that move to remove illegal electric bikes and unsafe devices from our roads, footpaths and shared paths. However, we request that this important bill be considered for amendments so that it does not discourage the use of legal mobility devices and pedal-assisted e-bikes. Legal e-bikes and PMDs are important mobility options which should be supported for use by the residents of Logan and by residents in Queensland generally. We welcome discussion and are open to any questions that may be forthcoming.

**CHAIR:** Thank you all for your submissions. We will now go to questions. I will go to the deputy chair.

**Ms BUSH:** I am going to hand over to the member for Kurwongbah.

**Mr KING:** Thanks for coming along. It is really good to hear from our councils. It is a pity Brisbane City Council could not make it. They have also put in a strong submission like yours. We appreciate your submissions and for coming in today. My first question is to the City of Gold Coast. You both touched on this. The proposed changes to licensing and the speed limits, with both councils' vision for sustainable transport into the future, how would this bill affect that? Could you both go into more detail?

**Mr Suharto:** With the default 10-kilometre speed limit, if the City of Gold Coast decided to look at a higher posted speed limit, whatever that might be—it could be 20 kilometres for example—there are significant costs to the city in the installation of signs. As I mentioned before, we have 1,940 kilometres of footpaths within the city. If we looked at, for example, a 20-kilometre speed limit sign for each minute of travel along these footpaths, there would be a gap of 335 metres. That would equate to something like 5,809 signs in one direction. For example, on the Oceanway, which is about 48 kilometres, there would be 144 signs in one direction that would be needed. From the point of view of the volume of signs that are required and also the costs involved, this is a particular reason we would look at speed limits being reviewed with rigour to understand the implications of speed limits on e-mobility devices and what might be considered a better speed limit.

**Mr KING:** I was more going towards the licensing, particularly on the Gold Coast but Logan as well. Tourists come and want to use these things but all of a sudden they cannot if they do not hold a licence. Could you comment on that, please?

**Mr Suharto:** For a learner's licence, the current road rules test does not quite incorporate hazard perception tests and skills for riding of e-mobility devices, which is also crucially important. These need to be included tools to support the road rules that are learned as part of those tests. We also have a rideshare scheme within the City of Gold Coast. One-third of users are visitors. It is not determined whether they are from overseas or not. The implication for that scheme is that if a licence is required then there is need for that overseas visitor, if they do not hold an overseas licence, to look at getting a learner's permit at \$77.55 and then \$28.70 for the PrepL—so there is a \$106 cost there, as well as the hire of the bike. That is one aspect from a tourism point of view. Overall, the basic riding knowledge and e-mobility device-handling skills need to be incorporated with a learner's permit, I would have thought.

**Mr Reilly:** In my opening remarks I touched on the aspiration for our city. We are seeing significantly greater requirement for us in regard to transport infrastructure, and we have a very high dependence on a car oriented network. We are targeting not only seeing more people on public transport—and we do not have a great public transport network at the moment—but also encouraging people to use more active transport infrastructure. With the target that we have set to try to reduce particularly peak-hour transport, a lot of that traffic is actually generated by people taking children to school and those sorts of aspects. By making it more prohibitive for particularly people in their teens who would be able to use these types of devices to travel to school, we effectively are pushing more traffic back into our network.

Our desire is to provide more dedicated infrastructure to support greater use of not only traditional bicycles but also legal and compliant e-mobility devices to mitigate the degree of commitment we will have to make in regard to road infrastructure. That cost share for us is going to be an important aspect around sustainability for local government in the long term. The more roads we have to build, the more traffic we generate that actually uses that. Trying to look constructively towards the shift in e-mobility road share is really important.

The other aspect which resonates with us significantly—and we hear about—is from people who have limitations in getting a driver's licence. I have members in my own family. Those who suffer from vertigo and those types of aspects are alright in terms of being able to ride a bike, but, in terms of securing a driver's licence, it becomes more challenging. There are some aspects there around equity for the general public as well.

**Mr McCanna:** Adding to what Daryl mentioned, we raise that the licensing requirement has a significant impact on younger people, people with a disability and people from low socio-economic backgrounds. They are all large portions of our community. We have largely the youngest population of any urban local government in Queensland. Certain parts of our city have very high levels of disability and significantly lower incomes, so we see e-mobility as providing an important option for those people to have more independence. The licensing requirement certainly would impede that independence for those residents.

**Mr KING:** I appreciate that. I am from Moreton Bay. We have a lot of the same problems. I have been hearing strongly from my community.

**Mr KEMPTON:** Sonny, in your preamble, you say that the 16-year age limit castigates younger teenagers and that a threshold of 12 years is more appropriate because children are transitioning from junior school to secondary school where independent commuting begins. I understand that argument, but this is more about understanding and complying with road rules, situational awareness and maturity to be able to operate a vehicle and public safety, and less about convenience. For those reasons, we do not allow children to drive motor vehicles under the age of 16. What are your thoughts about putting children on motorised cycles under the age of 16 for those same reasons?

**Ms BUSH:** Point of order, Chair: I wonder if that is seeking an opinion. Can he rephrase the question?

**CHAIR:** This is a committee hearing and we have witnesses here who are allowed to express their opinion. It is not the rules of the House.

**Mr Suharto:** I will refer this question to Renee.

**Mrs Wise:** I can talk to this and this is an opinion. I am a mother. I have a 12-year-old son. We live a 30-minute walk from his school. A legal e-bike would be a legitimate mode of transport for him. I would be confident with him on a legal e-bike. What you are talking as motor vehicles are illegal motorbikes; they are not legal e-bikes. It would be great for my son. I have not bought him one because I am part of this process and I know it is likely that he may be banned from using these devices. I, as a mother, would be comfortable for my 12-year-old son to ride a legal e-bike to school as a legitimate mode of transport. We live in Queensland—there are hills and it is hot. Pedal-assisted bikes have a role in our transport system. In regard to illegal e-bikes, I totally agree. I do not want any children or anyone on those without a licence. However, a pedal-assist bike, as a mother, I definitely would support my child at 12 riding that. That is my opinion.

**Mr Reilly:** At the outset it is really important to differentiate what we would view as being an illegal electric motorbike. We see those show up in the press frequently under the term 'e-bike'. It really bothers me that they get linked in the same category of legal pedal-assist e-bikes. We are highly supportive of removing them from our streets. When we come back to what we call a true e-bike, where it is a pedal-assist arrangement, I think that the speed limit and the licensing tie together fairly closely. I take on board your reference to the fact that having younger people in traffic generally is a deterrent for us in regard to having children actually ride to school.

The more we push them onto our heavier roads, the more it becomes a problem. Parents are not comfortable with that. That has a linkage to the 10-kilometres-an-hour proposal that is in the bill. Restricting the speed of those devices to 10 kilometres an hour works against the idea of trying to keep them separate on designated share paths that we would provide for people to use those and traditional bikes to access school and the like. I do not think one works without the other. It is that position around us providing safe environments. I do not think in that space there is a big differential between a traditional bike, which is going to run at around the same speed for children heading to school, and an e-bike.

**Mr MELLISH:** Thank you for coming in on a Friday morning and, particularly from Logan, for battling the M1 coming up here on a weekday. My question is probably to Logan, but Gold Coast can throw in as well if they wish. One of the recommendations from the committee's previous inquiry—and, indeed, many submitters talked about this—is increased investment in active transport infrastructure. Could you speak to how cancellation of infrastructure like the active transport component of the Logan and Gold Coast Faster Rail Project would risk putting more people onto roads who would use these devices separate from roads otherwise?

**Mr McCanna:** Council strongly supports the Logan and Gold Coast Faster Rail Project as a whole. We have been really clear with Transport and Main Roads, and as an activist proponent on that, that we would like to see the segregated continuous active transport corridor reinstated to the faster rail project. It provides a key opportunity in providing a dedicated, separated, active transport

route across the length of our city, linking together major centres at Logan Central and Beenleigh with a hospital, a TAFE and university at Loganlea and a major arts precinct at Kingston as well. We would really like to see all of those centres linked together appropriately. In this bill, especially in relation to the 10-kilometres-an-hour speed limit, I understand that would also apply to the sections of the active transport corridor which are planned to be retained within the current plans, so equally that would diminish the value of that as well.

In terms of our overall infrastructure network currently, Logan has about 1,800 kilometres of footpaths of which 175 kilometres are shared paths. That has been a substantial investment by council over many years. For comparison, in terms of segregated cycle infrastructure, we only have about 15 kilometres worth which has come through in new development areas. We would like to see that grow substantially in the future. That is all subject to the state's Active Transport Grants Program.

