TRANSPORT AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE

Members present:
Mr SR King MP—Chair
Mr CE Boyce MP
Mr LL Millar MP
Ms JC Pugh MP
Mr LA Walker MP
Mr TJ Watts MP

Staff present:
Ms D Jeffrey—Committee Secretary
Mr Z Dadic—Assistant Committee Secretary

PUBLIC HEARING—INQUIRY INTO VEHICLE SAFETY, STANDARDS AND TECHNOLOGY INCLUDING ENGINE IMMOBILISER TECHNOLOGY

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

MONDAY, 14 JUNE 2021

Brisbane

MONDAY, 14 JUNE 2021

The committee met at 9.31 am.

CHAIR: Good morning. I declare open this public hearing for the committee's inquiry into vehicle safety, standards and technology, including engine immobiliser technology. Thank you all for your interest and attendance here today. I would like to respectfully acknowledge the traditional custodians of the land on which we meet today and pay our respects to eldest past and present. We are very fortunate to live in a country with two of the oldest continuing cultures in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, whose lands, winds and waters we all share.

My name is Shane King, the member for Kurwongbah and chair of the committee. With me here today are: Lachlan Millar MP, the member for Gregory and deputy chair; Colin Boyce MP, the member for Callide; Jess Pugh MP, the member for Mount Ommaney; Les Walker MP, the member for Mundingburra; and Trevor Watts MP, the member for Toowoomba North.

On Wednesday, 24 February 2021 the Legislative Assembly agreed to a motion that the committee inquire into and report on vehicle safety, standards and technology, including engine immobiliser technology. The purpose of today's hearing is to assist the committee with its consideration of the inquiry.

The committee's proceedings are proceedings of the Queensland parliament and are subject to the standing rules and orders of the parliament. As parliamentary proceedings under the standing orders, any person may be excluded from the hearing at the discretion of the chair or by order of the committee. The committee will not require evidence to be given under oath, but I do remind witnesses that intentionally misleading the committee is a serious offence. You have all previously been provided with a copy of instructions to witnesses, so we will take those as being read.

The proceedings are being recorded by Hansard and broadcast live on the parliament's website. Media may be present and will be subject to the chair's direction at all times. The media rules endorsed by the committee are available from committee staff if required. All those present today should note it is possible you may be filmed or photographed during these proceedings by media, and images may also appear on the parliament's website and/or social media pages. I ask everyone present to turn mobile phones off or to silent mode. I also ask that any responses to questions taken on notice today be provided to the committee by 4 pm on Monday, 21 June 2021.

This hearing is the third in a series of hearings the committee will hold for this inquiry. Further hearings will be held over the coming weeks. The committee's webpage will be updated as further information becomes available about dates, times and invited witnesses. Today the committee will hear from the following groups: Teletrac Navman, Pointer Telocation, and MKPro Engineering from 9.30 am to 10.15 am; the Australian Recreational Motorists Association from 10.20 am to 10.45 am; Caravan Trades and Industries Association of Queensland from 10.50 am to 11.20 am; and the Department of Transport and Main Roads and Queensland Police Service from 11.30 am to 12.15 pm.

AKINDEJU, Dr Michael, Director and Principal Consulting Process Engineer, VMiT, MKPro Engineering (via videoconference)

BARUCH, Mr Yaniv, Vice-President, Marketing and Business Development, Pointer Telocation Israel, Pointer Telocation (via videoconference)

BOSMI, Mr Oded, Vice-President, Engineering, Pointer Telocation Israel, Pointer Telocation (via videoconference)

BOYLE, Mr Lou, National Manager, Teletrac Navman

BRINSDON, Mr Daron, Integrated Solutions Development Manager, Teletrac Navman

DAVIS, Mr Jason, Transport Solution Specialist, Teletrac Navman

L'ECLUSE, Mr Chris, Solution Specialist—Safety Compliance, Teletrac Navman

PROUD, Mr Larry, Advisory Board Member, VMiT, MKPro Engineering (via teleconference)

TOLEDO, Mr Ilan, Australian Representative, Pointer Telocation

CHAIR: Thank you for your attendance here today. To assist Hansard and anyone watching on broadcast, could I ask that you state your name and organisation when you first speak. Would each group like to make a short opening statement?

Mr Boyle: Teletrac Navman is pleased to attend this parliamentary inquiry. Our company is a subsidiary of Vontier Corporation, a US based global leader in technology that is used in and around vehicles. Vontier is listed on the New York Stock Exchange and our market capitalisation is about US$6 billion. Teletrac Navman has been delivering technology involving vehicles for more than 25 years. Globally, our company uses telematics to track and collect data on about 550,000 vehicles and has about 70,000 customers. Telematics by definition is a form of computer science that involves hardware and software, telecommunications, vehicle technology, sensors and the long-distance transmission of data. It can be displayed in real time and is recorded on a second-by-second basis.

Our business continues to grow significantly. Some areas enjoy double-digit growth in many verticals and in many regions. Our core markets are in the US and Mexico, the UK and Europe, and the Asia-Pacific region. We are the largest supplier of telematics in the Australian and New Zealand region. In Australia, Melbourne is home to our global innovative product development group whilst Sydney is our corporate headquarters, but South-East Queensland is home to this group before you today. We are responsible for a diverse range of areas such as change management and safety, the integration of our technology solutions to enterprise systems, heavy vehicle compliance and applications, and different aspects of government. In Australia there are probably 30 to 40 different suppliers that compete in the marketplace, but only a handful meet the Commonwealth government's standards for telematics, and Teletrac Navman is one.

The technology is known by different names, including GPS and in-vehicle monitoring systems, or telematics, but the trend is to call it by the latter two as GPS tends to indicate a more rudimentary solution—a dot on a map—rather than the rich data that is created. The data from IVMS, or telematics, is collected and presented in report formats that can provide significant insights into vehicle and driver behaviour. Data can also be collected from machines and applications on those vehicles; for example, the engagement of pumps, sprays, lights, seatbelts, cranes or tippers. The immutable data that is collected is used to make better decisions around the management of the fleet, safer field workforce and improved driver behaviour, and even the environment.

Today we are conflicted in our attendance. As a public company and technology leader obviously we desire to grow our business, but it is because of this experience with our large and diverse range of customers, who regularly challenge us by raising new problems they would like solved, combined with our commitment to research and development—for which we spend about US$15 million each year—that we are here today. We want to share with the inquiry some of our experiences as to where the technology is going and the benefits, particularly around safety, that are obtained.

As the largest supplier of telematics in the region, we believe that we can add to an awareness and understanding of what is possible. On a daily basis we see that hardware, software and applications and the innovative use by our customers as they solve ad hoc problems results in not only their own corporate benefits but the broader community in areas such as safety, reduced accidents and better drivers. Technology continues to evolve, and from some organisations in both the public and private sectors the biggest challenge and the main barrier to the adoption of technology is now what is currently on the shelf. In saying that, entities such as the National Heavy Vehicle Regulator and changes to workplace health and safety legislation across the states are looking at technology to create safer workplaces. An example of this is the December 2020 introduction of electronic work diaries for heavy vehicle operators.

We see firsthand the difference telematics can make to organisations. Greater efficiency, improved productivity, reduced risk and programs that improve the health and safety of drivers are examples. We believe that more fleet operators should be using this technology not only for return on investment and mitigating risk but also because of the reduction we see in accidents and claims as drivers become better. The rapid evolution of technology is a challenge for many of us. It may be a challenge for legislators, too. The inquiry provides an opportunity to discuss the advantages and disadvantages of technology change.

Aspects of our submission, such as immobilisation, recognise that it is possible and it is being used by some of our existing customers in certain circumstances, but it is firstly important to recognise the different forms of immobilisation. We believe there are two specific types: immobilisation from the ability to start and operate a vehicle which requires the need for additional authentication before a vehicle will start; and, secondly, immobilisation on a vehicle that is in operation, or remote immobilisation. Our focus has been on start immobilisation. We work with customers to ensure their vehicles require additional layers of security before they work. In this instance, we use a swipe-to-start process that involves encrypted RFID tags and readers. The advantage of this is that it allows the fleet manager to allow drivers with the right accreditation or licence conditions to operate specific vehicles which they are eligible to drive.

Because our company is international, we operate in a rich environment of innovative partners and suppliers. Teletrac Navman is able to tap into this global ecosystem to bring this technology to customers. An example is H&P, a UK company that has been leading in the RFID security industry for 25 years. However, our society is challenged by cybercrimes and hacking. Scenarios could occur where activating an immobilisation device may fail or the device is inappropriately activated without authorisation or the right authorisation. The legislative environment needs to consider these events for immobilisation on public roads to mitigate risk and possibly consider future legislation to absolve suppliers or operators of the device.

We look forward to answering questions as to how technology such as telematics and new technology is changing the nature of organisations, vehicles and drivers and adding to the safety of our roads.

Mr Toledo: Good morning, committee members. Thank you for the opportunity to appear here and give you a very quick briefing on the Pointer system, its association with American PowerFleet company and its operations in places such as Germany, the UK, USA, India, South America and South Africa. My partner, Miron Bleiberg, could not attend today, but with us via video link are Yaniv Baruch and Oded Bosmi, who know more of the detailed worldwide operations of Pointer PowerFleet.

I would like to do a very quick demonstration of a very basic unit of the Pointer company which we believe is a very simple, cost-effective, easy-to-install, highly effective vehicle immobiliser that is totally disconnected from the keys to the vehicle. As we know, in Queensland, and indeed Australia, more than 80 per cent of car thefts happen when the thieves actually steal the vehicle keys, take the vehicle and go on a joy ride.

Every vehicle that is installed with the Pointer basic coder, which is easy to install, will have its own unique code. This would represent the car dash where the little coder is installed or in any place that the owner of the car chooses. It could be hidden and it could be easy to access, right in the middle of the dashboard. This is your ignition key or the starter of the car which is connected to the car battery. Obviously if you steal the car keys and you get in the car, the immobiliser and the car keys would not work. If you try to ignite the car, you will have no ignition.

My code on this unit is 2444. If you simply push *2444, it will open the ignition and the vehicle is open to use. It also has a Bluetooth connection to a mobile phone app. The same thing will happen. I can lock it with a code. I can put my code in and the ignition is locked again. I can operate the same device by the app on the phone. On my way to the car I can put in my code and the ignition is on. I would now like to pass over to the marketing manager to give us more of a worldwide briefing.

Mr Baruch: Good day, Australia. It is midnight here in Israel. As Ilan mentioned, we are part of a global company PowerFleet. It is a company traded on the Nasdaq, so you can look at it on the internet. We are the Israeli operation. We have a lot of experience in vehicle security and safety. The immobiliser that Ilan just presented to you we have installed in over one million vehicles in Israel for the past 20 years up until now. In Israel all the vehicles are installed with the immobiliser. PowerFleet has telematics installed in the car. It is called in Israel the stolen vehicle recovery. In the case of especially premium vehicles we track the vehicles with an operations call centre. The most important thing, which Ilan mentioned, is that this basic solution is a very good solution to prevent theft. It means that people who try to take the car without the code will not be able to turn on the vehicle and take it. I welcome any questions.

CHAIR: Thank you. We will now move to MKPro Engineering.

