

8 April 2026

State Development, Infrastructure and Works Committee

Submitted via online upload

Dear Sir/Madam,

### **Inquiry into the Transport and Other Legislation (Managing E-mobility Use and Protecting Our Communities) Amendment Bill 2026**

The Insurance Council of Australia (Insurance Council), on behalf of its licensed Queensland Compulsory Third Party (CTP) members, welcomes the opportunity to provide feedback to the State Development, Infrastructure and Works Committee (Committee) on the Transport and Other Legislation (Managing E-mobility Use and Protecting Our Communities) Amendment Bill 2026 (Bill).

The Insurance Council supports the Bill and considers it a necessary and proportionate response to the rapid growth in e-mobility use across Queensland and the emerging safety risks associated with that growth. The Bill balances the benefits of e-mobility with the need to protect public safety, by clarifying device definitions, aligning regulatory requirements with recognised safety standards, strengthening age and parental responsibility settings, managing speed in high-risk environments, and enhancing compliance and enforcement powers.

Recent data demonstrates a sharp and sustained increase in injuries and fatalities linked to e-mobility devices, underscoring the urgency of regulatory reform. Hospital surveillance data indicates that presentations for e-scooter and other e-mobility injuries increased by more than 45 per cent between 2023 and 2025, reaching approximately 2,000 emergency department presentations in 2025 alone.<sup>1</sup> This equates to more than five serious injuries per day, with head and facial trauma and fractures being the most common injury types.<sup>2</sup> This escalation in harm has been accompanied by a rise in fatalities with eight people killed while using e-mobility devices in Queensland in 2024.<sup>3</sup>

Against this backdrop, the introduction of the Bill is timely and warranted, and the Insurance Council would welcome its passage through Parliament. More detailed feedback on specific aspects of the proposed amendments is set out below.

#### **Definitions and standards**

The Insurance Council strongly supports the updates to device definitions and technical standards in the Bill as regulatory ambiguity has contributed to inconsistent compliance, enforcement difficulties and heightened safety risks. Aligning the definition of e-bikes with the recognised Australian safety standard, together with the introduction of mandatory compliance labelling, will improve transparency for consumers, retailers and enforcement agencies, making it easier to identify lawful devices at the point of sale and during on-road enforcement. Revising the dimensional limits for personal mobility devices and reinstating a maximum design speed of 25km/h are also important safety measures,

---

<sup>1</sup> Queensland hospital data shows e-scooter injuries escalate to five day, 11 February 2026, ABC News, [Queensland hospital data shows e-scooter injuries escalate to five per day - ABC News](#)

<sup>2</sup> Ibid.

<sup>3</sup> Qld addresses e-scooter safety, 9 May 2025, Government News, [Qld addresses e-scooter safety - Government News](#)

ensuring that devices operating in shared public spaces are appropriately limited in size, speed and risk profile.

As noted in the Explanatory Notes to the Bill, there is a high prevalence of non-compliant e-mobility devices in use across Queensland, including illegal motorbikes, and ongoing confusion among riders and retailers about applicable device requirements and rules. The Bill responds to these issues by introducing a clearer regulatory framework for non-compliant devices through the creation of the concept of a '*prohibited bike*', and a new offence for riding a prohibited bike on a road, road-related area (such as a footpath), or in a public place.

The definition of '*prohibited bike*' captures non-compliant electrically power-assisted cycles (EPACs), non-compliant personal mobility devices (PMDs), and two-or three-wheeled motorized vehicles that are either ineligible for registration because they do not meet Australian Design Rules or are capable of registration but are being used while unregistered. Clarifying what constitutes a prohibited bike is a critical step in addressing unsafe and unlawful use, supporting consistent enforcement, and reducing the risk of serious injury to riders, pedestrians and other road users.

### Registration and insurance requirements

The Insurance Council understands that compliant EPACs and PMDs (that is, devices that meet the prescribed legal thresholds, including maximum design speed of 25km/h and applicable dimensional requirements) will not require registration or CTP insurance. The Insurance Council supports this approach, as treating compliant EPACs and PMDs consistently with bicycles is appropriate and proportionate to the level of risk posed by these devices.

The Explanatory Notes provide that following the conclusion of a six-month transitional period, any PMD capable of exceeding 25km/h will fall outside the statutory definition of a PMD and will be treated as a motorbike. Where such a device is capable of registration, it must be registered. It follows that CTP insurance would be required for registered motorbikes. The Insurance Council supports registration and CTP requirements for devices that are registrable.

Where a device does not meet the requirements for registration (e.g., it does not meet the Australian Design Rules), it will be treated as an illegal motorbike. The Explanatory Notes provide that devices most associated with dangerous or anti-social behaviour will generally fall within the new prohibited bike framework. These devices are typically non-compliant with the EPAC or PMD definitions and are not capable of registration. The Insurance Council supports this framework and the clear policy position that such devices should not be permitted on public roads, road-related areas or in public places.