**Mr Reilly:** The other point I would like to highlight is the significant and met portion of the shared pathways that we have across the city are part of the principal cycle network, which is adopted by the state. We have been able to provide those connections to promote active transport use, to facilitate that where we do not have on-road capacity. We have built a lot of that network offline. In terms of what we are talking about, it actually creates a restriction on what would be our principal cycle network for people who are on e-mobility devices. I acknowledge that there have been changes in regard to the state funding for active transport arrangements. We continue to work with the state and we have received a lot of support from them over the years in achieving the network connections we have.

**Mr MELLISH:** Essentially you have worked with state governments of both colours over the years to expand the principal cycle network and other active transport, but now only those parts that are completely separated will be able to be properly used by these devices?

**Mr Reilly:** Yes.

**Mr JAMES:** In the City of Gold Coast's submission, you talk about the uniform 10-kilometres-per-hour footpath speed limit and you use the phrase 'potential legislative ambiguity'. What if the councils were given the option, depending on the environment of the shared path, of increasing the speed limit in specific areas? How would you consider that and whether that clarifies some of the ambiguity for you?

**Mr Suharto:** Renee, would you like to speak to that one?

**Mrs Wise:** Yes. I think our biggest concern with that kind of approach would be the impost on the signage and the process. As Sonny has mentioned previously, we have a large footpath network. That would put the impost on us to review each pathway, potentially undertake a speed limit review in accordance with the guidelines, submit it to the speed limit committee and then install speed signs at regular intervals, so I think that is outside the realms of practicality for local government.

**CHAIR:** Chris, did you have anything to add?

**Mr McCanna:** I would just like to agree with Renee in that the cost, process and time that undertaking those individual speed limit reviews for individual pathway segments is quite substantial. In terms of going through that speed limit review process, undertaking new designs and then the delivery, that can be quite substantial for each individual project, let alone for a city-wide pathway and shared path network. The other consideration is that the bill does include the 25-kilometre-an-hour limit for personal mobility devices and that the legal electric pedal-assist cycles will cut off at. That limit effectively already exists within the equipment and that is a solid basis, I think, as a starting point around how that speed could be managed for those devices. Obviously speed for electric motorbikes, which are throttle controlled, is a separate matter, and that is much more around enforcement that they should not be in the road space.

**Ms BUSH:** Good morning, everybody. Thanks for being here. I have a question about costs, but before that I was hoping to clarify with a quick yes or no with a couple of you on an issue. Sonny, you mentioned that electric motorbikes are your major issue and that importation needs to be addressed; and, Daryl, you mentioned that you welcomed that the unlawful bikes will be prohibited in parks. Sonny, do you accept that this bill does nothing to address the importation aspects that you talked about on illegal electric motorbikes; and, Daryl, do you accept that this bill really just reaffirms the status quo that the illegal electric motorbikes were already prohibited on public parks and roads? I am looking for just a yes or no answer.

**Mr Reilly:** I am happy to lead. In my opinion, yes, devices that did not meet a 25-kilometre-an-hour limitation and were pedal assisted, in our understanding, were not prohibited under current arrangements.

**Ms BUSH:** Sorry, were currently prohibited?

**Mr Reilly:** I need to be clearer than use a potentially double negative—were not allowed, yes.

**Ms BUSH:** Thank you.

**Mr Reilly:** Certainly the enforcement of that is the aspect. We are happy for that to have greater reinforcement and for greater powers to be provided to the police to be able to do something about that. We have spent numerous decades pursuing, effectively in the past, motorbikes which were behaving in similar manners and trying to address that. The more powers that we have, just because of the change in the device, it is still the same issue.

**Ms BUSH:** Yes, and those powers were there. Sonny, do you accept as well that nothing in this bill addresses the importation?

**Mr Suharto:** Yes, that is correct.

**Ms BUSH:** Thank you. My question was actually around costs. Chris, you mentioned low socio-economic areas and the benefits that e-mobility adds to that. Do you envision having to roll out additional public transport to those locations and what would those costs look like? Actually, I would be interested also in the costs of the additional signage that you mentioned on bike paths.

**Mr McCanna:** Sure. In terms of transport options, the introduction of 50-cent fares has had an enormous impact on Logan. Just this week Translink came out with the quarter 2 public transport patronage statistics and for the second quarter in a row Logan has the fastest growing public transport usage—18 per cent roughly year on year, so that is quite substantial. We are seeing a big impact. It is really helping our community in terms of providing transport options for them in a cost-effective way. We have seen that our community is cost sensitive and imposing the licensing costs, particularly for younger members of the community or people who might be on fixed incomes, disability payments or that type of thing, can be a significant impact for those individuals. Would you like to refer to the cost on infrastructure?

**Mr Reilly:** I think infrastructure for us is a challenge. With a lot of our shared paths, a lot of our shared path network has arisen from the point that we do not have a copious amount of land in our road reserves, so trying to provide more on-road capacity is a challenge, but it is also a challenge in terms of take-up where we are talking about mums and dads who are happy to have their children ride to school or do recreational use of that. That becomes a problem for us if we are trying to provide both those facilities in terms of that cost implication for us.

**Ms BUSH:** Has council undertaken any modelling for those costs, or is that something you could take on notice? You mentioned, I think, a couple of thousand signs.

**Mr Reilly:** We have not, but the other point that I probably should have mentioned earlier—I am not sure how we would manage that—is the bill talks about speed limits with regard to electric mobility devices. If we moved to an arrangement where we were trying to sign each individual shared pathway arrangement, I am not clear at this point how that speed limit then applies to users of traditional bikes, which at the moment are not regulated in that space. We are a relatively flat city for a lot of our areas. We actually would see speeds which are greater than what e-mobility devices can cater for for some of those general bicycle users as well.

**Ms BUSH:** So, Daryl, are you saying you would have to then consider maybe rolling this out to analogue bikes?

**Mr Reilly:** What I am concerned about is if we are going to provide specific speed regulation on shared paths how we would then differentiate between whether it is an e-mobility device and whether it is a traditional bicycle. We have not looked at how we would accommodate that. That is something that I think would become of greater importance if we ended up with having to have differential speeds for differential devices. I suspect it would be complicated for police enforcement as well.

**Ms BUSH:** That is a good point.

**CHAIR:** Thank you, Daryl. We have gone past time, but I am going to ask a couple of questions. Firstly, this inquiry obviously is a supplement to the inquiry that we did where there were 28 recommendations which the government has responded to, including one about mandatory imports that the transport minister, through the appropriate networks, is working on, so this bill does not need to do that for a start. Secondly, with regard to the issue of footpaths, the original inquiry talked about 10 kilometres on footpaths, so I really want to get some clarity—

**Ms BUSH:** I raise a point of order. Sorry, Chair, but I was just wondering where the question was. That was an explanation, not a question.

**CHAIR:** It was; thank you. So now we get to the point of the 10-kilometres-an-hour speed limit on a footpath and shared path. I am trying to get some clarity around that. If the committee was to consider how we managed that, there may be other options rather than signage. Would it be simply to say on shared paths, 'Slow down around pedestrians,' and use the due care offence that we created from the original inquiry? Could you talk to us about those solutions, because we want to get this 100 per cent right?

**Mr Reilly:** I think the due care and attention arrangements are reasonable to request of users that are on our footpaths and our shared path network, and I think they are equally applicable to the users of personal mobility devices, e-bikes and general bicycle users as well. I do not think that there is a specific implication of that for e-bikes. I think it is something that is reasonable that we should expect from all users who use our network, regardless of those aspects.

**CHAIR:** What about with regard to slowing down around pedestrians rather than signage?

**Mr Reilly:** In terms of that, I think that is a due care and attention piece as well in terms of being considerate to other users of the facilities that we provide.

**CHAIR:** Sonny or Renee, did you want to contribute?

**Mrs Wise:** Yes, I will speak to this one. I am not opposed to a speed limit; I just do not think there has been enough rigour around the research into what that limit is. TMR's own research says that under 11 kays an hour normal bikes become unstable, so if you are on a legal pedal-assisted bike you are going to get the wobbles at 10 kays. I am not opposed to a default speed limit. I just think some research needs to go into what that speed limit should be and I think the 10 kay has just been pulled out of the air. It has not been researched. It has not been ground truthed. We have done our own research on the Gold Coast and came up with maybe a 20-kay speed limit, but again that was just desktop analysis from engineers. We have not actually researched that in-depth. I think a speed limit is okay, but it just needs to be ground truthed.