Dr Akindeju: Good morning, Chair and MPs present. We are MKPro Engineering. I am Michael Akindeju, and Larry Proud, despite the flooding in Victoria, has kindly joined us on the phone. We are a consulting engineering firm. We deploy strategic thinking to demonstrate our products. The products we are demonstrating to you and giving testimony on today are a suite of products that do

remote engine immobilisation. These products have been tested and demonstrated. We have conducted over 1,000 hours of testing in a simulated environment and over 100 hours of on-field road testing.

It was organically developed with an understanding of what the challenges are. We understood that we could only immobilise vehicles while in stationary mode. Because of our strategic thinking and engineering expertise, we are capable of organically developing this product, which is safe. We have demonstrated that in Victoria.

The vehicles are uniquely identified. There will be no means of misidentifying a vehicle while in operation. They will be able to identify the location of the vehicle and the characteristics of the vehicle—brand, colour and make—before commands are issued to them. While commands are issued to them, in real time we would track every two seconds to get data from the vehicle—where they are and what kinds of commands are being issued.

There are visual and audio alerts to alert everybody in the environment that a command has been issued to that vehicle—that there is something happening with that vehicle. Depending on the speed of the vehicle at that point in time, it is allowed a certain travel time before it comes to a rest. Therefore, everybody in the surrounding vicinity of the vehicle will have enough time to react to the vehicle. Therefore, it is safe. We do not arrest the steering. We do not arrest the brakes.

Some of the functionality that we bring on board includes DriveIntervent, in case you want to apprehend an offending vehicle. We also have SpeedIntervent. For instance, if a vehicle is speeding in a school zone, we can actually reduce the speed of that vehicle to match the posted speed requirements in that area without necessarily stopping the vehicle which might cause safety issues. We can also geofence a vehicle. If there is an offending vehicle travelling in a particular area, we can have law enforcement agencies around the perimeter. We can geofence that vehicle so it cannot travel beyond that area while we slow the vehicle down and eventually DriveIntervent a vehicle for apprehension.

We can provide information on driver behaviour. The design of our products complies with ADR 82/00, excluding paragraph 31.4. We believe this parliamentary inquiry has the power to recommend for that provision to be repealed. That is why we are here. We have tested products and we are confident that they will perform the required tests safely.

Our product can be retrofitted to all cars, be they old or new, internal combustion, electric vehicles or hybrids. It is user friendly. If you pull it off somewhere to issue a command to the vehicle for intervention, that command cannot be overridden by a single user, an individual user. Only the officer or officers can override that command. For legal reasons, when that command has been executed a secure report will be generated and transmitted to all parties involved. That command is locked and can be tendered in a court of law as evidence of transaction of what happened. It records the location of the vehicle, how the vehicle was driving and the command that was issued for intervention.

Data is securely logged. We deploy our system on the EC2 Amazon data management system. It is very expandable. At the moment we have the capability of 19 million vehicles. That is expandable to over a billion because Amazon itself is expandable.

At the moment it can operate at 800 degrees centigrade. That then becomes a black box for the vehicle. If there was to be a fire incident, we can retrieve data from that vehicle at that local point, in addition to what was uploaded through the cloud as the vehicle was in operation.

We have simplified our business process to avoid or eliminate business risk. We have considered functionality including ergonomics and where we can install the device in the vehicle so that it will be tamper proof. The driver would not be able to access it. It would require a high-level crime syndicate, or anybody who wants to spend six hours to remove a device from a vehicle. It makes us No. 1 in the world.

It is able to be mass produced. If required in Australia, we can produce 10,000 units within the first two weeks. Like I said earlier, we comply with Australian Design Rules, with the exception of paragraph 31.4, which is why we are here today. Then there is ease of installation and ease of use. Then we have post-installation support including training for all stakeholders.

CHAIR: Thank you very much for that. We will now go to questions.

Mr BOYCE: At the moment I have a large crane company that has smart tracking in relation to DTMR and NHVR. Huge cranes that travel the road network are tracked by this technology so that everybody knows where they are going. That is attached to permit systems and so forth. DTMR erects geofencing around road infrastructure that is suspect. The technology then automatically issues fines

to these vehicles and the companies that own them in respect of not having permits or having permits. Can this sort of technology be adapted to motor vehicles where the same sort of thing might happen with respect to speeding, driving under the influence—all of those sorts of things—automatically?

Mr L'Ecluse: Are you talking about the issuing of fines for the general public based on the information generated by telematics?

Mr BOYCE: Yes. Is there potential to collect that type of data and then issue fines?

Mr L'Ecluse: That data exists. For any vehicle movement the data exists. However, the data is owned by the vehicle owner or the company owner in this instance. For IAP, for instance, it is part of the legislative process by which they sign up to the IAP. However, should they contravene the conditions set out in that IAP, the legislative process allows for the issuing of penalties.

However, for the general public, for the purpose of maintaining or reducing the number of vehicles being stolen, while the data exists there would need to be some form of legislative process to ensure that data could be used for prosecution, and that currently does not exist. As an example, the data that we provide from the telematics is highly accurate. Therefore, when some of our customers may go past a speed camera at a speed which triggers that camera and issues a fine, they ask if they can use our data to defend themselves in court. They cannot do that because of the way the legislation is written.

Only speed-measuring devices that are approved by the minister can be given in evidence for processes under that particular statute such as speeding. If, however, speeding formed part of the offence such as reckless driving—the types of offences we would see typically with stolen motor vehicles—then the speed aspect would not need to come from a device which has been approved by the minister, but it could add to the admissibility of the evidence to support the overarching charge of reckless driving. There would need to be an offence committed first and that offence would need to then allow for the access of that data.

Mr BOYCE: In effect, the capability exists. The data exists. It just requires legislation change.

Mr L'Ecluse: That is right.

CHAIR: What about the calibration of instruments? I know that speed cameras have to go through a calibration regime. Would you have to then comply with whatever calibration for that particular instrument?

Mr L'Ecluse: Just for context, I was a police officer. I was 20 years as a police sergeant in Western Australia. I spent many years in the camera section et cetera issuing speeding tickets and indeed chasing stolen motor vehicles, so I have a fairly in-depth background with this.

For calibration purposes, the cameras are calibrated to the manufacturer's specifications, as required under the approval process. The other speed-measuring devices—be they laser speed measuring, radar speed measuring, even the speedometer in the vehicles—have to be calibrated and recorded on a periodic basis. Our devices do not need to meet that specific requirement by virtue of the fact that they are not used in speed-measuring court cases, if you will, or prosecutions. That is not to say that they are not accurate, because they are dealt with from time over distance from the satellite. We measure in second-by-second data, so it is highly accurate.

The difficulty that a lot of members of the public are faced with is the inaccuracy of the needle or the instrument within the vehicle. Under the Australian Design Rules and vehicle standards regulations, a vehicle that is brand new is deemed to be accurate within plus 10 per cent, plus four kilometres per hour. In effect, in a vehicle that is travelling at a true vehicle speed of 100 kilometres per hour, the needle could in fact be displaying plus 10 per cent—110 kilometres per hour—plus four kilometres per hour, giving a needle reading of 114 kilometres per hour. That is now deemed accurate by the definition. However, if the needle underscores the true speed—if the vehicle true speed is 100 kilometres per hour and the needle demonstrates 99 kilometres per hour—then that vehicle is deemed inaccurate. That is for a brand new vehicle. As components wear, that error margin increases.

CHAIR: Tyre size changes?

Mr L'Ecluse: Exactly.

Mr Brinsdon: If I can add, around speed management there is a concept of GPS accuracy, which is different to calibrated instruments, which are fixed on the road. There also needs to be an understanding of the base layer data around speed zones in Australia and how we measure the location of the vehicle relevant to the speed segment on the road, which is out of our control. We buy the aggregated data from suppliers. If that is inaccurate—and the inaccuracies are borne through

road upgrades which then require the data to be updated and made available to people like us to purchase, consume it within our solution and then measure it against the vehicles. You could have a situation where a road is upgraded to 80 kilometres an hour from 60 and vehicles are travelling on it at 75 to 80 kilometres per hour. Because of the delay or lag of the data or of us purchasing the information or it being made available, it could erroneously measure that road speed. There is always a lag that you have to understand around roads being upgraded and making it available to commercial operations like us.

CHAIR: And roadworks.

Mr Brinsdon: Yes, or roadworks or variable road speeds.

Mr Toledo: I believe the technical manager from Pointer would have some input into that.

Mr Bosmi: I can suggest a solution for a speed reading. We have a device that we can connect to the vehicle computer so we can read the speed directly from the computer and there are no problems of accuracy there. The problems with accuracy can be found with the GPS reading. We can solve it by connecting to the data computer.

Dr Akindeju: In our design we went through our algorithm to improve the accuracy compared to ordinary GPS devices. Our accuracy is plus or minus five metres from where the vehicle is at a particular point in time, whereas current GPS devices could be up to plus or minus 50 metres. The reason we did that was to be sure that we are actually capturing the true vehicle speed on ground. Because we poll every second, we remove that ambiguity of inaccuracy with our measurements. Because we have the data, if legislation allows it, we have everything in place to issue a report, that report can be used as a legal instrument for issuing a fine.

Ms PUGH: I want each of the groups represented to clarify any retrofitting of the vehicle and what you actually retrofit. I understand your device can be put anywhere in the vehicle that can actually fit; is that right?

Mr Toledo: The coding device can. I believe the unit that actually does the separation is installed inside the vehicle fuse box by a trained auto-electrician. It takes something in the vicinity of three-quarters of an hour to an hour to install. They just need to be trained. There could be variation for specific vehicles. Again, my colleagues might have a bit more information.

Mr Baruch: The installation is very simple. It takes about 20 minutes. It is just four wires that you have to connect, plus and minus, and then the ignition.

Ms PUGH: That gives me a pretty good idea.

Mr Bosmi: Our solution contains the two models. One of them is the immobilising device with the code that Ilan showed you, and the other model is the tracking device. You can use both of them or use the simple immobilising unit by itself.

Mr Brinsdon: For us it is a very similar methodology. Our solutions are completely universal. We have a range of products to suit assets and light vehicles or heavy vehicles up to the IAP standard that the member Colin Boyce mentioned previously. The installation can be anything from 30 minutes to several hours, depending on the complexity.

Ms PUGH: It can be fitted anywhere in the vehicle?

Mr Brinsdon: Yes, if there is what we call an edge device—interaction between the driver and the vehicle to create authentication. That is usually placed somewhere on the dash, depending on the real estate that is available and the size of the device. The rest of it is inside the dash. Usually the instrument cluster comes out and it goes in there underneath where the kick panels are located.

Dr Akindeju: For us installation is 45 minutes. That is what we have tested so far. We only have five positive pins out, and they are standardised, and they go behind the dashboard. That can be between the engine and the dashboard such that it is very hard for anybody to access. It would have to be an organised crime syndicate that would want to do that, really. Once installed it is locked away. All interactions are removed, either by a superuser or a handheld device. It takes 45 minutes, like I said, and any vehicle, old or new or hybrid, in Australia can have devices installed.

Mr Baruch: I would like to share with you our experience because we have a lot of experience here in Israel and it is very important. If you are looking for a simple solution to prevent theft, the immobiliser is the solution. That is what we are doing in Israel. On top of it, for premium cars or in special cases we have a telematic unit and then you get the location services—added value services, to the vehicle and to the driver. Again, if you are looking for a simple solution, the immobiliser is the solution.