### Safety measures

The Insurance Council supports the introduction of a minimum rider age of 16 years for e-mobility devices. Claims experience and broader injury data indicate that younger riders are disproportionately represented in serious incidents, largely due to inexperience, risk-taking behaviour and limited hazard perception.<sup>4</sup> Establishing a clear minimum age threshold is a proportionate and evidence-based

---

<sup>4</sup> The US Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC) reported that children under 15 account for 36 percent of micromobility injuries, despite representing just 18 per cent of the US population (around double their proportion) (E-Scooter and E-bike Injuries Soar: 2022 Injuries Increased Nearly 21%, October 17, 2023, United States Consumer Product Safety Commission [E-Scooter and E-Bike Injuries Soar: 2022 Injuries Increased Nearly 21% | CPSC.gov](https://www.cpsc.gov/E-Scooter-and-E-Bike-Injuries-Soar-2022-Injuries-Increased-Nearly-21%|CPSC.gov))

safeguard, that aligns with broader transport safety frameworks that recognize graduated exposure to risk.

The proposed licence requirement for e-mobility riders is also supported. Requiring riders to hold a licence provides a practical and established mechanism to ensure baseline understanding of road rules, traffic signs and shared space responsibilities. This measure is likely to reduce unsafe behaviour and improve safety outcomes for riders, pedestrians and other road users, while also preventing individuals who have demonstrated unsafe driving behaviour from using e-mobility devices.

The Bill's strengthened parental responsibility provisions are similarly appropriate. Enabling enforcement action against parents or guardians where a child under 16 unlawfully rides an e-bike, PMD or prohibited bike reinforces the seriousness of the safety risks involved and promotes more responsible decision-making in relation to device access, supervision and compliance. These provisions also assist in clarifying responsibility and liability in circumstances where incidents involve children.

The Insurance Council notes the proposed reduction of speed limits on shared paths to 10km. While this measure may improve safety for pedestrians, there is a risk that it may unintentionally encourage some e-mobility riders to shift onto roads where higher speed limits apply, potentially increasing exposure to more severe collisions. This behavioural shift could elevate risk to riders and result in increased CTP claims. Should the proposal proceed, the Insurance Council recommends that any impacts on rider behaviour, injury patterns and the CTP scheme be closely monitored and reviewed.

### Enforcement powers and offence regimes

The proposed enforcement powers and offence regime are necessary and appropriate to address the risks posed by unsafe and illegal e-mobility use in Queensland. By equipping police with clear powers to seize and dispose of prohibited bikes, strengthening drink-riding controls through the introduction of random breath testing, and extending hooning and evasion offences to e-mobility devices, the Bill addresses critical enforcement gaps that have undermined compliance, deterrence and public confidence.

The introduction of targeted offences with meaningful penalties sends a strong deterrent signal to high-risk riders, while increases to infringement notice penalties more accurately reflect the potential for serious harm to riders, pedestrians and other road users. These include penalties for speeding, failing to wear a helmet, carrying passengers, riding on prohibited roads and riding without due care and attention. Collectively, these measures modernise the regulatory framework to ensure it can be enforced consistently and effectively, support early intervention (particularly for young riders) and reinforce the expectation that e-mobility devices are vehicles with real safety obligations, not recreational devices to be used without consequence.

The Insurance Council supports the Bill's expansion and clarification of enforcement powers and offence regimes. However, a key consideration for the Government will be how these measures are operationalised in practice, including the enforcement of the licencing requirement, and whether sufficient, dedicated police resourcing, training and operational guidance will be provided to ensure the new powers and offences can be applied fairly, consistently, and effectively across Queensland.

In this context, consistent enforcement outcomes across the State, including between local government areas, will be critical. Inconsistent enforcement risks undermining public confidence, weakening deterrence and limiting the effectiveness of the reforms in achieving improved safety outcomes.

## Additional feedback

The Insurance Council recommends that there are clear and well-communicated transitional arrangements, particularly for existing device owners whose devices may no longer meet the clarified definitions or technical standards. Targeted public education campaigns and accessible guidance materials will be critical to supporting understanding, promoting voluntary compliance and minimizing unintended non-compliance during the transition period and beyond.

We hope this submission is of assistance. Please do not hesitate to contact Alice Nichol, Senior Adviser, Insurance Lines, at [anichol@insurancecouncil.com.au](mailto:anichol@insurancecouncil.com.au) or on 0427 902 960 if you have any questions or would like to discuss anything further.

Kind regards,



**Alexandra Hordern**

General Manager, Regulatory & Consumer Policy