**CHAIR:** Thank you, Renee. I encourage you to read that report about Transport and Main Roads, bearing in mind that a lot of these devices kick in at six kilometres an hour, so you have to ride up to that speed. Did you take a question on notice from the deputy chair about the investment in infrastructure? Was that taken on notice?

**Ms BUSH:** Was that something you could provide on notice in terms of estimates that you would have?

**Mr McCanna:** We could take that away and see if we can provide a very high level—

**Ms BUSH:** Yes, see what you can do.

**Mr McCanna:** It would be a back-of-a-napkin rough estimate of what it would cost in terms of the hard infrastructure but I think, more importantly, the labour and the resourcing from councils in order to do those speed reviews and get that work in place. We can have a look at that.

**CHAIR:** If you could provide that by Wednesday, 29 April, that would be very much appreciated. Thank you. That is the only homework that has come from this session. Thank you for appearing today before the committee. Enjoy the balance of your day.

**ALEXANDER, Ms Matilda, Co-Chair, Human Rights and Public Law Committee, Queensland Law Society**

**MOSCHELLA, Mr Adam, Member, Criminal Law Committee, Queensland Law Society**

**STUBBINGS, Ms Hayley, Special Counsel, Legal Policy, Queensland Law Society**

**CHAIR:** I now welcome representatives from the Queensland Law Society. I invite you to make an opening statement, after which the committee will have questions for you.

**Ms Stubbings:** Thank you for inviting the Queensland Law Society to appear today. In opening, I would like to respectfully recognise the traditional owners and custodians of the land on which we meet. The society acknowledges the significant community concern regarding the safety risks posed by inappropriate use of e-mobility devices and, in particular, illegal e-mobility devices. The society remains concerned about insurance gaps, which are not addressed in this bill, that limit the availability of appropriate compensation for injured persons.

Turning to this bill, while we support the overarching goal of enhancing public safety, our submission highlights several areas where the bill will create additional barriers to mobility and independence for some Queenslanders. Primarily, the society holds concerns regarding the appropriateness and proportionality of the proposed licensing framework. While we understand the policy intent is to ensure basic road rule knowledge, the requirement for all riders to hold at a minimum a learner driver's licence creates a substantial and potentially discriminatory barrier. It is vital that the bill recognises the accessibility benefits personal mobility devices and electrically assisted cycles provide, including enhanced mobility and independence for people with disability and others who do not or cannot hold a driver's licence. In our view, further consultation is required with those with lived experience, including a diverse range of people with disabilities, to obtain a better understanding of how reforms can be designed to be fair and practical.

Turning to other parts of the bill, the society wishes to note its support for the submission made by YFS Legal in relation to the parental responsibility offence provision in the bill. The society shares concerns regarding new section 78D, which provides that where a child under 16 rides an EPAC or PMD or a prohibited bike the parent is taken to have committed the same offence. While QLS accepts that parents have an important role to play, we are significantly concerned about the parental responsibility offence in section 78D. It is a significant departure from fundamental legislative principles as it attributes criminal liability to one person for the conduct of another and reverses the onus of proof by requiring a parent to prove, on the balance of probabilities, that they did not know of the conduct or took all reasonable steps to prevent it. This reversal of the onus of proof is a serious step that may unfairly penalise parents and guardians who are placed in the impossible position regarding a child's independent actions in public spaces. We consider that further consultation is required to ensure that any regulatory step regarding parental responsibility respects fundamental legislative principles and is appropriately targeted at deliberate flouting of the law.

I am joined today by Matilda Alexander, Co-Chair of the society's Human Rights and Public Law Committee, and Adam Moschella, accredited specialist in criminal law and member of the society's Criminal Law Committee. We welcome any questions the committee may have.

**CHAIR:** Thank you. We will go to the member for Cooper.

**Ms BUSH:** Thanks, everybody, for your submission and for coming in. In your submission you reference unintended consequences of licensing requirements. I am curious about whether these types of limitations or restrictions would be subject to a legal challenge, whether it be around licensing or, in particular, around disability and how legally viable that is.

**Ms Alexander:** Certainly in looking at these laws there will be a lot of confusion for people with disability. Some people with disability have purchased devices using NDIS plans or other subsidised plans and are relying on those for day-to-day access to the community. There will be a lot of confusion. 'Does my bike count?' 'Can I get a licence? The test for driving a car at more than 100 kilometres an hour on a freeway is completely different to the medical test for whether you can safely ride a bicycle. I think there will certainly be a lot of confusion for people with disability. They will be seeking legal advice and looking at whether or not these implications could be indirectly discriminatory or directly discriminatory against people with disability.

**Mr KEMPTON:** In your submission you raised the issue of the application of a 10-kilometre-an-hour speed limit on footpaths and that other submitters have raised this issue. We heard from visually impaired people, the elderly and parents with children about that interaction. If you go closer to the

speed they are travelling—less than 10 kilometres an hour—in your submission you say that the bikes are unstable. However, if you go above that speed, you are changing the differentiation between their speed and that of other bikes, and everyone is going to do a couple of kilometres an hour more. You have people walking with children and the visually impaired going at about four to five kilometres an hour and then these bikes will be going so much faster. It just defeats the purpose of having a speed limit at all. Do you have any view on that?

**Ms Alexander:** It is important to look at the Vision Australia submission in its entirety. There are some great things in there for people with vision impairment. The parking issue has been a huge concern for a long time—bikes and scooters parked on footpaths. They also have some very sensible recommendations around acoustic vehicle alerting systems and pedestrian avoidance technology, which this law does not touch. I think that we need to be creative when looking for solutions because people with disability are not a homogeneous group where everybody has the same needs. In looking at those types of technologies you may in fact find some solutions.

**Ms BUSH:** Thanks, Matilda, for that response. I go back to my earlier question. It sounds like the doorway is open for potential legal challenges. Similar to that, are there concerns in the legal community that the sudden criminalisation of what is currently lawful property could, in fact, also be subject to a legal challenge?

**Ms Alexander:** We also need to think about the human impact of somebody having spent their money on these devices. People with disability already have so many financial and administrative barriers, and now there are going to be more financial and administrative barriers not only to the vehicles they already own but to any new ones to be purchased.

**Mr Moschella:** I do not have too much to add to what Matilda has said. Whether a law is specifically susceptible to challenge is quite complex and contingent on a number of matters. From a human rights perspective, there is the potential where certain provisions of this bill may be seen to limit human rights under the act. From a strictly criminal perspective, at the end of the day the legislature can criminalise as they see fit. Whether that criminalisation effectively directly gives rise to a challenge is not a simple question to ask and it is not a simple question to answer. In terms of what is susceptible to a challenge and capable of being struck down, ultimately there is a myriad of factors that contribute to that. I might have to take the question on notice to give a fulsome and proper answer.

**Ms BUSH:** Can I clarify something? You mentioned the human rights impact. Would you like to have seen a submission from the Human Rights Commission to this bill?

**Mr Moschella:** That might be a question for Matilda. Given my experience on the Criminal Law Committee, I think it probably would have been appropriate for the Human Rights Commission to comment on the bill. I think every bill comes with a statement of compatibility with respect to human rights. At the end of the day, the Human Rights Commission is always going to have an interest in commenting on that statement of compatibility.

**CHAIR:** With regard to your submission, could you talk us through some solutions for that? I know that in the original inquiry we talked about completing a PrepL, which is only a part of it and does not require a physical driving test. So there is that opportunity to be able to answer questions. That would educate people about the safety aspects of this. Then with regard to the specifics in this bill on the EN15194:2017 standard et cetera, can we put exemptions in there? We want to be inclusive. We want to make sure that each of the requirements—again, we said the appropriate safe standards for PMDs are being developed. They are not there at the moment. Could you talk to your submission about those recommendations so that this is inclusive and we are not disadvantaging people with accessibility issues?

**Ms Alexander:** I think the Office of the Public Advocate submission goes a long way here as well with the example that he gave of his 22-year-old nephew with an intellectual disability who would not even be able to get a learner's licence but who enjoys riding his bike, along with his uncle, along shared paths. Even getting a learner's licence is going to be prohibitive. When it comes to the test, as I said, the medical requirements are different. I think it is better to have a concept of universal design that does not have additional barriers for people with disability or a separate system of licensing for people with disability. In the absence of universal design, we certainly need to think about not having a system that excludes and discriminates against people with disability.

**CHAIR:** You mentioned that there are different medical requirements for these things. Perhaps we could come up with guidelines with the medical profession to point to those medical standards so they can sign off on these exemptions?

**Ms Alexander:** We could, but technology is always changing. You could have a bike that takes into account a medical condition today but tomorrow's technology could mean that the medical condition is irrelevant. This is a rapidly evolving area of technological advancement. Trying to bring in this kind of criminalisation and regulation is fraught with difficulty in terms of future proofing.