CHAIR: Is there any evidence that the devices are able to be hacked? MKPro said it would only be large crime syndicates who would bother, but can you answer just generally?

Mr L'Ecluse: You cannot say at this point anything cannot be hacked.

CHAIR: Sorry to interrupt. The basis of this inquiry was kids stealing cars. That is the level I was looking at.

Mr L'Ecluse: From the basis of youth stealing motor vehicles, I think it would be very difficult. However, my experience in having dealt with that side of the law for many years is that, no matter what you introduce, the offenders will always seek opportunities to circumvent whatever you do, be it legislatively, mechanically or electronically. Whatever we do, we have to be conscious of understanding, if we go down the path of immobilising, be that from a parked vehicle or potentially from a moving vehicle, what redundancies there are. Apart from the technological aspect, it is going to be from a policing or law enforcement perspective. What redundancies are in place for the actions taken by the individuals?

My experience is, and always has been, that the offenders will do literally anything they can to avoid detection and capture, even if it places their own safety at peril. If we have a situation whereby they understand that we are going to start to reduce the speed of the vehicle, they are likely to open the doors and run from that vehicle while it is still in motion, and now you have a vehicle which is unpredictable. If we have a situation where they know that the protocols are that we kill the engine once the vehicle is already stationary, which by and large is the safest option, they will not stop that vehicle. These are the concerns I have.

We can implement the electronic and the mechanical firewalls, if you will, but you have to understand what they are likely to do. If you have a scenario on the M1 when a vehicle is travelling at 100 kilometres per hour and we gradually reduce the speed of that vehicle and they know that that is happening, it will not be uncommon for them to exit that vehicle in the middle of a motorway and try to run across several lanes of traffic. These are the things to consider. From a hacking perspective, we do not see that in the short term. We do not believe that they are going to have the specialist knowledge or skills to be able to do that in the short term.

CHAIR: As we move on, I would like to say the police had similar concerns. I had a similar device to yours in a Subaru WRX I had years ago. From an owner's perspective it was very frustrating. However, I would not steal that car because it was so frustrating to start; you had to put the code in every time.

Mr Toledo: The greatness of that device is its simplicity. It is connected directly. It is a mechanical coding device. It does not go through a cloud or through remote control. In terms of the operation through a phone—I do not use the phone because this is so much easier—it has a bluetooth connected to it and it needs to be in the vicinity. There is no opportunity for anybody to come from anywhere else and connect to it. Am I right?

Mr Baruch: Yes, you are right.

CHAIR: I think my frustration was that it was under the handbrake so it was difficult to get to as well. It was the location of the device.

Mr Toledo: It has a default setting of three minutes before it will set itself up again. Again, you can bypass that with the four times three code that I have done. There are also lots of other codes you can install if you put your vehicle in for a service at the garage for the day; you can disassemble it for the day just with the code. Again, you try to have the simplicity of operation but also the effectiveness to not have the car stolen.

CHAIR: What happens if you forget the code? I am guilty.

Mr Toledo: It is going to have an online and phone support system.

Mr WATTS: Write it on the back.

Mr Toledo: I believe there is a way to bypass it and put your birthday or your wife's birthday or any code if you want.

CHAIR: Having that phone there would be an app you could circumvent.

Mr Toledo: I would think if you use it four, five or 10 times a day you are not likely to forget.

Mr Baruch: Just to answer the question, seriously sometimes it happens. Yes, people forget the code. We have a code generator that we give the technicians and with this generator they can bring a new code to the customer.

Dr Akindeju: Just responding to the question on hacking, except for state sponsored hacking, we are fairly confident that the five-layer security system that we have implemented will be pretty hard to hack into.

Mr WATTS: Very briefly, I would like to hear about experience from around the world and/or in Australia. First of all, in very remote locations do all the telematics work? More importantly for me, has there been a reduction in insurance premiums once people have the devices fitted?

Mr L'Ecluse: I can answer from the insurance perspective. Generally, we have data to support the fact that when the telematics devices are fitted to the vehicles the number of claims reduces and the value of those claims reduces. That is tied in to the driver behaviour, because it gives us clarity over how the asset is being utilised against either the law or policy. People recognise that and their driving adjusts accordingly. The number and frequency of those collisions reduces, as does the value of those. The other question relating to remote Australia—

Mr Brinsdon: I will just talk about the insurance side. Although Australia lags a little bit around how the industry and technology use it for insurance, it is moving towards a user-pays and spot-pricing model. We have seen some of our markets like the UK use insurance as a method to positively reinforce driver usage and therefore reduce claims. Certainly, our customers see a lot of opportunity in reducing fines, accidents and claims through the use of our technology and the management of it. As far as remote use is concerned, like the other respondents here, all of our data is stored on the device, so things like authentication are done in case the vehicle is parked in the middle of nowhere and does not have the connectivity to the cellular networks, or we have satellite network options as well.

Mr Boyle: We see new business models out there as well. From an insurance perspective, there is pay as you drive and pay how you drive. If you are a better driver, you would like to think your risk is mitigated and you should get a better rate. We are seeing that creep through the industry as well. As new technology has become available, it is being used. From what we see with a lot of our corporates and public sector customers, they are changing the risk profile. They are mitigating the risk and that should be rewarded as well. We are seeing changes happening out there, which is pretty important.

Mr WATTS: If you live in an area where there is high theft and you have an immobiliser fitted, do you get a reduction in your premium?

Mr Toledo: I think the question should be addressed to the insurance companies. When this was invented over 20 years ago—and it started in Israel—the initiative came from various insurance companies. It got to a stage where you could not insure your vehicle unless you installed one of them in it. In vehicles with a higher value, you actually had to install the tracking device as well or they would not insure you. I was here in the first meeting, when the people from RACQ explained that more than 82 per cent of their claims are crashes, and I got the impression that basically they were not really interested. I tried to contact them two years ago after the unfortunate accident in Townsville where four teenagers stole a vehicle and wrapped it around a pole. I think that is where the committee connecting it together could give them the incentive with the correct device.

CHAIR: We are out of time but, Dr Akindeju, did you want to add a final point?

Dr Akindeju: There are two items I will quickly touch on. In terms of insurance premiums, our discussions with the insurance associations should demonstrate that, yes, there will be reductions in premiums if this is to be adopted. Responding to remoteness for utilisation, the way we have configured our device is that even if you were to have only 2G connection in remote areas our device will still work. We have tested with one of those in Ballarat, Victoria—in a very remote area—and it did work very well.

CHAIR: Thank you for that. Thank you all today for your attendance. As this inquiry is still underway, if we come up with some other questions during our inquiry would you be open to those questions coming to you on notice?

Mr Toledo: Sure.

Mr Boyle: Absolutely.

CHAIR: That is much appreciated. Thanks for your time.

BRENNAN, Mr Miles, President, Australian Recreational Motorists Association

COOK, Mr Matthew, Sales Manager, Superior Engineering, Australian Recreational Motorists Association

CHAIR: I welcome representatives from the Australian Recreational Motorists Association. Thank you for your attendance today. Would you like to make a brief opening statement?

Mr Brennan: Good morning. I would like to thank the Transport and Resources Committee for allowing us to provide evidence to today's inquiry. Nine years ago the Queensland recreational motoring community tried to change vehicle modification standards with Queensland e-petition 1975. Unfortunately the petition was unsuccessful, which led to nine years of engagement with TMR bureaucrats and lobbying ministers and political parties to get these and other modification issues addressed. We all remember the fallout from Operation Lift.

The first thing I would like to do is correct the testimony from TMR on 2 March. It was stated that four-wheel drive vehicles were allowed to lift their suspension up to 125 millimetres in height. This is not correct.

I am also concerned that during their testimony to the TMR briefing they failed to mention the federal second-stage manufacturing process regarding the fact that vehicle modifications can be undertaken against any brand new vehicle prior to registration and the testing and certification is undertaken using the federal government's Australian Design Rules. Just like any brand new vehicle sold to the Australian marketplace, any new modifications continue to be certified against the federal standards. However, the exact same type of modification on the exact same type of vehicle may be banned and classed illegal under Queensland government regulations, and the only difference is whether a vehicle is modified pre registration or post registration when the modification is certified.

We requested vehicle accident statistics for modified vehicles through a series of RTIs, and both the Queensland Police Service and the Department of TMR do not have any facts or statistics relating to vehicle accidents for modified vehicles and whether they were any more dangerous on the road than vehicles which had not been modified. We believe TMR are purposely controlling the information in the narrative being presented and they are not willing to make any changes to vehicle modification standards for the benefit of the four-wheel drive motoring community without ministerial intervention.

CHAIR: Thank you. I am pretty well versed in the modification items and I do sympathise with those. I want to ask about remote immobilisation, because you mentioned that in your submission. Could you give an overview of your thoughts? The police have said to us that they are not keen on remote immobilisation, and the previous submitters spoke about immobilising a vehicle that is in motion without line of sight and everything like that. Can you give us your thoughts on that?

Mr Brennan: We put fairly extensive detail in there. My background is that I did 21 years in the Australian Army in communications and I work at the moment in cybersecurity. You have some significant issues with remote immobilisation which we covered in the submission. There are going to be a significant amount of cybersecurity requirements around an internet of things—of communications and GPS monitoring for vehicles and autonomous vehicle connectivity. You are going to put a system that is going to lock the telecommunications systems into certain technologies that will not be able to advance, because you are going to put systems into a car that is a 4G or a 3G and we are going to have to maintain backwards compatibility with that technology in order to remain compliant with 20-year-old vehicles.

The other thing is that it is going to be a relatively easy activity for a vehicle thief to take a $20 GPS jammer off eBay and jam the electronic signal for the GPS of that vehicle. For a few more dollars, they can buy a signal jammer that jams 2G, 3G or 4G communications signals to a vehicle, so you are not going to be able to track it effectively if you get the next level of smart thieves. If we put smarter technology in, you are going to get smarter thieves. Unfortunately, with electromagnetic radiation it is just physics. You cannot legislate a change in physics.

Mr WATTS: Just to clarify, are you saying that the devices which were just spoken about can all be jammed with a simple purchase?

Mr Brennan: Correct.

Mr WATTS: And that purchasing that device is currently not illegal in Australia or Queensland?

Mr Brennan: Correct. Even if it was, you could still buy it straight from the States.

Mr WATTS: Sure, but possession could become a crime in itself.

Mr Brennan: Certainly, but if someone is going to steal a vehicle they are not going to worry about the consequences of an illegal device.

CHAIR: With the keypad one that was localised, you need your keys and a keypad or whatever that device uses—be it a keypad or something else—and that would be more secure than a remote.

Mr Brennan: I did not see the submission on that one, but my understanding is that it will be a device that someone puts the key in, the PIN in, to unlock it when you leave the vehicle. It is just another layer of multifactor, that someone has the key to that vehicle when they leave. At the end of the day, you still need to have your GPS and you still need to have your communication signal between the police or the vehicle control station to the vehicle. If you can disrupt that—

CHAIR: This one was a localised one so your key would not complete the circuit to start the vehicle without the keypad going in as well.

Mr Brennan: Okay, so a second-stage authentication for a vehicle. I was unaware of that one.