**CHAIR:** As we are finding out, but we want to make sure that we are inclusive. Did you have anything to add, Hayley?

**Ms Stubbings:** In terms of the standard, the example from the Public Advocate is an excellent one, given that his nephew rides a tricycle, whereas the EN15194 is geared towards upright, two-wheeled bicycles, so you are immediately cutting out all the tricycles, recumbent bikes and hand-pedalled bikes. Yes, there is a special circumstances permit, but, similar to licensing, you are then imposing something different on people with disability who might have one of those devices or some other kind of adaptive device and putting an extra burden on them to go and get that permit, which I do not know what that process would be like.

**CHAIR:** Yes, for sure. We are hearing from the Public Advocate on Monday.

**Ms BUSH:** I want to share with you something that a shared scheme provider has commented in relation to this bill, stating that the bill and the licensing requirement may impact their ability to maintain and provide comprehensive insurance coverage. They specifically said, 'This creates a material risk that the bill would have unintended consequences of removing the comprehensive insurance currently provided.' Do you have any thoughts or concerns on the insurance aspect?

**Ms Stubbings:** As you know, we are concerned about insurance in general with these devices. At the earlier inquiry we discussed that we were not of the view that the shared scheme insurances were quite enough. We would rather see far more consistent insurance coverage, especially for third parties who are injured—low aggregates on those things. In terms of how licensing impacts those insurances, I am not sure. I think it would be a matter for the shared scheme and their insurer.

**CHAIR:** We have gone over time, but there was a question on notice from the member for Cooper with regard to the potential legal challenges. Knowing solicitors quite well, I think there is always an opportunity for legal challenges. If you could provide a response to us by 29 April, that would be very much appreciated. Thank you for joining us today. Thank you for your information and, again, for your submission. Enjoy the balance of your day.

**ANDERSON, Ms Melanie, General Manager—Strategy and Advocacy, Queensland Tourism Industry Council**

**WALKER, Mr Nigel, Owner, The Bike Hire Company**

**CHAIR:** I now welcome representatives from the Queensland Tourism Industry Council and The Bike Hire Company. Would you like to make a brief opening statement before the committee has questions for you? It is over to you, Melanie.

**Ms Anderson:** Good morning, Chair and committee members. Thank you for the opportunity to appear today. I represent the Queensland Tourism Industry Council, the peak body for the state's visitor economy. I am here to provide a practical, on-the-ground perspective on how the proposed legislation will operate, particularly in regional Queensland, and within structured compliant tourism businesses.

At the outset I want to be clear: industry supports the intent of this legislation. We recognise the need to improve safety standards. The evidence before the inquiry is compelling—over 6,300 injury representations and 12 fatalities in one year. However, the issue is not the intent; it is the unintended consequences of how the legislation is currently drafted. There is a real risk that these reforms will disproportionately impact compliant, low-risk tourism operations while not effectively addressing the behaviours that are actually driving harm. I will outline five key issues.

The first is that the blanket 10-kilometre-an-hour speed limit makes tourism operations unworkable. The proposed blanket limit on footpaths and shared paths is not workable in a tourism context. Many guided experiences operate on wide purpose-built shared pathway networks, coastal boardwalks, regional trail systems and tourism corridors which were designed for mixed recreational use. Under a blanket speed limit, the tours become commercially unviable due to the pedestrians walking faster than the vehicles and there are more difficulties navigating riding at a slower pace, particularly for riders who are not au fait with electronic bikes.

The second is that there is no distinction between guided tourism and general use. The current framework treats all riders equally regardless of their risk profile. This fails to recognise that guided tourism operations operate under permits and approvals, deliver mandatory safety briefings and training, supervise riders at all times and operate in structured, low-risk environments. As evidenced in operator submissions, these are highly controlled experiences with strong safety frameworks in place. They are not contributing to the safety problem. A one-size-fits-all regulatory approach is therefore misaligned. A risk-based framework is needed that formally recognises accredited tourism operators in a separate category.

The third point is that licensing requirements are not workable for tourism. The proposed requirement for a driver's licence creates significant unintended consequences for the visitor economy. It excludes two critical tourism cohorts: under-16s, who are essential to family travel—if one participant is excluded, the entire booking would be typically lost; and international visitors, many of whom do not hold driver's licences. Requiring a Queensland learner driver's licence is not practical or achievable for short-term visitors. There are also broader issues of proportionality. These are low-speed supervised guided experiences, yet regulatory requirement mirrors that of operating a motor vehicle. The outcome is clear: compliant tourism experiences are restricted while unsafe, unregulated use remains the primary issue. A more appropriate approach would be operator-controlled environments, mandatory training and supervision, and a practical exemption or alternative pathway for supervised tourism use.

The fourth point is that device standards create immediate and unintended business impacts. The move to enforce the EN15194 standard introduces significant practical issues. Many existing tourism fleets, particularly pre-2023, will become technically noncompliant. These devices remain safe and fit for purpose with no meaningful difference in real-world performance. Some fleets were recently purchased, including with government grants. In addition, compliance marking is inconsistent across manufacturers. Even compliant devices are not clearly identifiable, and enforcement will, therefore, be inconsistent and unclear.

The fifth point is that the legislation does not significantly target the actual safety risks. The inquiry clearly identifies primary drivers of harm—illegal high-powered vehicles, modified bikes, excessive speed and non-compliance with existing rules. However, the current framework does not sufficiently target these issues. Instead it risks placing additional burden on compliant operators while illegal and modified devices remain prevalent. The most effective safety outcomes would be stronger import controls, retail accountability and compliance, anti-tampering enforcements and targeted policing on high-risk behaviour.

Finally, I want to highlight the regional impact. These businesses are small family-run tourism operators embedded in regional economies. They create jobs, support local supply chains and contribute to diverse visitor experiences. We support reform. We support improved safety outcomes but legislation must be refined to ensure it is targeted, proportionate and risk based. Thank you. I welcome your questions.

**CHAIR:** Thank you, Melanie. Nigel, did you have an opening statement? For the committee's awareness, Nigel, through The Bike Hire Company, offers the hire of bikes for the Brisbane Valley Rail Trail, which is in my area, and I thank you for your advice earlier.

**Mr Walker:** I would like to thank the committee for inviting us along to speak in support of this. We like the idea that this report has been done but we think it has just been done wrong. I run The Bike Hire Company. We have been operating for nine years in Australia. We specialise in bike hire tourism operation on rail trails in Australia, so we have quite a background in that. We use bikes that are all legal e-bikes under current standards.

First of all, there must be a clear distinction between the current fully legal and compliant e-bikes and the problem e-motorcycles and e-mopeds, most of which are illegal and need to be classified as e-motorcycles and e-mopeds. Many of recommendations in the report are framed around urban safety issues, particularly e-scooter crashes, pedestrian conflicts and high-speed riding in dense environments. These concerns are valid in cities but they do not translate directly to rail trails, where we operate, where pedestrian density is extremely low, paths are wide and generous, sight lines are long and the use is predominantly recreational, not commuting. The committee in their report has stated that Victoria has an age limit of 16 for e-bikes. This is actually incorrect. There is no age limit in Victoria for the use of e-bikes.

Interstate and international visitors who do not hold a Queensland licence have no real way of obtaining one, so people over 16 who want to ride an e-bike are going to go elsewhere. They will go to other states. They will go to New Zealand. They will even go to Samoa and do bike riding over there. For every family group that we lose because of age limits or licensing, that is \$6,000 to \$10,000 per family group that will not go into the area. I am not saying that that is all from e-bikes, but it is the cafes, the accommodation and everything else that is included.

The Queensland government has spent approximately \$50 million on the Brisbane Valley Rail Trail, so that is going to become a white elephant if this bill goes through as it is. In my own family, my brother requires an e-trike. He is about to lose his licence due to medical reasons. My niece has cerebral palsy and requires an e-trike as well. These are not taken into account in the new legislation.

Commercial tour operators and bike hire people have invested heavily in this area. We stand to lose—we will probably go broke under this. We have already had our major wholesaler for our bikes leave Australia in the last week. That is because of the legislation that is in New South Wales regarding how their bikes are registered et cetera. With this upcoming legislation here—they are a big Swiss operation—they have just said, 'Enough is enough. We cannot be bothered. Australia is such a small market for us.' They have just shipped all their bikes to New Zealand and they are operating out of there. That is all I have to say in terms of my opening statement.

**CHAIR:** Thank you, Nigel. I will go to the member for Cooper.

**Ms BUSH:** I will pass to the member for Aspley.

**Mr MELLISH:** Thank you for your submission and thank you for coming in today. My question is to Melanie first. Do you have any estimates of the number of international tourists who may not visit Queensland going forward because of this legislation or the number of people who may come here but who may not be participating in tourism offerings?

**Ms Anderson:** We do not have specific numbers on that exact question. What I can tell you is that we had about 2.3 million international visitors as of September 2025 for that previous year. That brings \$7 billion in funds into our economy. Particularly for smaller regions—let's look at Cairns—they would attract just under 600,000 international visitors. That brings about \$1.1 billion into their economy. We surveyed visitors to the Brisbane region, and over 80 per cent of those visitors surveyed said that using an e-bike or scooter has enhanced their experience of Brisbane. They were able to see more of the outdoors, visit more businesses and had a more vibrant experience of the city. It would definitely make a big impact. We have e-bikes and e-scooters available across the globe. It is an acceptable way to see a town or region or go on a tour. I think, if that offering is lost, there would be a significant drop in our visitor numbers.

**Mr MELLISH:** You mentioned Cairns. What impact would the licensing and the speed restrictions have on individual operators in a place like Cairns that is very tourism focused?

**Ms Anderson:** Thank you for the question. I have something prepared. In actual fact, it was a submission through this process from Whitsunday Segway Tours. They have done a bit of work on this as it has an impact on their business. An under-16 restriction alone would remove about 19 per cent of the business, with a further 18 per cent loss expected from family and group bookings where one person cannot participate. The operator estimates that the combined impact of the proposed changes could reduce operations around 69 per cent, making the business unviable.

The same operator notes that it has operated safely for more than 11 years. They use a 17-page rider training procedure manual and undertakes practical rider assessment, supervises tours throughout and records riding portions with a helmet-mounted 360-degree safety camera. On speed limits, Whitsunday Segway Tours currently caps riders at 12 kilometres an hour and notes guests are already passed by joggers and cyclists. The operator argues that reducing the limit to 10 kays would reduce tour enjoyment and viability with little safety gain.

**CHAIR:** Thanks, Melanie. Nigel, did you have something to add to that question?

**Mr Walker:** Yes, I do. Since the announcement of this bill with all the MPs going on Facebook and everything like that, our phones have stopped ringing regarding family groups and tour operators who provide us business. We are not getting any inquiries for group bookings. They are getting a lot more inquiries around the country. It is going to take a huge effort on our behalf to try to get those people back again. People are ringing up and saying, 'What's happening?' and I just turn around and say, 'I don't know.' I was actually out riding with Jim McDonald on the BVRT. We had a group pass us. Obviously there were some younger people in the family. I caught up with them later. They had an 11-year-old girl and a 14-year-old girl. They had just bought e-bikes for them for Christmas. They lived in Brisbane, but they came out to Coominya and were spending three nights in Coominya. That will all be over.

**CHAIR:** Unless we get it right. Nigel, thank you.

**Mr KEMPTON:** Nigel, this is all about preventing injury and death to children. It is certainly not about sending businesses broke, as you say it will. I am interested in the nine years you have been operating. What did you do before e-bikes in terms of family trips and what percentage of your market now comprises parents and children?

**Mr Walker:** Before e-bikes we just had standard analogue bikes. We were a small business. Since then, 75 per cent of our business would be e-bikes. Quite a large percentage are family groups, and we know that those will be gone.

**Mr KEMPTON:** Is it possible that you could look at other options like going back to normal bikes for children or tandem bikes? Is there any other option?

**Mr Walker:** We already have that option.

**Mr MELLISH:** My question is probably to Nigel but Melanie you might want to comment as well. I see another component of the bill requires that devices that do not meet the updated standard would have to go not only back to the retailer but all the way back to the manufacturer. What does that mean specifically for you, Nigel? I think you mentioned you have over \$200,000 worth of stock that would now be illegal and, Melanie, there would be operators in a similar situation.

**Mr Walker:** First of all, as I said, our wholesaler has pulled out of the country because of all the legislation that is coming in here to do with e-bikes. They are a Swiss company. Their bikes are built, like everyone else, in Taiwan. It is going to be impossible. They will not go back and get them re-engineered just purely on a cost basis. It will be a huge issue for us. Those bikes will be unsellable for us, so we will not exist.

**Mr MELLISH:** Melanie, would other operators be in a similar boat?

**Ms Anderson:** Absolutely. As a small and medium sized business most of your expenses go into capital. This investment is really the whole of the business, apart from the workforce. It would pose a significant issue.

**CHAIR:** I have a question in relation to two aspects: firstly, the issue you raised, Nigel, about the EN15194:2017 that is referred to in the bill. EN15194 came in in 2009. If we were to point to each of the different stages of that standard through to now and grandfather that, would it resolve that issue for you?

**Mr Walker:** All our bikes are currently compliant under the 2017 one. As to the new one for 2023—no.

**CHAIR:** The committee has had some discussion with regard to making sure that it backdates to 2009 and carries through and then is grandfathered to whatever Australian standard or EN might come after this. That would resolve that?

**Mr Walker:** That would resolve that for us, but there are currently no bikes in Australia that we can purchase under the 2023 regulation that are suitable for our operation.

**CHAIR:** I can assure you that we have got that message loud and clear. With regard to the speed limits that you are both concerned about—and we are concerned about that as well—the original inquiry talked about footpaths. As you rightly said, if you go on a footpath in a high-traffic, built-up area then it is clear that it should be slower on shared paths. Do you have any thoughts around whether an exemption for the rail trails might then satisfy those requirements—that is, they are not required to comply with other areas such as footpaths? Is it simply a matter that you have to slow down, as it is now, when you use the path? You slow down around pedestrians? We want to get this 100 per cent right and look for those solutions. Would that help?

**Mr Walker:** All of our bikes, as I say, are compliant. At 25 kilometres an hour, the motor kicks out but they can still go faster than that. We have areas with hills. If you want to go at 25 kilometres an hour, say you have set the speed limit at 25 kilometres an hour on a rail trail, then you are going to have to go down those hills with your brakes on. It is also going to mean that, when people are travelling with people who have analogue bikes and can go as fast as they like down those trails, they are going to be split up. We also have the situation of going into the towns. The rail trail does not go directly into the towns all the time. If you want to go into your accommodation, a cafe, a pub or anything like that then there will be regulations that affect those areas. In terms of riding a bike with the 25-kilometre-an-hour speed limiter on the motor, they are hard to ride above 25. For the majority of people who are pedalling and not going downhill, they are not going to go over the 25-kilometre-an-hour limit. Can I ask how many of the committee have actually ridden a legal e-bike?

**Ms BUSH:** Yes, I have one.

**CHAIR:** Melanie, do you have something to add to the solutions that I was talking about and the exemptions?

**Ms Anderson:** I definitely think that it is not a cookie-cutter approach. We do need to look at the different speed levels because the enjoyment of being on an e-vehicle is the ability to have that freedom to go a bit faster. I have just bought one, too. I clocked 38 kilometres an hour around UQ. It is very easy to get that speed happening. It is also the joy and the practical use of it. If it is a busy built-up pedestrian shared bike path, obviously there need to be speed considerations. If outside of that it can be looked at then I think that would suit a lot of the different tourist operators.

**Mr KING:** I have also spoken to a lot of mountain bikers who say it is now something you can do all year round because of e-mobility. Melanie and Nigel, you mentioned the cost with \$200,000 worth of stock, the trailers and other things that you have to tow. There is also the workforce. Can you both comment on the impact to your tourism workforce?

**Mr Walker:** Our workforce in Queensland is quite small compared to our workforce in Victoria. We have big expansion ideas and things like that. I have already earmarked a quarter of a million dollars that I have taken out of Queensland and put into Victoria. I will be increasing our staff and our offerings in Victoria whereas that was going to go into Queensland. Due to the uncertainty, how long it is going to take to get going here and everything like that, we have moved that money out of here. That also means that our workforce is smaller. We are stopping some of our shuttle services and things like that, purely because we cannot put in an investment not knowing what the future is. It has had a huge impact.

**Ms Anderson:** From our point of view, particularly in the more urban areas, we have a huge percentage of workers within the visitor economy who are young, part-time, casual, often international backpackers or international students. A lot of them do not have or hold a driver's licence. You can start working part-time or casually from 15 onwards. For people getting in and around the city to work, often living in the city and not owning a car and not having a driver's licence, that transport mechanism for our workforce is important to consider as well. Obviously they will be juggling university and moving around, so time is the issue. Definitely it will have an impact, particularly as we go further and further into the fuel crisis. We have the war ahead of us. No doubt within a couple of months we will all be looking to use other forms of transport to attend work. I think we need to take that into consideration, too.