Mr WATTS: I am very interested in insurance, because the insurance companies have all these actuaries that value risk. We are not trying to burden people with additional costs, so I am looking at a reduction in insurance—whether it be from modifications done to a vehicle and how that affects people's insurance. Also, from an immobilisation point of view, are you aware of people who have first- or second-stage immobilisation on their vehicle—in terms of it being physical or it being done through the cloud—and the effect of that on their insurance policies, through Shannons or anybody else?

Mr Brennan: No.

Mr Cook: We are a company that manufactures here in Queensland. We also fit vehicles and do modifications. I have also done a lot of them personally. We do not have any issues. We have distributors Australia-wide. In terms of these kits that are federally approved or state approved in other states, there are no issues with insuring them for the full value with all of the details with the insurers. Shannons are a popular one, but there are other insurers that we do not have an issue insuring them with either.

Mr Brennan: We understand there may have been some communication in some articles that we read in the paper during our research that the cost of this might be pushed back to the insurance companies. When you look at the fact there is going to be $10 a person per car and there is a fleet of 20 million vehicles in Australia, that is in the order of $200 million a year to run this program to network-connect every single device if you were fully autonomous. That is a significant amount of money to have the infrastructure set up.

CHAIR: I am going to read this one, sorry. It is a lengthy one and I want your right of reply on this. The Low Volume and Individually Constructed Vehicle Association submission stated—

- Cars can be defected on interstate roads but are perfectly legal on the roads of the home state

The committee suggested to them that the Department of Transport and Main Roads had advised us in an earlier hearing that Queensland has interstate recognition, whereby if a vehicle is registered in New South Wales, for example, where there is a different requirement, and that vehicle comes to Queensland, it is completely legal if that vehicle is modified, even if it is outside Queensland rules. The low-volume industry suggested that you would be more across this issue and I would really appreciate your response.

Mr Brennan: I did have more of a clarification on TMR's point, but I took it out due to time. The point that we want to clarify is—there are two different items there. Let's talk about enforcement and then there is the standards that TMR do. If a vehicle comes from another state and it is legally engineered and certified in that other state, the Australian Constitution is supposed to allow people to travel between states without—because they are legal in one state, why should they not be legal in another state?

Enforcement through QPS should allow that vehicle to come through. We have seen examples where they have been pulled over and defected according to Queensland standards, but the minister did put out some correspondence to debunk that about a year or two ago, which was good. That is more recognising that if the vehicle is safe and certified in its own state it should travel interstate.

When it comes to mutual recognition of modifications, we do not have that at the standards and regulations level. A perfect example is a friend of mine, Abdul, who found a vehicle that was registered in South Australia with six inches worth of lift and 37-inch tyres. The vehicle was completely safe and legal in regard to South Australian regulations, but when they inquired about purchasing the

vehicle and transferring it to Queensland they would have had to take all the modifications off because Queensland does not accept the modifications or the certifications from South Australia. I would like to present that as evidence.

CHAIR: Is leave granted to table that document? Leave is granted.

Mr WATTS: To clarify, you are saying that if the car was registered in South Australia it can drive on Queensland roads?

Mr Brennan: Correct.

Mr WATTS: But they cannot purchase the car and transfer it because it does not meet Australian compliance?

Mr Brennan: No, does not meet Queensland compliance.

Mr WATTS: Queensland compliance, yes. A person from South Australia can register that vehicle in South Australia, drive it up to Cape York, have fun and go home, but they cannot sell the car to anybody in Queensland because it cannot be registered in Queensland?

Mr Brennan: If it is outside the limits of the Queensland regulations, no, you cannot do it.

CHAIR: This has been the bone of contention—

Mr Brennan: Absolutely.

CHAIR:—for those who have not previously been on the committee, with ARMA. We do heavy vehicle national law and make sure that we have that across the states that are involved—and Northern Territory and Western Australia are not—however, for light vehicles we do not have that and that has been the bone of contention.

Mr Brennan: We have so many people who want vehicle modifications and things for their community. Superior Engineering, through Matt, have so many things that are being held back they cannot trade interstate.

Mr Cook: We export and we have distributors around the country. We sell, and our distributors interstate are doing 10 times the amount of business as our distributors in Queensland because of the restrictions that Queensland has. A lot of it is to do with the second-stage manufacturer and Queensland not recognising them on a registered car. To give an example, you can have two vehicles that can be bought from the Toyota dealer the same day. They can come to our workshop and that one can get a federally approved lift if it is not registered with a four-inch lift, 35-inch tyres, all engineered and all tested. The one that has a Queensland registered numberplate on it cannot get the same kit. It can drive around for the rest of its life legally. If that kit gets fitted, because it has a Queensland numberplate on it that is illegal.

CHAIR: This is pre and post rego?

Mr Cook: Yes, pre and post rego. The issue is that other states will allow post rego because of the federal approval. Queensland does not. We manufacture, but we also supply and we fit. It is that sort of chain that can create employment. Our stockists, independent distributors, in other states are literally doing 10 times the amount that Queensland distributors are because they are allowed to do that.

Mr Brennan: TMR are fully aware that there is a federal process for this and they will not accept the modifications.

Mr Cook: That is the thing: they are not unsafe. We spend hundreds of thousands of dollars doing R and D, engineering, test tracks and reports.

Mr Brennan: We are disappointed they have not presented this information to you as a committee that is looking at vehicle modification standards.

Mr BOYCE: Correct me if I am wrong about the explanation you have just given. If I go down to my Toyota dealership, for example, and instruct them that this is what I want before a vehicle is registered in Queensland—if that is done and we register it, it is fine. However, if I buy the car as is, off the showroom floor, and then I go to you and have it altered or whatever, then it is not compliant?

Mr Cook: That is exactly right.

CHAIR: The question I had on that is really moot, because you have highlighted the situation if it is modified before registration. I would like to hear your comments about other states where they have annual inspections. Do you think that has anything to do with it, and do you like the annual inspection regime?

Mr Brennan: It does seem like a good idea. I grew up in New South Wales and I thought this is quite clever. Going to all the meetings with Main Roads, police and all these other groups that have a more vested experience than we do, we totally understand their submission—and even RACQ talk about the fact that annual inspections are not a way to ensure vehicle safety. We find that the vehicle modification community, who generally have the people who want to do it right with safe, legal modifications, actually have safer vehicles because they regularly go and do work on their vehicles and regularly maintain them. Particularly in relation to our incorporated motoring associations, they are doing maintenance on their vehicles more than the general public.

CHAIR: I do not wish to put words in your mouth, but, from previous meetings we have held and discussions, the four-wheel drives you see getting around that turn a corner and just about lie on their side—that is not what is being advocated for?

Mr Brennan: No, certainly not. We want—

Mr Cook:—properly engineered.

Mr Brennan: Yes. Our philosophy is safe, practical and affordable. Safe: it has to be safe for on-road and off-road use for all vehicle owners. Practical: the testing needs to be practical to certify that modification. If there is a test that meets that requirement, then do that test. However, we are finding there are arduous or additional testing requirements being added that do not provide any value. In terms of cost, if we are not providing costing services to the community that are beneficial to everyone, then people are not going to purchase it. For example, to do an electronic stability control test on a lifted four-wheel-drive vehicle, you have to spend $15,000 and send the vehicle down to Victoria, and that is not a guaranteed pass. It is only the ARBs and the TJMs, that can spend a considerable amount of money in R and D, that can actually undertake that. If we are expecting every person to do that, they are just going to bypass it. They do not have that and they will buy the cheap Chinese eBay suspension kit. We are creating a system that is so hard and so difficult to navigate that people are going out and buying unsafe products. We keep telling Main Roads that, but they just—

CHAIR: That is where enforcement becomes a problem, because the police officer who sees the four-wheel drive cannot differentiate what system is on that vehicle.

Mr Brennan: The other thing is that we are clashing with the anti-hooning laws. The way the modification legislation and standards are written, they are very finite on what you can do, down to the millimetre. Under Queensland regulations you can increase your tyres by 25 millimetres at the bottom—bottom and top, because you cannot have a lopsided wheel. They call it a 50-diameter increase in tyre. If you go to 51, that is defective. Police class any modification that is outside the standard as defective—not unsafe but defective. It is a very strong term, being defective. It just means they may have gone over the limit; it does not mean the vehicle is unsafe. That is one of our biggest contentions: we want safe modifications but Main Roads are putting in place the testing processes and they keep changing the goalposts on what we can and cannot do. You have had testing and you have shown them—

Mr Cook: We have had meetings with vehicle standards and they have said, 'If you can provide us evidence, we will look at it.' That is an open-ended thing; they will always look at it. Like I said before, we have spent hundreds of thousands of dollars, but we have vehicles with bigger lifts, bigger tyres, completely new suspension and we have done a lane-change test to prove that vehicle is safer than when it came out of the factory and they have said, 'That's great. Not interested.'

CHAIR: Yet over the border—

Mr Cook: We can do it and do it every day.

CHAIR: If the vehicle was new, pre registration?

Mr Cook: Illogical.

Mr WATTS: I am trying to understand that. If you modify a vehicle and it is a particular class—I will not say a brand name, but a particular brand of dual cab. You can then send that away for that kit to be tested. That kit meets all of the safety standards and requirements, but it is not allowed then to be sold in Queensland because it is noncompliant with the regulation, even though it has met all the safety standards?

Mr Brennan: Of the federal—

Mr Cook: You can have a federal approval, which to my way of thinking should override everything, but then Queensland have their own standards. If it does not meet those, it can be registered pre rego but it cannot be registered post registration, which is just illogical.

Mr WATTS: My point is: there is a regulation that exists that is supposed to be around safety. You have proven the safety—

Mr Cook: Well and truly.

Mr WATTS:—but then it is not permitted because it does not meet an arbitrary regulation that is obviously not related to safety, because if it was it would not have passed in the first place?

Mr Cook: Yes, that is the issue we have.

Mr WATTS: That is effectively what you are saying?

Mr Cook: One hundred per cent.

Mr Brennan: This is a bureaucratic issue at Main Roads.

CHAIR: Are there any other states that have the same issue?

Mr Brennan: Yes, definitely.

Mr Cook: There is a myth there. There is a misalignment between—

Mr Brennan: Yes, they are all misaligned. So they have all different—

Mr Cook: That is the issue as well.

Mr Brennan: For example, in South Australia you can do any size modification that you want and it comes down to the engineer to do that work, to do the testing and certification in order to meet the testing requirements and prove that vehicle is safe. Regardless of the height or the width or whatever, that vehicle can then be done either before registration or after registration, and that modification is fit for purpose for the life of the vehicle. There are limits inside the Australian Design Rules that actually say you cannot go too high. Even if we said unlimited modifications, we are not going to get the big things that you see on Facebook that have 40-inch tyres, because there are limits that actually restrict dimensions of vehicles on the road.

CHAIR: Sorry, what I meant to ask was: what if there was a federal law so that you could modify the vehicle before you register it? Does that happen in other states?

Mr Brennan: Yes.

Mr Cook: Yes, every state. With the federal approvals that we do, you can get the second-stage manufacturing kits registered Australia-wide without an issue. Say you did that in New South Wales and you moved to Queensland, it is no problem getting that transferred and registered in Queensland if it has done that first federal approval registration.

Mr WATTS: I just wanted to clarify something there. The reason you can get the federal approval is because there has been a safety standard test rather than a bureaucratic test?

Mr Cook: Yes.

Mr WATTS: So to get the federal approval it is not that they are lax; it is that they are actually testing safety as opposed to having some prescribed criteria.

Mr Cook: Yes. There is a whole process of engineering reports and tests that you need to do.

Mr WATTS: Is that per vehicle or per class?

Mr Cook: It is per vehicle for that specific modification, so that suspension kit on that model of vehicle. It is specific—

Mr WATTS: So it is per class of vehicle. You do not have to do it for each individual vehicle?

Mr Cook: Not each time, but once you have done it on that vehicle with that specific kit then that is approved for that vehicle.

CHAIR: Did you want to add to that, Miles?

Mr Brennan: No.

CHAIR: I just have one more question and I probably already know the answer. As an overarching thing that we understand you are advocating for, if a new modification then is allowed in one jurisdiction, you would advocate for that to be allowed overall because it has been tested to engineering standards—

Mr Brennan: Yes, but further than that, we have testing standards that are exactly the same that are international and we cannot install some of the internationally certified and modified components for our vehicles because, again, they do not allow us to bring in things from the States. Fiat Chrysler or Jeep are built in the States and they do their engineering and their certification in the States. The aftermarket suspension kits and companies over there do their things and test it in the

States. The American testing standard is exactly the same as the Australian testing standard. It is just that the ADRs are aligned with the United Nations ECE codes. We are not aligned to the American ones, so technically we do not recognise the American code. It is exactly the same test. The only thing that we should be doing is saying to the engineer, 'You can install that kit into that vehicle. It has been certified. It meets and has passed the testing. You just need to make sure you're happy with it.'

CHAIR: I sympathise with you, having bought a European car from America to convert to right-hand drive here and having to deal with American standards yet the original manufacturer standards are okay.

Mr Brennan: We have prepared some questions. I notice that you have Main Roads coming in later this afternoon. I would like to provide some questions that may give you the opportunity to expand on the second-stage manufacturing. Whether you want to ask those or not, they may help to expand on some of the points we have raised.

CHAIR: Thank you. Is leave granted to table those? Leave is granted. Once again, time has beaten us. We really appreciate you coming in. The new committee will now be versed in this ongoing item of contention. As I have asked everyone else, as this inquiry is continuing, if we come up with questions would you be happy to answer them if we forward them to you?

Mr Brennan: Most definitely. You have all of our details, so feel free.

CHAIR: We really appreciate your time. A transcript of these proceedings will be provided in due course.

PLANT, Mr Jason, Chief Executive Officer, Caravan Trade and Industries Association of Queensland

CHAIR: Welcome. Thanks for your attendance today. Would you like to make an opening statement?

Mr Plant: I thank the committee for the opportunity to attend today. I would like to make a brief opening statement to emphasise some of our association's key priorities around road safety. As outlined in our submission, we are the peak industry body for the caravan and recreational vehicle industry in Queensland, representing 240 businesses including manufacturers, dealers, repairers and accessory retailers. The recreational vehicle industry is worth over $2.9 billion to the state's economy. This economic contribution is increasing rapidly, particularly while international travel restrictions remain in place. I want to point out, too, that when I mention recreational vehicles I refer to caravans, camper trailers, motorhomes and campervans—so the breadth of vehicles in that sector.

Even though we are a significant contributor to the state's economy, there have been examples in the past of our industry being overlooked and not considered through inquiries such as these or when there have been legislative changes. I thank you for our inclusion in today's proceedings. It is important to note that recreational vehicles are a significant road user. There are approximately 200,000 recreational vehicles currently registered in this state—the most of any nationally. Any inquiry that focuses on motorised vehicle road use must take into consideration the potential implications to recreational vehicle road users so that motorhomes and campervans are not inadvertently caught up in any unnecessary or unfair changes.

Our industry is passionate about road safety. Users of our products must be able to travel with confidence, arriving at their destination and returning home incident free. More recreational vehicles on the road means more stimulus for our domestic tourism industry, particularly remote and regional Queensland, at a time when it is needed most. Our association currently runs free caravan safety programs in conjunction with the department of transport inspectors across the state in most major centres, educating RV owners to ensure they are not overloaded or overweight whilst travelling. We also provide advice and information on how to set up their tow vehicles and their caravans or camper trailers safely when those two items are in combination.

It is also important to ensure that, when purchasing privately owned RV products, consumers are receiving not only safe and roadworthy products but also legal and compliant products. A few years ago we ran a program titled Van Aware, in conjunction with the department of transport, designed to educate buyers on the telltale traits of rebirthed recreational vehicle products. We feel a relaunch of this program is required, particularly given the surge in retail activity around recreational vehicles.

Another area of concern for our association is statutory written-off recreational vehicles being sold through auction houses and then rebirthed. A statutory written-off caravan cannot be re-registered and should only be used for parts or scrap metal, or they are sometimes placed on properties and used as accommodation for private people. They should not be towed, ever. We have seen occurrences recently of statutory written-off caravans being sold through auction for over $30,000. This is quite a price to pay for something that is to be used as parts or scrap metal.

Our association and our members work hard to ensure RV owners are travelling safe and compliantly and with confidence on our roads. With the appropriate level of government support and funding for these programs and other potential road safety initiatives, we will be able to educate more RV owners, reducing accidents involving recreational vehicles and allowing more people to disperse throughout the state into regional and remote areas.

CHAIR: Thank you. I am interested in hearing about that statutory write-off. When they are a statutory write-off, are they on a register so they should never be allowed to be rebirthed?

Mr Plant: They are, so they should not be able to but there have been instances where they have been rebirthed illegally.

CHAIR: So a new VIN, for want of a better word. Do they have a VIN, a vehicle identification number, like a car?

Mr Plant: Correct. A statutory written-off vehicle can be purchased through an auction, and there have been cases like this in the past where people have been charged. They will purchase the vehicle, remove the VIN plate and reapply a new VIN plate. They will apply for a new VIN through the low-volume VIN program. They will place the new VIN number on. They will etch out or grind off the VIN that is stamped into the chassis of the caravan. They will even remove the chassis number. Some

manufacturers place a chassis number on the chassis as well which is an identifying factor. They will sell these privately to unsuspecting consumers. This was part of the Van Aware campaign that we ran a few years ago trying to educate people on what to look for.

CHAIR: I never thought about that for caravans. Obviously a motorhome has all of the things that a car would have.

Mr Plant: It was three years ago, I think, when there was a case where a gentleman was charged for rebirthing 81 caravans.

CHAIR: Is there a reparable write-off category for caravans?

Mr Plant: Yes.

CHAIR: What sort of damage would that be that could be repaired?

Mr Plant: That could be minimal hail damage or minimal damage to the body of the caravan—anything that was deemed—

CHAIR: Nothing structural though?

Mr Plant: No.

CHAIR: Just for the record, I have never repaired a caravan. I have done a car.

Mr WATTS: In your submission you spoke about engine immobilisers not being required for motorhomes—obviously not required for a caravan. I am interested in the reason you would seek to not be included if there was a requirement for immobilisation.

Mr Plant: For the remote engine immobilisers?

Mr WATTS: Yes.

Mr Plant: It is not that we would not; we just think there needs to be more research conducted into that technology before it is implemented.

Mr WATTS: I could not agree more. So it is not, 'We don't think it should apply to our category of vehicle'? It is more to do with the overall technology and whether it should apply at all?

Mr Plant: Perhaps it does not need to be applied to us. If it were to be brought in and we did fall under that category, like I said, we are just concerned about the safety implications around those products. Most motorhomes and campervans come with the engine immobiliser technology anyway. The cab chassis that the products are built on come with the same engine immobiliser as a vehicle.

Mr WATTS: I was just curious as to whether it was because of the class of vehicle, but your reservations are the same as ours.

Mr Plant: Yes. From speaking with insurers, any claims relating to theft for motorhomes and caravans are absolutely minimal—they are below one per cent—so at the moment it is something that we do not have a strong focus on.

CHAIR: They are not a real target for joy-riders.

Mr Plant: No.

CHAIR: What sorts of security measures do your members use, if there are any additional security measures that you use in your industry to stop theft?

Mr Plant: Tracking devices.

Mr WALKER: You say that it is less than one per cent of vehicles that have issues.

Mr Plant: That is the information we can get out of the insurers.

Mr WALKER: Do you think that is organised crime? Some of these vehicles are worth over $500,000. Like the chair said, it is not joy-riding; it is more that they are worth a lot of money. Do you think it is organised crime that would get involved in this?

Mr Plant: It is hard to say. I could not comment on that, because we do not have enough information on that. I could seek to try and source some feedback from our members or from the caravan or motorhome specific insurers to see if we can get some more information on that for you.

CHAIR: Could you take that on notice?

Mr Plant: Sure.

CHAIR: I do not want to step on the member for Toowoomba North's toes; I know he is very big on insurance. Do your members have any difficulty obtaining insurance for motorhomes and caravans? You have said that theft is not a huge issue.

Mr Plant: It is not a huge issue for motorhomes and campervans—I want to stress that—because with caravans there are still issues with theft.

CHAIR: Does that present an insurance problem at all? Have you found that amongst your members?

Mr Plant: No, we have not found that consumers are finding it difficult to obtain insurance for recreational vehicles.

Ms PUGH: Regarding the $2.9 billion figure, is that for purchases of motorhomes and caravans each year or is that also around the discretionary spending of grey nomads and other people who use campervans and caravans each year?

Mr Plant: That is all-encompassing. That is retail sales and overnight stays in caravan parks. Our federal body commissioned BDO to conduct research on its behalf. That was research conducted by BDO last year. In the past 12 months, as we know, we have seen a dramatic surge in activity. That figure could be well over $2.9 billion.

Ms PUGH: I got a lot of calls to my electorate office last year, when Queensland was locked down, saying, 'Let us go out.' People were very keen to go off the beaten track.

CHAIR: I note that in your submission you said that for many first-time caravan users on the road there are some safety concerns. Can you outline the safety concerns in more detail?

Mr Plant: With international travel restrictions, a lot of new people who would not normally have thought of purchasing a recreational vehicle as a holiday option are entering the market. They may not understand that how you load a caravan affects its towability—how the relationship between the car and the caravan impacts how it is towed and driven, and the safety of it. Also, there are just different driving techniques. When you are towing a 2½-tonne or three-tonne caravan behind a vehicle, you need to take in some different considerations. For five or six years we have been running caravan safety check programs across the state in conjunction with the department of transport. They are free. They fill up immediately. We could be doing 10 times more than we are doing in this regard. We find that there is a hunger for information out there, particularly from these newcomers, even at our caravan shows. The most popular topics we run in our seminars and presentations are around road safety—weights and towing, how to load your caravan, information on different technology that is available to improve road safety whilst towing. We just think now more than ever, with the new people coming through, these types of programs need to be amplified.

CHAIR: Do you think there should be formal training for over a certain weight of caravan on the road? You mentioned that you do these sessions, but what about formalising that training?

Mr Plant: There are plenty of options out there for people to have towing training. There are facilities like that available across the state. We find that the face-to-face sessions we run provide ample opportunities for people to pick up this knowledge. We produce written material. We have information on our website. We have a national towing website with all of this information as well. We find that consumers react better and hold information much better when it is delivered face to face rather than when they read it. That is why the programs we run across the state are very well attended and really well received.

CHAIR: Are you aware of any jurisdictions that have a towing test or anything like that?

Mr Plant: Not that I am aware of, no.