**Mr KEMPTON:** Melanie and Nigel, it is hard not to be impacted by the argument you make and we are not in the process of putting people out of business. I am putting this up as a suggestion: if there was a licensing ability for tour operators where they could clearly identify the parents and children, they had adequate insurance and they did not allow people under 16 to go out on tours unsupervised, is that something that would be attractive to you?

**Mr Walker:** We already have that. Our riders all need to sign a waiver, a liability form. People under 18 have to have a parent or guardian with them. That parent or guardian signs on their behalf as well. We go through a full briefing on the bikes et cetera. That is already a requirement of our business. We also have e-bikes that are suitable for eight- to 12-year-olds. We have 24-inch e-bikes. These are used under parental supervision. The children or the young adults are all read the riot act by our staff. Their parents have signed a waiver. Their parents have given us credit card details and they know that if anything goes wrong they are going to be in serious trouble. Over nine years of operation we have never had an issue with a child. In over tens of thousands of rentals we have had three cases of hospitalisation. That is from falling off a bike. Two were on analogue bikes and one was on an e-bike where he was using his phone to take a selfie of the group behind him and fell off. He just said, 'Look, I totally mucked up.'

**CHAIR:** Nigel, you mentioned that you give a briefing about the bikes. Does that include safety aspects and not just the bikes?

**Mr Walker:** Absolutely. We talk about how to ride on a trail, where to ride on a trail, what to do when you are coming into areas, especially on the Brisbane Valley Rail Trail where we have some big gullies and things there. We instruct them on how to operate through there by going up into high motor and changing down to low so that when you get to the bottom you are in the right gear to go up again. We talk to the kids about where accidents can possibly happen if they are following someone too closely. If the front person sees a wallaby or a kangaroo they might stop and if the person behind them is not watching they can go—smack—straight up behind them. We talk to them about that. We personally fit all their helmets to make sure that they are all correct and everything like that. All our gear is currently compliant as well.

**Ms Anderson:** I can confirm that, across the whole of Queensland, for tour bike operators that is exactly the same. They follow the same procedures and accreditation.

**CHAIR:** Thank you, Melanie. That is great.

**Ms BUSH:** Nigel, I wanted to comment on your statements. You have given us some really emotional and, I think, very real impacts into what this bill is going to do. I want to acknowledge that. You are in the chair's electorate and you have had meetings with the chair. What assurances has the chair given you around addressing some of our concerns?

**Mr Walker:** First of all, we talked about the speed limiter on the Brisbane Valley Rail Trail and that it was not the intention of the report from the committee to do that sort of thing on a rail trail. As I said, we have the feeder towns and also there are the small trails that you have in town. People might be riding for four, five or six kilometres to get to those trails. Where do you draw the line on saying that that trail is exempt or whatever but getting to it is not?

**CHAIR:** Thank you, Deputy Chair, for the question. I assure you, for the committee's benefit, that I have said to Nigel that I would listen to their concerns and take them forward. Thank you, Nigel and Melanie, for your time today. We appreciate the information and your thoughtful criticism of the bill.

**ASHCROFT, Ms Nicole, Director of Safety, Australia and New Zealand, Uber Eats**

**EPOV, Ms Polly, Senior Manager, Public Safety and Government Relations, Australia and New Zealand, Uber Eats**

**PAYNE, Mr Rowan, Manager, Government Relations, Policy and Public Engagement, Australia and New Zealand, DoorDash**

**CHAIR:** I now welcome representatives from Uber Eats and DoorDash. Thank you very much for appearing before the committee today. Would you like to make a brief opening statement before we ask questions of you?

**Ms Ashcroft:** Thank you, Chair and committee. As the region's head of safety, I am humbled to appear before the committee today and commend the government on these bold reforms. Uber supports the intent of the bill and the government's focus on improving safety. Community concerns around e-bike use are real and deserve a strong response.

At Uber Eats, we have taken a leadership role in improving bicycle safety across the sector. In 2021, we co-founded the national platform safety principles setting minimum standards for rider education, personal protective equipment and training. We have worked with We Ride Australia and Bicycle NSW to create clear practical guidance on local road rules that are integrated into our e-learning modules. Since 2018, we have provided free personal protective equipment to all bicycle delivery riders. Since 2023, that pack has included a redesigned high-visibility vest, a raincoat and backpack. That gear was designed in consultation with delivery people to make sure it was fit for purpose. Partners cannot go online unless we have verification that this personal protective equipment has been delivered, ensuring that compliance is built into our system. We have also embedded safety directly into the app with features like helmet detection, a mandatory bicycle safety checklist and tools such as 'don't type and ride' and notification holds to reduce the risk of distractions.

Our core point today is that the response needs to be targeted to the risk. E-bikes operate in very different environments to that of cars and applying a car-based licensing model risks missing the behaviours that actually drive safety. E-bikes are essential to how goods move through Queensland, supporting thousands of small businesses and a large delivery community. Settings that unintentionally restrict this mode will have flow-on impacts to service reliability and local economies.

We believe there is an opportunity to get the balance right here by improving safety through targeted measures like education, enforcement and infrastructure while maintaining access to the mode that is already widely and safely used. We are here as a constructive partner and welcome the opportunity to work with the government on making e-bikes safe and accessible throughout Queensland.

**Mr Payne:** I will make a few brief comments. Perhaps it would be useful for the committee to zoom out a little bit in terms of how different Australian jurisdictions are dealing with the rise of e-bikes. I think it is fair to say that the inquiry and now this legislation are probably one of the most, if not the most, comprehensive body of works a state government and now a parliament has done in the e-bike space. Certainly, there have been a lot of efforts in different jurisdictions to catch up with the rise of e-bikes and there has not been a really comprehensive framework put down that is considering, as Nicole says, how big an impact they have in terms of generating commerce and getting people around our cities and towns.

From DoorDash's perspective, in principle we are very supportive of the legislation's attempts to clarify the rules and put, effectively, a reliable system in place to give users and businesses like ours confidence. We do have a few concerns, particularly around the licensing requirement and I suppose the question of whether there is a reasonable safety dividend to that point of friction. We acknowledge that it is an additional cost to users and also that it will ultimately have an economic impact in terms of our merchants on the platform, particularly for, we think, those in inner-city areas and on the Gold Coast, which of course will have a detrimental impact on tourism as well. To wrap up, we are very happy with the legislation's attempts to put a system in place and hopefully we can clarify some of the points around licensing and get a good outcome.

**CHAIR:** Thank you, Rowan. Polly?

**Ms Epov:** There is nothing from me. My colleague articulated our opening statement.

**CHAIR:** Fantastic. I will go to the member for Cooper.

**Ms BUSH:** We will go to the member for Kurwongbah.

**Mr KING:** After listening to you and reading your submissions, I understand that many of your riders would not have a Queensland driver's licence. I know you touched on it, but how will this bill affect their livelihoods and their ability to earn an income?

**CHAIR:** Just for clarity, the bill includes valid non-Queensland driver's licences.

**Mr KING:** In terms of the age restrictions and people who cannot attain the licensing requirements in this bill.

**Ms Epov:** What we do know about our delivery community in Queensland is that they are quite price sensitive, so any legislation that proposes additional costs for them to utilise e-bikes or to deliver on the roads in Queensland is going to be preclusionary. We also know there are flow-on effects to the broader delivery ecosystem if we do not have enough delivery riders to deliver in the state. We are likely to see an impact to service reliability. We are likely to see longer than usual wait times for food to be delivered. We are likely to see a sense of merchant frustration because their lovely meals are sitting on the pass and there is no-one to pick them up and deliver them. There is likely to be a larger impact to that entire delivery ecosystem.

**Mr KING:** My follow-up question related to the impact on small business, but I think you have answered that. There is definitely going to be a flow-on effect for the businesses you provide services to.

**Mr Payne:** I can add to that. One of the things about our business is that it is not uncommon to have plenty of customers and plenty of merchants but perhaps not the supply to deliver them in the system. That is always a challenge globally. It is going to be one more factor that makes it difficult because there will be fewer people inclined to use an e-bike and flexibly earn income on the platform for whatever reason. There is the cost. There is also the fact is that many of them are visiting from overseas temporarily and might not be familiar with the process. It is certainly not going to encourage anyone to take up the opportunity to earn flexibly on the platform.

**CHAIR:** I have a follow-up question directly on that before I go to the member for Cook. Could you tell us or take on notice how many of your delivery drivers would be under 18?