CHAIR: I have been frustrated at the dump watching people try to back a trailer!

Mr Plant: They are the hardest ones to reverse!

Mr BOYCE: Do you believe there should be some sort of qualification on a person's driver's licence in respect of towing caravans and so forth? I am sure we all have seen examples on the highways and byways of people who are probably not as qualified as they might be.

Mr Plant: We do not think any formal qualification is required; we just think there is the opportunity for more education regarding towing courses, workshops or seminars. There is plenty of written material out there. There are plenty of opportunities for people to draw upon the experience and knowledge of experts in that area without having formal qualification. The tow vehicles and the caravans these days are a lot safer than they used to be in terms of the technology attached to those products. As long as you are aware of some of the basic requirements as far as loading, weights and knowing where to place the heavier items, for example, within your trailer—so that you do not impact the stability of the trailer while towing—that sort of information is gold. We do not think a formal qualification is required, because there is plenty of information and training opportunities available.

CHAIR: Our previous submitter referred to four-wheel drive modifications and the legality of those among states. I know that people like to put jerry cans and other things on caravans and motorhomes. Do you have any issues with modifications making the vehicles illegal? What regulatory bodies are there to allow that?

Mr Plant: In part of the programs that we run—the caravan safety checks—we also check for aftermarket modifications. A private owner of a caravan may have a toolbox mounted to the A-frame of the caravan or a generator box mounted to the rear of the van. Again, this is where it comes back to them not understanding what impact that has on the towability or the compliance of the product itself. There are concerns around that as well. If the work is being conducted through a professional repairer or dealer, we do not have any concerns because that dealer, repairer or manufacturer should be aware of the legalities surrounding any aftermarket modifications. Where it is done privately and then resold privately, that is where the concerns lie.

CHAIR: I have seen caravans with a 'window rattler' air-conditioner on the other side. I would hate to see that on the highway. They are parked, of course, and not on the highway.

Mr WATTS: Are you saying that if someone, say, attaches a generator to the chassis that should require a modification on the registration of the vehicle?

Mr Plant: It depends on the circumstances.

CHAIR: Is that because of the weight added to it?

Mr Plant: Yes.

Ms PUGH: My dad is looking at getting a caravan and also a new car. He says, 'I don't know how I'd go with a hybrid in terms of towing and things like that.' The concern might be that people would run out of petrol if they use up their energy quicker when they are towing. Can you explain how hybrid vehicles interact with towing a caravan and things like that? What effect does that have, if any?

Mr Plant: The tow vehicle being a hybrid?

Ms PUGH: Yes.

Mr Plant: There is a hybrid form of caravan as well.

Ms PUGH: I did not know that!

Mr Plant: Obviously when you are towing anything, it is going to place more stress on the vehicle so you will draw more energy. I do not have a great deal of information on hybrid vehicles particularly, as far as the impact that has on the vehicle's performance, but any large item that you are towing, be it a caravan or a trailer, is going to impact the performance of the vehicle and the fuel consumption.

Mr WALKER: I heard you talk about the weight distribution on the back of a towed vehicle, be it a genset or a toolbox on the front. I note that internally on a caravan the storage is under a bed or a lounge area. Sometimes the lounge is at the front or over the axle, but when you open up the area of a bed, which is normally to the rear, in the ones I have seen there is nothing saying 'weight capacity' or 'Caution, weight distribution must be adhered to'. Is there more that can be done in relation to having those stickers or badging that brings it to the attention of the consumer or the operator? They do it on boats in relation to certain safety equipment, but I have never noticed on a caravan badging that says 'Caution, must be adhered to' or that outlines manufacturer's specifications. Is there anything you are aware of that does that?

Mr Plant: There will be information in the manuals that come with the caravan. We produce a towing guide which provides information around where you should be placing the heavier items when you are loading the caravan. Obviously, people should try to disperse the weight so that the heavier items are placed over the axle.

Mr WALKER: I think that is where the problem will lie, because, as we know—I just want to add to this, because it is very serious—some people do not read the manuals. Some vehicles are hired. What brings the person's attention to that? I think we really need to look at that a bit more so that in these compartments there is information. People need to be very aware of what they are doing. That is a very serious point.

In terms of social media platforms and education, do you have a campaign where you educate people about weights and distribution? Last night I saw one about boats with outboard motors on the back—how all the weight pushed to the back can flip a vehicle around and how the movement of weight to the front makes it so much safer. Do you have any education on a social platform?

Mr Plant: We do. Last year during Queensland Road Safety Week we produced a suite of videos highlighting everything from aftermarket fitting of toolboxes and bike racks through to gas safety—everything. We have that material online, in social media and printed. We find that the best form of delivering that is face to face.

CHAIR: Thank you very much for coming in and for your interest today. We have placed a question on notice regarding the crime statistics.

Mr Plant: I will see what information I can gather for you.

CHAIR: Could we have that answer by 4 pm on Monday, 21 June?

Mr Plant: Sure.

CHAIR: Thank you very much. A copy of the transcript will be provided to you in due course.

Proceedings suspended from 11.13 am to 11.30 am.

ELLIS, Mr Nigel, Executive Director, Legislation, Standards and Accreditation, Department of Transport and Main Roads

MAHON, Mr Andrew, General Manager, Land Transport Safety and Regulation, Department of Transport and Main Roads

ROHWEDER, Chief Superintendent Ray, Queensland Police Service

STAPLETON, Mr Mike, Deputy Director-General, Customer Services, Safety and Regulation, Department of Transport and Main Roads

CHAIR: I welcome representatives from the Department of Transport and Main Roads and the Queensland Police Service. Thank you for your attendance here today. Would you like to make a short opening statement?

Mr Stapleton: Good morning, Chair and committee members. Thank you for the further opportunity to appear before the Transport and Resources Committee. The Department of Transport and Main Roads and the Queensland Police Service previously briefed the committee on 22 March 2021. Both government agencies subsequently provided answers to questions taken on notice at the committee briefing on 22 March. The Department of Transport and Main Roads subsequently coordinated a whole-of-government submission to the inquiry which was forwarded to the committee on 22 April 2021. To assist the committee, the submission is structured under general headings which are generally reflective of the inquiry's terms of reference.

The promotion of road safety and the prevention of crime are pivotal roles for the Queensland government. The Queensland government therefore welcomes the opportunity to be involved in the current inquiry process. Given the Queensland government has already made a written submission to the inquiry, and in order to provide as much time as possible for the committee to ask questions, I will respectfully leave it there and ask the committee if they have any questions.

CHAIR: I will just say at the outset that earlier the Australian Recreational Motorists Association gave us some questions they would like answered. To save time, because I would like to ask some questions about reparable write-offs, could we give these questions to you to be taken on notice?

Mr Stapleton: I am glad to accept those, Chair.

Mr MILLAR: Thank you for appearing before the committee again. My question is to Ray from the Queensland Police Service. We are talking about immobilisers, but when it comes to stopping the theft of cars—certainly when we see what is happening in North Queensland—from the point of view of the Queensland Police Service, what is the best way for us to address this issue?

Chief Supt Rohweder: I think the best way we can address this issue is to look at the underlying problems, such as social issues, that cause generally young people to behave in the way they do. Whilst we are very keen to apprehend those offenders when they steal a vehicle, there is no doubt that there is a range of societal issues that put those young people in the driver's seat. Whilst we have a reactive duty to apprehend offenders, there is no doubt that government as a whole, not just the police, has an obligation to look at the underlying issues that are causing these young people to offend.

Mr MILLAR: I agree with that, but right now we have young people who commit crimes continuously and continue to ignore the responsibility of trying to correct themselves, which takes a lot away from police resources in certain areas. That is having an impact on the Queensland Police Service. What immediate actions need to be taken to address this issue?

Chief Supt Rohweder: I think immediately the things that we are doing are the only things we can do. We try to educate the public to be more aware of the environment around them and make it more difficult for them to become victims of crime. It is apprehending the offenders and placing them before the court and allowing the justice system then to deal with them. I think our officers are doing everything they can to bring people before the courts and, as I say, allow the justice system to deal with them.

Mr MILLAR: But they come before the courts, they reoffend, they come before the courts again and then they reoffend. How do we address that issue?

Chief Supt Rohweder: I think the issue is one that perhaps people in other departments should answer. All I can say is—

CHAIR: It is not really a question for the police to comment on the justice system. I understand your frustration.

Chief Supt Rohweder: We can bring them before the courts, and I suppose the courts are governed by precedent and all the issues that they take into consideration.

Mr MILLAR: Are you finding there is fatigue within the Police Service in that regard? They go before the courts, they get out, they reoffend, they go back before the courts and they reoffend. Do you feel there is some fatigue within the police force and that this is just getting out of control?

Chief Supt Rohweder: I have been a police officer for over 36 years and I often hear about this onset of fatigue. I have been hearing that for 36 years. I think we are currently involved in a situation where people at times may feel fatigued, but I do not think anything has really changed. I do not find it to be any different from the past. I also think we have a system in place that deals with our officers in a much better way should they be feeling fatigued or stressed out with what is currently happening.

Mr MILLAR: Thank you for your service.

Chief Supt Rohweder: Thank you very much.

CHAIR: For the benefit of all of us, can you explain the current process of the approval of reparable write-offs?

Mr Mahon: The current Written-Off Vehicle Scheme is pretty simply broken up into two main categories: reparable write-offs and statutory write-offs in Queensland. If a vehicle is in an accident, one of three outcomes could occur: first, it is a reparable vehicle and it does not have a written-off status; secondly, it is a reparable write-off, which means the damage is able to be repaired; and, thirdly, it is a statutory write-off, which means the vehicle cannot be re-registered. It is either damaged beyond repair or part of the damage has been deemed to be statutory in nature. They are the three groups that can happen if you have a vehicle accident.

In Queensland right now we have approximately 13,000 vehicles that go through the Written-Off Vehicle Scheme every year. Not every vehicle that is categorised as a reparable write-off necessarily gets repaired. In many cases they end up going to yards where they are used for parts, but in some cases they are repaired and they can be repaired. There are about 13,000 that go through the scheme annually, if we look at the 2019 figures for example, out of the four million vehicles that are on the road.

CHAIR: With regard to the safety of a reparable write-off, there are concerns from some submitters but others who love the current system. My understanding is that there is a roadworthy component once the vehicle is repaired, and then it goes for a security check with the department before the written-off status is taken away.

Mr Mahon: That is correct.

CHAIR: Are there any plans to change that and to add to that as part of this process?

Mr Mahon: As part of the reforms that were announced by the Minister for Transport and Main Roads a couple of months ago there are a number of measures that will be changing in relation to the Written-Off Vehicle Scheme. Right now a vehicle that is a reparable write-off has to be repaired first, obviously, get a safety certificate and then attend one of the written-off vehicle inspection sites that we contract out to Queensland Inspection Services. They do a number of checks to make sure the vehicle is not stolen or a write-off in another state so that it cannot be registered, for example. The changes that are coming, which we hope to implement next year, mean that reparable write-offs will effectively no longer exist. Most vehicles will become a statutory write-off.

There will be exceptions where some vehicles can be repaired still or retained and registered, and they are examples like hail damage or where the vehicle's owner is the existing owner and wants to retain the vehicle. Those vehicles will have to go through an additional check as part of the new scheme, which means that a quality repair check will have to be done by Queensland Inspection Services that we do not currently do. That will require them to produce a range of documents and verifications that the vehicle has been repaired appropriately—photos and images of the vehicle being put back together, for example—but also some additional inspections as part of that process. What we expect to see is a fairly significant reduction in the number of vehicles that were written off being repaired. As I mentioned before, there are currently about 13,000. That number could drop to around 3,000, for argument's sake, if we look at similar vehicles in New South Wales.

CHAIR: One of our submitters was quite concerned about that. He said it would be a waste of vehicles that would go on the scrap heap, literally, that could be repaired. I used an example of someone I know who bought a BMW and it was just the GPS system. It was a stat write-off, unable to be repaired, because the GPS system could no longer be bought and an aftermarket one could not be installed. I was just wondering what the benefit of that would be, rather than keeping the reparable write-off system with a more robust inspection afterwards.

Mr Mahon: There is always a risk that a vehicle that may still be useful could become a write-off and is effectively wasted; however, those vehicles are still useful for parts. As I mentioned before, most vehicles are not written off when they have an accident. If we look at the 2019 figure, according to insurance data that we have collected, 380,000 vehicles were involved in an accident. Only 13 per cent of those were some type of reparable or statutory write-off, so you are talking about a small portion—13 per cent of the number of vehicles that are in accidents to begin with—that then potentially cannot be re-used under the new scheme. I acknowledge that there will always be a case here or there where a vehicle, for all intents and purposes, looks like it could be re-registered. In those cases, those vehicles will be used for parts and other things. There are certainly parts of the industry that are really keen to see these changes come through, because there are concerns around the quality of repair but also some of the decisions being made around those written-off vehicles.

CHAIR: But the ones that can be repaired would involve a structural engineering type of whatever the repair is. For clarity, in the past I have repaired one reparable write-off. It was a flood damaged vehicle, so it required a flush-out of all the oils and a new computer. It was as simple as that. I did not sell that vehicle in the end. It actually got crashed and became a statutory write-off. Another one I am doing has hail damage which requires panel replacement. That is not something that requires engineering certification.

Mr Mahon: In both of those examples, Chair, under the new scheme the hail damage one will likely be able to be re-registered. It is unlikely that the flood damaged vehicle will be able to be re-registered.

CHAIR: The computer was obviously from another vehicle purchased, and they went through the process of the inspection to make sure the computer and everything that was purchased was not from a stolen vehicle and there was a chain of ownership.

Mr WATTS: In terms of data around the reason for the change, there is going to be a change in legislation. Is there data that shows that reparable write-offs have a higher propensity to be in an accident or are more dangerous? Is it a data driven decision?

Mr Mahon: In relation to reparable write-offs being more dangerous, the answer is no. We do not have data that says a reparable write-off is a more dangerous vehicle on the road. We expect that those vehicles have been repaired appropriately to a safety standard and have been through a safety check. However, the issue we have is that we do not have a quality check in place at present. Whilst a vehicle may look like it has been repaired appropriately, underneath it may not have been. It is often very difficult to determine that.

In relation to crash stats, we do not see them necessarily show up in a higher number of crashes, per se, but then we do not always check and verify that, either. If a vehicle is in an accident or fatality, we do not record the data that says that vehicle was reparable, written off previously or not.

Mr WATTS: I am just interested as to why. Surely if we are going to make a decision to change a legislative framework it would be useful to have the data that indicates the reason that change is being made.

Mr Mahon: There are a number of other factors that are being considered as part of it. We have had feedback from industry. A lot of industry players have come to us over a number of years suggesting that the vehicles are not being repaired appropriately. Secondly, we have issues in relation to vehicles moving interstate. New South Wales obviously has the same or similar statutory written-off scheme that we are looking to implement. We have other considerations as well as criminal activities that may occur in relation to vehicles coming from other places and/or being rebirthed. There are a range of different things that we are trying the resolve here, not simply whether the vehicle is safe, because if it has been through a safety inspection arguably it should be.

Mr Stapleton: The National Motor Vehicle Theft Reduction Council has identified that there is a trade in stolen vehicles specifically to harvest parts for reparable write-offs. They have made that quite open and public and there is a concern that that continues to drive part of the stolen vehicle industry.

Mr BOYCE: In relation to DTMR/NHVR overweight and overmass dimension vehicles using our roads and the technologies that are used to track those sorts of vehicles, there are some anomalies in the regulations around applying for permits, the issuing of permits and so forth. What is the department doing to address those issues?

Mr Stapleton: You have just written to the director-general, I am aware, asking pretty much the same question. I do not know if we have here today everything we need to answer that particular question. It is not specific to what we came prepared for. Can we take that offline and more or less respond to your letter?

CHAIR: If you have already asked the question, member, would you be happy with that response?

Mr Stapleton: We could give you some information here, but it will not be comprehensive.

Mr BOYCE: Thank you.

Mr MILLAR: I have a question to the Queensland Police Service. One of the things we have seen in Townsville when it comes to the theft of motor vehicles is the continual setting of those cars on fire. Are you finding that is a common theme at the moment: once a juvenile steals a car they light it up?

Chief Supt Rohweder: I do not have the statistics with me, but what I can say is that historically that type of thing often happens. That can be around pure spite or at times offenders utilise lighting up the vehicle to avoid detection from fingerprint or DNA evidence and that type of thing. I am unaware that there is any huge spike in that type of behaviour. What I am cognisant of, though, is that once a group of offenders develop a particular MO they tend continue with that. It certainly alarms me, because it is dangerous behaviour—particularly dangerous for the offenders themselves if they conduct themselves in the wrong way. We are seeing that happening in Townsville, without doubt. Without having the figures in front of me, I was actually stationed in Townsville as a regional crime coordinator superintendent for a couple of years and there certainly did not appear, in my time there, to be as much of that as there is now.

Mr MILLAR: That is what I am trying to get at. Is it a gang related thing to do: steal a car and light it up? That obviously gets rid of the evidence. Is it just one particular group of people or do you think it is widespread?

Chief Supt Rohweder: I am unaware of whether it is a particular group of people, but often, particularly with juvenile offenders and younger offenders, it is learned behaviour. What you have to realise is that it is all interchangeable. As we understand gangs, as we do with the motorcycle world, a lot of these young people know each other. It is interchangeable. They will be with a particular group of friends one week and then another group the next week and the behaviour hybrids across from group to group.

Mr MILLAR: Once they do this, are they sharing that information through their own apps that they have done this and is there a scorecard or is there some sort of behaviour like that?

Chief Supt Rohweder: I am unaware of anything like that. I could take that on notice and discuss that with the Townsville police.

Mr MILLAR: If we could that would be great, thank you.

Ms PUGH: Looking at car theft and hooning, I am wondering if you have any research on the psychology of hooning and if there are any groups in particular that are particularly well represented in the cohort of people caught and convicted. Supplementary to that, I think most of us would have seen the article about the Lamborghini that is up for auction. Roughly how many vehicles a year would go up for auction and how many of them are as nice as that Lamborghini?

Chief Supt Rohweder: In relation to your first question, there is no doubt that in recent times there has been a grouping of offenders that have links to other types of criminal gangs that engage in hooning. That is something that I personally have not witnessed before. Generally speaking, we tend to see offenders are a group of mates on a Friday night spinning their wheels, speeding and that type of thing. Particularly with the advent of social media, people from disparate areas come together and engage in that type of behaviour.

As for the Lamborghini, it was certainly a magnificent car. I, unfortunately, was a little large and could not fit in it. They are quite small, which surprised me. We very much wish to say that we do not care what you drive; we will, if you engage in hooning behaviour, take your vehicle off the road. I think

the Lamborghini was an excellent example that shows that, as police, we are not just targeting people from lower socio-economic circumstances; we look across the board and if you do the wrong thing, regardless of who you are, we will take action.

Ms PUGH: What is interesting about that is that a lot of us have a view that a hoon is often a young man—but not always—and they are doing it in their first car. A Lamborghini is a heck of a first car. Are we seeing people right across the age spectrum in that hooning behaviour and is it correct to say that a lot of that behaviour is actually taking place in people's own vehicles rather than a stolen vehicle? That seems to be the case here.

Chief Supt Rohweder: Absolutely. There is no doubt that often that type of hooning behaviour does occur with people with their own vehicles. Some people may have a second vehicle that they utilise at a particular time to engage in that behaviour, with different tyres et cetera. Particularly with the inclusion of high-end speeding offences, that is across the spectrum. Some people, regardless of age, think it is fair enough to travel at 50, 60 or 100 kilometres above the speed limit, and that is unfortunate because people die as a result of that.

CHAIR: They should limit it to race tracks. That is where it is meant to happen.

Mr BOYCE: We are engaged in a reactive process of trying to deal with youth crime, youth offenders and so forth. In the space of being proactive and trying to stop these young offenders in the first place, are there any examples of community engagement that work well?

Chief Supt Rohweder: I had some exposure to Booyah when I was in Townsville. I cannot speak strongly enough of how much Booyah impressed me. There are a lot of individual community policing initiatives across the state and we share those, but certainly the one that really sticks in my mind is Project Booyah. It makes some real difference to some young kids who often come from terrible backgrounds. It does change lives.

CHAIR: I spoke about one recently: Youth Insearch, run by the Lions, that is peer based. They talk to each other on the same level. It seems very effective as well.

Ms PUGH: That was a follow-up question that I had following on from the member for Callide: if there were any particular programs that any of you had seen be particularly effective around either diverting people away from the criminal justice system in the first place or re-diverting people who have entered the criminal justice system, like Project Booyah. I have also heard of ones that have been privately run in different parts of the state that have also been effective. I am very keen to hear of any that you know about. We have heard a little bit here and there. I know that Project Booyah has been very effective.

Chief Supt Rohweder: Some of our police in our discrete communities are involving themselves with young people obtaining their driver's licence by helping to get their hours up, because often they do not have access to a vehicle to get the number of hours required to get their driver's licence. That is a real problem, because that often can be their first exposure to the justice system in that they are unlicensed drivers. A licence is an opportunity for employment. There are programs like that. I think those locally led, grassroots type programs that identify specific issues are, particularly from a road policing perspective, the things that tend to work best.

CHAIR: We heard from the Motorcycle Advocacy Group during these proceedings about the particular stretch of road between Samford and Mount Glorious and some corners where the signage was changed after years of lobbying and that has lowered the traffic incident rates there. They were grateful that that was done, but their concern was the length of time that it took for that to happen from when they first reported the incidents. I am just wondering if you would care to comment on that or if there is a better way for those groups to advocate and let you know what they see as a dangerous situation.

Mr Stapleton: I do recall that related to an approach from the group to our region in relation to reviewing the speed on the road there and bringing in some better signage. Not being directly involved in that particular body of work, I cannot speak with a great deal of authority, but there are processes we go through. We would take a request like that and we would probably send road safety engineers out to have a look and have a talk with the group about it and do some assessments. I do not know in the end how long that took. Do you have an idea of how long it took?

CHAIR: They said 2½ years.

Mr Stapleton: We would hope to go through a process like that quicker. Quite often it could be a matter of funds available as well. I would agree: we would like to have completed that in a quicker period of time than 2½ years.

CHAIR: I am a motorcyclist, although my motorcycle is not one for riding around Mount Glorious. They talked about uncapped Armco and what they referred to as the cheese grater style wire barriers which are dangerous for motorcycles to hit. The Armco is better. No-one wants to hit it.