**Mr Payne:** You must be over 18 to 'Dash' on our platform.

**CHAIR:** You have to be 18?

**Mr Payne:** Sorry, 18 is the minimum, yes. There are no 16-year-olds on our platform.

**CHAIR:** So the issue of 16- and 17-year-olds really does not apply.

**Mr Payne:** No, not at DoorDash.

**Ms Epov:** Correct. The same condition applies at Uber Eats as well.

**Mr KEMPTON:** We are concerned mostly with public safety. We certainly do not want to impact on businesses. Do you have any stats around delivery riders being involved in accidents or being injured in the last few years?

**Ms Epov:** Unfortunately, bicycle riders are unprotected, so a small incident, whether you hit the kerb or otherwise, does result in an injury. I do not have the stats in front of me, but we do get injuries based on bicycle riders. We have a huge number of them across the country, but particularly in Queensland and the metro areas of Queensland. We obviously see more serious incidents when there are interactions with vehicles, so the more separation we can have with vehicles the better, whether that is shared paths or otherwise. Unfortunately, then we end up with community incidents such as the one that initiated this bill where shared paths kind of become a challenge as well, so the more opportunity we can have to separate bicycle riders from both vehicles and pedestrians the safer the community will be.

**Mr KEMPTON:** Would you be prepared to take that on notice? I would be really keen to know whether there is a large number of people involved or not compared to the other cohorts that ride e-mobility devices.

**Ms Epov:** Oh, I see what you are asking. The comparison is really difficult because the data is hard to come by. It is held by different authorities, and depending on how you define a serious incident versus not serious means that it would be hard to compare. I can say that the majority of our trips and bicycle riders travel without incident and that it is only a very small proportion that do have incidents. However, we definitely see a number of safety incidents coming through where delivery people have come off their bikes and either injured themselves with potentially broken arms or hits to the head even though they are wearing helmets.

**Mr Payne:** I am happy to also take that on notice and have a chat to our safety team. I suspect that there will be a similar challenge around how you define an accident, but we will come back to the committee with what we have.

**Mr KING:** Further to my previous questions, what percentage of your riders currently would not hold a licence? I imagine that, because there is no requirement at the moment, there would be a lot. Can you comment on that?

**Ms Epov:** We articulated this in our submission, but I can give you some top line numbers again. Uber Eats has 30,000 delivery people across Queensland and they use a mix of modes—cars, bikes, e-bikes and motorbikes. Of those, around 10,000—and that fluctuates and is a bit elastic depending on what day it is—utilise and deliver on two wheels, and 89 per cent of those two-wheeled delivery partners sign up using an international passport. I can get you those numbers on notice about exactly how many currently use a Queensland driver's licence, but my preliminary hypothesis would be that that would be quite a small number.

**CHAIR:** It would be great to get that information on notice. In line with that, that would mean that 100 per cent of your delivery drivers would be identifiable.

**Ms Epov:** Absolutely.

**Mr Payne:** I do not have those statistics in front of me. I would need to speculate, but a good many 'Dashers' who do two-wheeled deliveries are visiting or international students. We are obviously very happy that the exception for the recognition of foreign licences is in the bill. That is an important—

**Ms BUSH:** Is it in the bill?

**Mr Payne:** Our understanding is that it is in the bill.

**CHAIR:** Yes, it is.

**Ms Epov:** I might ask our director of safety just to clarify that point, because it is an important point about our identification system.

**Ms Ashcroft:** We collect identity for every single delivery person as part of their onboarding process and we validate if it is an Australian identity and we also validate international passports. We then have ongoing identity checks where the individual takes a selfie of themselves at risk-based intervals. It is not every time they log on, but it is at risk-based intervals. We compare that selfie back to their identity document to ensure it is the same person who has been through our training et cetera, so that is how we manage identity.

**Mr JAMES:** Nicole, in your submission you talked about opportunities to strengthen the bill. Could you elaborate on the administrative burden?

**Ms Epov:** As my colleague said in her opening statement, we do commend the government for strengthening the safety of e-mobility in Queensland. We think it is a really important area. Our primary concern is with the licensing component of the bill because we think that is going to create some prohibitive barriers of entry for our delivery community. We do agree with a lot of the other tenets of the bill on enforcement, more emphasis on infrastructure, on import standards and whatnot. It is just that issue about licensing.

**CHAIR:** The time allocated for this session has now expired. There were a couple of questions taken on notice. If you could get those to us by Wednesday, 29 April, that would be very much appreciated and informative. I hope you enjoy the balance of your day. Thank you again for your submissions.

**COONEY, Mr Joshua, General Manager, Advocacy, RACQ**

**KIRK, Mr Andrew, Principal Technical Researcher, RACQ**

**CHAIR:** I now welcome representatives from RACQ. I will give you an opportunity to make an opening statement before the committee has questions for you.

**Mr Cooney:** RACQ is very pleased to attend today's hearing to further explain our recommendations on the Transport and Other Legislation (Managing E-mobility Use and Protecting Our Communities) Amendment Bill 2026. I will call it 'the bill' from now on. The committee has our initial submission to last year's inquiry and it now also has our submission on this bill which we lodged earlier this month.

RACQ has been very open, transparent and consistent in our views. From day one we have supported the work of this committee. We believe it has done a good job examining complex e-mobility issues in Queensland. Most of the committee's recommendations aligned with ours, which was pleasing to see. On the few points where they did not, there was not much that we strongly opposed. We did, however, struggle to see the need for a licensing requirement. We flagged that concern with the committee after the report was released.

Then came the Queensland government's response and ultimately the introduction of this bill. Once again, there is a lot to like in this bill. RACQ particularly supports the crackdown on illegal devices, clarifying the definition of prohibited bikes and personal mobility devices, tightening the rules around their sale and encouraging safer parking of these devices. Of course, none of these changes mean much without proper education and enforcement, so enhancing police powers is a welcome step, especially when it comes to stopping riders, seizing prohibited devices and conducting random tests to deter riding under the influence.

We have said this before and we will say it again: we want our roads and paths to be safer for everyone. Overall, these reforms will help achieve that provided they are backed up with suitable levels of police enforcement. However, after receiving member feedback and reviewing the bill in detail we see two main areas that should be addressed to strike the right balance between safety and allowing Queenslanders to ride sensibly: firstly, we remain concerned about the new licensing requirement, specifically the rule that riders must hold at least a learner driver's licence; and, secondly, we believe the bill's approach to speed limits should be revisited. Extending the 10-kilometre-a-hour speed limit from footpaths, as the committee initially recommended, to also include shared paths is of particular concern to us. We understand what the government is trying to achieve with these reforms, but we are worried that the adverse outcomes are too great.

Requiring a driver's licence excludes right-minded and responsible people who rely on these devices for their daily mobility who are not able to drive. We believe the goal should be to open up safe mobility options, not restrict them without a clear need. Likewise, imposing a blanket 10-kilometre-and-hour limit on shared paths will likely create new problems that we will need to fix down the track. It will push more riders onto busy roads when they would be a lot safer on a pathway. It may even discourage active transport for many people altogether. These outcomes would not be in the best interests of anyone, particularly motorists, riders and governments at all levels. These are outcomes that do not make sense, especially if they end up worsening congestion or, perversely, reducing safety. We put forward suggestions in our submission to address both of these issues as well as the concern around compliance labelling on e-bikes, and we are happy to discuss those ideas today.

Finally, we would like to reiterate that Queensland has a great opportunity to be a global leader in managing safe, productive and sustainable e-mobility. We just need to get these reforms right and strike the right balance.

**CHAIR:** Thank you, Joshua. I will go to the member for Cooper.

**Ms BUSH:** I will go to the member for Aspley.

**Mr MELLISH:** Thanks, RACQ, for your ongoing involvement in the committee process and now in the bill stage of the process. You talked about speed limit changes. With the provisions that talk about riders being allowed on roads up from 50 kilometres an hour to 60 kilometres an hour and the bill actively saying that they want to push these devices onto roads, are you concerned there will be more of these devices on the roads battling with car, motorbike and truck traffic—and whatever else is on the roads—rather than on footpaths?

**Mr Cooney:** Yes, that is exactly what we are saying. We are worried that, with a blanket 10-kilometres-an-hour speed limit that is applied to shared paths as well as footpaths, riders will not see the sense in continuing to use this pathway infrastructure. Our observation is that a lot of these shared paths are wide enough and are designed and constructed in a way that can take higher speeds safely. We are worried about some adverse perverse outcomes when you are pushing more riders onto busy roads. It actually compromises safety, not improves safety. There are regulations and laws that we point to in our submission. There is already a requirement for riders to take due care of pedestrians and to give way to pedestrians. We believe that you can achieve the objectives that the government is striving for by properly enforcing those particular regulations and laws.

**Mr MELLISH:** On the 10-kilometres-per-hour speed limit component, in your submission you state that you do not think there is a compelling policy rationale for it. We heard from the City of Gold Coast earlier that they think that speed limit has been pulled out of the air. Do you find the 10-kilometres-per-hour speed limit odd, given that the department's own guidelines state that these devices are unstable below 11 kilometres an hour?

**Mr Cooney:** We are left wondering where the 10 kilometres got to. Why reduce it from 12 to 10? We are not sure. We have written to the minister and the department. We think it is really hard to enforce. Typically, most riders would not have a speedometer on their bike or scooter, and you will not have a radar gun on every pathway either. We are talking about making it easy and simpler to enforce good regulations that are designed to improve safety. We would think it is much easier to enforce and prove riders who are not taking due care and who are not giving way to pedestrians.

**Mr JAMES:** Thank you for your submission. I want to talk about the 10-kilometres-an-hour uniform speed limit again. Firstly, what if the committee looked at clarifying or better defining 'footpaths' and 'shared paths'? That would potentially help with your submission of looking at local governments defining the speed limits in their different defined areas?

**Mr Cooney:** You are saying stick with the committee's footpath-only 10-kilometre-an-hour speed limit?

**Mr JAMES:** Whether expanding the definition of 'footpaths' and 'shared paths' would help with your submission in relation to having a greater speed in different environments.

**Mr Cooney:** Yes, I think so. Proper education of riders about what is a footpath and what is a shared path would make a lot of sense to us. Shared paths appear to be the most contentious issue that we are hearing in feedback from our members on this subject. Again, you are left with the problem of how to enforce 10 kilometres an hour on footpaths. We feel it is very arbitrary. It feels like a perverse outcome to us. Who is going to enforce these speed limits? There are much more sensible ways to enforce what is already there in the act and regulations: ride with due care and give way to pedestrians.

**Mr MELLISH:** You point out towards the end of your submission about the compliance label required by the manufacturer. We have heard today about the difficulties around how that works and who applies it and what have you. Do you think transferring this responsibility to another agency like the Office of Fair Trading or TMR would be a better process? How do you see the process being better managed?

**Mr Cooney:** It is probably best managed at point of sale. Requiring an owner to seek such labels back to their manufacturer appears to be quite convoluted and difficult to do, particularly for bikes that might have aged over the journey. I will hand over to my colleague, Andrew Kirk, to explain maybe a way that we could achieve both objectives.

**Mr Kirk:** At point of sale when the device comes into the country is fairly easily achievable, but the main problem will be for existing bikes—you will have to go and get a label fitted from the manufacturer who has made the device or who has assembled the device prior to sale. Say, you have bought the bike online or at Big W. If you take your bike back to Big W, they will not have anyone in store who is qualified to look at that bike to say, 'Okay, it is still as it was when we sold it,' and apply that label. It is the same situation for a vehicle which has a compliance plate on it, but that is not to say that that vehicle cannot be modified and is no longer compliant. This is where the enforcement and regulation of having that label gets complicated.

**CHAIR:** Thank you again for your submissions. It is really appreciated. Following on from the member for Mulgrave's question, as your members have advised you, we have also had a lot of feedback on the issue of shared paths and resolving that. Do you have any other suggestions for us? Is it a matter of just leaving it alone and having those offences or focusing further on what the definition of a 'footpath'? I find when I go with somebody to many different areas, as I have done since the bill

came out, when you get to that location and it is a built-up area with a narrow footpath et cetera, it is very easy to say, 'Well, that is that, and a shared path is that.' Do you have some advice for us? Again, I thank you for the submission, but can you take it one step further?

**Mr Cooney:** I would go back to enforcement. We have looked at how the existing regulations are enforced and to what extent they are enforced. We look at riders being penalised for failing to give way to pedestrians. We have looked at the stats. We believe only 12 infringements in FY25 were given for failing to give way to pedestrians. That is one a month over a whole year. That tells us that, if we are serious about getting the right balance and improving safety outcomes on pathway infrastructure, perhaps better education and better police enforcement is the way to go. We also want on-the-spot fine notices for not riding with due care. We notice that that is a court offence; it is not on SPER. Perhaps some thought could be given to making that an on-the-spot infringement notice.

**CHAIR:** It is certainly the intention that there would be an on-the-spot infringement notice. We were informed through the original inquiry that the 'give way' offence has only been prosecuted when there has actually been a collision with a pedestrian, thus the recommendation for that additional due care offence to cater for those issues. Your advice about the PIN, I think they call them—penalty infringement notice—is very sound.

**Mr MELLISH:** We have heard through the inquiry that there is a bit of confusion around the definition of 'footpath' versus 'shared path', and how you split those up if that is what you need to do. I appreciate the RACQ's view around behavioural enforcement rather than location and speed enforcement. In your mind, is there a clear way to differentiate footpaths and shared paths if that is what is needed?

**Mr Kirk:** The easiest way to look at it is a footpath is very narrow and is typically on your suburban street, whereas shared paths are more through parks and locations and they clearly have line markings on them and most of them are also signed with a picture of a bike and a pedestrian showing that they are shared paths. I think city councils and regional councils pretty much have all of those sorts of paths labelled and that makes it pretty clear for riders and pedestrians what type of path they are on.

**CHAIR:** With regard to your conversation about the driver's licence, was there a breakdown with regards to that? Again, the committee's original report talked about the PrepL, which actually does not require getting the licence. It is about doing training on road rules and safe driving behaviours. Do you have some advice with regard to that?

**Mr Cooney:** We are imagining a relatively easy, straightforward process if it is designed well. What comes to mind for us are five clear steps that a rider could follow to get a licence for the purposes of e-mobility only, and that is the key point. For e-mobility only, you would get onto an online road safety and road rules test provided by a registered service provider. That would be the first step. The second step would be to provide basic details including your age, your name and other details like your email. The third step would be to complete the road safety and road rules test, potentially tailored for e-mobility riders. The fourth step would be to successfully complete a test online. You would receive a completion certificate issued by the registered service provider. That certificate could be valid for, let's say, 28 days, subject to all of those personal details being correct and truthful. Then the fifth and final step, within those 28 days, would be to go a TMR shopfront where you would provide your details again with proof of age and receive potentially a new class of licence. You may call it an E-class licence, and then you are on your way.

The key point there is that I do not think we are inventing anything new here. We have borrowed from something similar that currently exists within motorbike licensing where you have what is called Q-Ride. The Q-Ride system uses registered providers, like motorbike instructors, who issue a certificate before licences are then provided by TMR. You are kind of piggy-backing off existing TMR frameworks. You are ticking a lot of boxes, actually. You are fulfilling the government's policy of requiring a basic knowledge of road rules. If the government is using this mechanism to impose age limits for 16-year-olds and older, it fulfils that policy as well. It puts less restrictions on tourists and visitors to Queensland because you could stop at step 4 and use that certificate for a short stay, a 28-day kind of permit. Importantly, it avoids that discrimination element by allowing those who want to ride and who are perfectly able to ride but who are unable to drive for whatever reason, and that is a lot of the concern that was coming from feedback from our members and in talking to other stakeholder groups like bike groups as well.

**CHAIR:** Thank you, Joshua. That is very informative.

**Mr MELLISH:** Are you concerned more generally? We have talked about speed limits, we have talked about licensing requirements and we have talked about the potential need for a new licence. Are you concerned that for this bill even to be workable there are very significant changes that would need to be made to it from all that we have heard from stakeholders? Putting ideology aside, are you concerned that we are at this point in the process yet we have a bill that, to make it workable, we essentially need to bash it into shape and do some panelbeating on it in a number of ways?

**Mr Cooney:** Potentially. I am not an expert on the public administration side of things, but potentially. The date of 1 July does not seem too far away. If you are enhancing police powers and the like, I would imagine those kinds of reforms could potentially start on 1 July, but, if you had thinking about changes to minimum licensing requirements, that might seem tough. We probably do not have a strong view on that matter.

**CHAIR:** Thank you very much, Joshua and Andrew. The time for this session has expired. There are no matters taken on notice, so you do not have any homework for the weekend. Thank you for your flexibility with regard to the changes to the committee timeframes and the witness requirements. We really appreciate you appearing before the committee today and hope you enjoy the balance of your day. Thank you to everyone. I declare the hearing closed.

**The committee adjourned at 10.44 am.**