Mr Stapleton: The uncapped ones are a danger. We have underruns that we put on to prevent motorcyclists from sliding in underneath the Armco as well. The wire rope is probably equivalent to the Armco in many ways. I know there is a school of thought amongst motorcyclists that it is actually more dangerous. I think when you look at the statistics you will see on most roads that where there is wire rope there are lower rates of injury and fatality for motorcyclists than there are when they are not there. We do not know exactly why. We have noticed particularly on roads like the Gold Coast Highway, for instance, when a wire rope barrier was installed there we definitely saw a drop-off in injury rates.

Mr Mahon: There also has been a significant spend over the last couple of years in relation to motorcycle-specific safety equipment like safety barriers and so forth, such as has been put on at Mount Glorious and other places, as well as improving some of the corners and stretches of road along those regions. There has been quite an investment—I do not have the figures with me right now—over the last couple of years particularly in those regions where motorcycles go on weekends and so forth.

Mr WALKER: Chief Superintendent, you mentioned Project Booyah. We have Transition 2 Success and Queensland youth services that use volunteers to assist drivers to get their 150 hours, which is great because it is all done by volunteers and donated vehicles. It is very successful. I sat in on one of those programs. As you know, we have to be proactive to try to stop this behaviour. When we do get those characters in custody and incarcerated in youth detention, for example, do you think we should be playing videos where victim statements are played? Whilst they are in custody we have a captive audience. They can listen to the journey of the victim so that they can get a clear understanding of the trauma they are causing across the spectrum. I can understand why they would not let victims into the court—because they would see the offenders, who are protected under juvenile justice legislation—however, do you think there is an opportunity to play such videos, which would give the victims the opportunity to have their say on that offending behaviour?

CHAIR: The member is seeking opinion, so feel free to answer if you can, but obviously you are not required to answer.

Chief Supt Rohweder: That would be a matter for Youth Justice, obviously. I am not a psychologist so I am not sure whether that would work. Personally, I would be very keen to see anything that is evidence based that would assist in reducing victimisation—absolutely. As I say, as long as there is an evidence base to what is happening, I think anything is a good idea. We have to try something.

Mr Ellis: I would add a supplementary answer to that and to the member for Mount Ommaney. I will highlight that we did seek some input in our whole-of-government submission. From around page 6 onwards we list all of the various programs that are delivered, mostly through Youth Justice but some through Fire and Emergency Services. They would probably be best to answer those questions. The full range of programs we set out in the submission.

Mr WATTS: My question relates to data collection, distribution and publication in several areas. The first one relates to stolen cars. I am curious what data is being published on the location the car was stolen from, the age and nature of the car, and the demographic or nature of the person or persons who may have stolen it. The other set of data questions relates to accidents on roads. I am particularly interested in the comparison between regional roads and more urban roads. Where are the accidents happening, at what time of day, on what quality of road—whether it be its barriers, its camber, its visibility, its run-off or whatever else it might be, and particularly its maintenance? I am trying to understand what data the department is collecting to try to inform decision-making going forward as to the best bang for our buck in areas of both safety and theft.

Mr Stapleton: That is a fairly comprehensive question and obviously we could answer parts of it. Really, I think that might be one where we need to come back to you with the data we are collecting and how we are applying it.

Mr WATTS: Thank you. I want to confirm that you can take that on notice. I want to be able to make evidence based decisions on where we are making investment around both theft and road safety, and the data drives that. I understand that some of the data is maybe not as accurate as we might like in terms of the nature of its collection.

Mr Stapleton: There are probably two broad schools, and we will cover that in our response. There is road condition, obviously, as one and the data that we collect there. The other one is clearly crash statistics, and we have fairly comprehensive crash statistics that are a guide as well. I assure you that we do have processes and we do use data. We will come back with a comprehensive response on that one.

Mr WATTS: I do not know if it would be your department or the police, but I am interested in trying to understand some of the data around theft, particularly in terms of age of vehicle, location of vehicle, nature of theft and demographic of the thief.

Mr Stapleton: The Department of Transport and Main Roads collects no information in relation to the theft of vehicles et cetera. We just report on the crash. I think Andrew Mahon responded earlier that we do not record whether or not the vehicle has been stolen; we report on the event.

Mr WATTS: I might put that to you, Ray. Can you let us know the nature of the data that is being collected? These two things interact, but if we are going to make sensible decisions about how to spend taxpayer money on improving the situation then the data around that is critical.

Chief Supt Rohweder: I will take that on notice. We do collect comprehensive data around the victims, offenders et cetera, through our QPRIME system. We utilise that to form a picture of what is happening in a particular area and, in fact, across the state. Yes, we do collect data on the demographics of the vehicle stolen, the victims and also the offenders.

CHAIR: At the start of this inquiry the Queensland Police Union was supporting remote engine immobilisers and now they are suggesting ghost immobilisers should be trialled. Would the QPS support that? We have heard both sides a lot of times. I am not seeking opinion, but would some form of ghost immobiliser help with the crime statistics?

Chief Supt Rohweder: We would participate, within reason, in any type of trial that we thought would assist in this area. The thing is that immobilisers, depending on technology, data platforms et cetera, can assist in some areas but there would definitely have to be some safeguards around how that all occurs. We particularly worry that we would still need police officer line of sight if we were to slow a vehicle in a particular area.

CHAIR: That is the remote one, yes. From what we have heard, the ghost one is more proactive. It stops the car being stolen in the first place rather than being reactive.

Chief Supt Rohweder: I am sorry, that was my—

CHAIR: No, that is fine. We are using all the jargon. The line of sight and everything was highlighted and how dangerous that could be. We heard earlier from manufacturers. Some say that you can slow down the car, but what happens when you do that? Will the participants jump out of the car and leave it running to save themselves being caught? It was more about the ghost immobilisers as a trial to stop cars being stolen, basically.

Chief Supt Rohweder: I know from reading the transcripts of the previous hearing that there are issues around domestic and family violence that concern us. If a vehicle is an opportunity for a victim to escape a particular situation then it is important that that avenue be left open to them. If a trial was proposed we would certainly look at that, but we would have to ensure there were particular safeguards.

CHAIR: I go back to reparable write-offs. The member for Toowoomba North asked—and I could be wrong in what I heard—about there being no status of write-off kept by the department; is that right? A PPSR search would say whether a vehicle has had a history—

Mr Mahon: I am sorry, Chair. We do keep it on our system. If a vehicle is written off, whether it is reparable or statutory, that is registered. It is put on our system so that we know. That feeds into the PPSR information that people can access. Members of the public can access it to check whether or not a vehicle is a write-off.

CHAIR: Or if it has been? If you were to purchase a vehicle, you could see its history?

Mr Mahon: That is correct.

CHAIR: Obviously the value of a reparable write-off vehicle will always have that on it—that it has been a reparable write-off.

Mr Mahon: That is correct.

CHAIR: Some people have suggested that that be a condition of the sale of a second-hand vehicle, that for a private sale you get a roadworthy certificate and a PPSR—which costs only a few dollars—to guarantee the history, that it is not stolen and that the vehicle check has been done. I wanted to put that out there for comment.

Mr Mahon: We do not currently require that, but we encourage people to do those checks. We have information on our website for anyone who is purchasing a vehicle or selling a vehicle. I think from memory one of those PPSR checks is around $30.

CHAIR: For around $3 you can get a basic one.

Mr Mahon: Yes, but for the full one I think it is around $30. That will give you stolen status, reparable write-off and whether it is encumbered through some sort of finance and so forth.

CHAIR: A speedo check to make sure the speedo has not been replaced.

Mr Mahon: There are a number of things that are done there. That system is run nationally. We do not currently require it but certainly we encourage it. As I mentioned before, with the number of reparable write-offs to decrease significantly over coming years, we would expect there may be less of a need for that because the numbers will be far smaller. However, certainly we encourage that and we encourage anyone who is purchasing a vehicle to do their due diligence.

Mr WATTS: Chief Superintendent, in relation to pursuits, I want to ask about the use of police helicopters in the outcome of a particular pursuit in comparison to the non-use of police helicopters. Is there any data available that relates to a safer outcome, a better conclusion or a different conclusion between those different types of pursuits?

Chief Supt Rohweder: There is no doubt in my mind that any extra resources to more safely resolve a pursuit is a very positive thing. There is no doubt that the use of PolAir, helicopters et cetera allows for that to occur because it is the eye in the sky type of thing. Particularly at night, with infrared we can see where offenders are going. As to data to say when a pursuit is resolved by the use of PolAir or the use of a helicopter, I am unaware whether that data exists, although I can certainly take it on notice and find out.

Mr WATTS: Thank you.

CHAIR: I have a quick question. We will run out of time but I am happy to go a little over time for you, member for Gregory.

Mr MILLAR: I just want you to follow up on the questions that are taken on notice.

CHAIR: Yes, we will. Going back to reparable write-offs, we have had some very keen stakeholder interest in this area. What is the process for these changes being implemented and any consultation to be undertaken prior to that process?

Mr Mahon: There are a number of changes we have to make, obviously, to our back-office systems and our arrangements with the current provider, Queensland Inspection Services. There are also some legislative changes that are required. We did go through a very comprehensive consultation process throughout last year and engaged with quite a number of insurance providers, peak bodies—the MTAQ for example—the RACQ and a number of other individuals. We put out a Get Involved questionnaire on the public register so that people could provide commentary and feedback. We received a lot of really good feedback through that process that guided where we went in relation to the position the government has taken on this. Of course, with any legislative changes we will continue to do that, and we will continue to talk to those groups and bodies as we make those changes over the coming year.

CHAIR: Thank you very much. Time has beaten us. We do have some questions on notice. There is one from the member for Gregory about the scorecard.

Mr MILLAR: Basically the burning of the vehicles: is it shared on a social media app and is there a scorecard used on that social media app.

CHAIR: That was to the QPS. There was a question to TMR about data collection on theft.

Mr Mahon: We do not publish theft data, but we do publish road safety data. We would be able to confirm what we publish for you.

CHAIR: There was a question about what the QPS can provide to do with vehicles, demographics, victims and offenders. The member for Toowoomba North had a question regarding pursuit processes.

Mr Ellis: If I might add, the National Motor Vehicle Theft Reduction Council do collect statistics on motor vehicle theft and they potentially would have it broken down on a state-by-state basis, so that could be a good one to check with.

CHAIR: We can write to them as well.

Mr WATTS: The clarity I am after is exactly what we are collecting and then for us as a committee to look at whether there is anything else we should be collecting that might be useful. That is really what I am trying to get to the bottom of, not the actual figures. I realise there are various things published. The question is whether there is data that we should be collecting that we are not collecting that might better inform the legislative process.

CHAIR: Once again, because this is an ongoing inquiry, if any questions do come to hand, are you are open to us sending them through? As we said at the start, there are questions from ARMA that we will send through as well, if that is okay. Could we get the answers to those questions on notice from today's hearing—the ARMA one may take a little longer—by 4 pm on Monday, 21 June?

Mr WATTS: Just to clarify, these were taken on notice as well?

CHAIR: They are taken on notice, yes. Thank you all for your participation. You will be provided with a copy of the transcript in due course. Once again, thank you for your time; we really appreciate it.

The committee adjourned at 12.18 pm.