



**Austroads Ltd**  
 Level 9, 287 Elizabeth Street  
 Sydney NSW 2000 Australia  
 Tel: +61 2 8265 3300  
[austroads@austroads.com.au](mailto:austroads@austroads.com.au)  
[www.austroads.com.au](http://www.austroads.com.au)

## Document Review Form

Please send your submissions by email to [MMD\\_Consultation@tmr.qld.gov.au](mailto:MMD_Consultation@tmr.qld.gov.au)

<p><b>Project No.:</b> Austroads Project SRL6218: A Nationally Consistent Framework for Motorised Mobility Devices</p> <p><b>Reviewed Document:</b> <b>Motorised Mobility Devices Discussion Paper</b></p> <p><b>Author:</b> Sona Trivedi-Ginn, Queensland Department of Transport and Main Roads</p> <p><b>Date circulated for comment:</b> 16 August 2019</p> <p><b>Due date for comment:</b> 23 September 2019</p> <p><b>Reviewer:</b> Alice Dixon-Wilmshurst, Policy Officer, Physical Disability Council of NSW</p>
--

#	Section	Comment	Authors response
1	<p><b>4.3: Option 3 – Industry driven approach</b></p> <p>Are there any other partnerships or existing schemes that could be leveraged to better communicate the Technical Specifications once adopted?</p>	<p>As MMDs meet the definition of a medical device and can therefore be assessed by and registered with the Therapeutic Goods Administration (TGA), communicating the technical specification could be incorporated into this process.</p> <p>In addition, public transport bodies in each state and territory could be effective at communicating to the public (through media and other campaigns) the need for a 'blue label' (if adopted) for use on public conveyances.</p>	
2	<p><b>4.4: Option 4 – Regulatory prescription of the Technical Specifications</b></p> <p>Do you have a view on possible amendments to the ARR to recognise the unladen mass limits for MMDs as</p>	<p>PDCN supports increasing the unladen mass limit for mobility scooters to 170kg and motorised wheelchairs having no weight restrictions in the ARR, to reflect modern mobility devices and make it consistent across jurisdictions. The current limits are outdated and inconsistent, and do not reflect the variety of MMDs on the market, or the large increase in MMDs in the Australian community.</p>	

#	Section	Comment	Authors response
	shown in the technical specification?		
3	<p><b>4.4: Option 4 – Regulatory Prescription of the Technical Specifications</b></p> <p>Are there other options for the adoption of the Technical Specification that meet the key principles that have not been explored?</p>	<p>PDCN generally supports the adoption of the Technical Specification, however it is also important to note that, while outside the scope of this project, there is a need to redesign regulations regarding infrastructure to reflect modern mobility devices. Heavier people require heavier devices, and more weight will put strain on the device's infrastructure and battery power (meaning more batteries will need to be carried). PDCN would like to see some consideration given to adopting new standards for infrastructure.</p>	
4	<p><b>5: Recommended Approach for the Adoption of the Technical Specifications</b></p> <p>Do you agree that Option3 (industry driven approach) is the preferred approach for adopting the Technical Specification for MMDs?</p>	<p>PDCN agrees that the adoption of Option 3 is the preferred approach for adopting the Technical Specification. It is important to PDCN that the adopted approach provides good choice, information and education. PDCN suggests that the blue and white labelling system is positive, will provide consumers with clear pre-sale information and open up conversations about needs and uses.</p> <p>Suppliers will need to have a conversation with customers and get an idea of their lifestyle and what they want to use the device for, and this will put customers in a better position to make an informed decision about the most appropriate device for their lifestyle. The intention of the Technical Specification is that the device is tested against certain standards, and users will know if it is safe for use on the footpath or public transport (or both). It is imperative therefore that this option is well marketed and includes a comprehensive education and awareness program.</p> <p>It is important to note also that this is a long term approach, uptake will not be immediate, and "buy in" from all relevant stakeholders will be gradual.</p> <p>In addition, older devices already in use need to not be disadvantaged in this newer system and must be taken into account within the introduction of the Tech Specs, to allow them to still be used (with consideration taken for the lifespan of such devices).</p>	

#	Section	Comment	Authors response
5	<p><b>5: Recommended Approach for the Adoption of the Technical Specifications</b></p> <p>Do you think that the adoption of Option 3 is likely to be successful in achieving the desired benefits of the Technical Specification? If not, why not?</p>	<p>PDCN believes Option 3 is likely to be successful in achieving the desired benefits of the Technical Specification, provided it is implemented in conjunction with an education program, and given the opportunity to develop over time.</p> <p>Mechanisms would need to be in place to ensure industry acted appropriately, and non-conformance, incorrect advice or acting outside of the industry code of practice was subject to legislative controls (fines/de-registration etc).</p>	
6	<p><b>5: Recommended Approach for the Adoption of the Technical Specifications</b></p> <p>Would another option be preferable?</p>	<p>PDCN supports the approach suggested by ATSA, one of its organisational members and peak industry body. ATSA's suggested approach is a voluntary rating system, similar to the ANCAP car rating system, or whitegoods star rating system. These systems provide customers with all relevant information to make an informed choice, and if they choose not to buy a compliant device then that is at their discretion. It may also assist in understanding that whilst a device may not confirm to public transport needs, it may well be satisfactory for in home, or international travel use where size and weight may be a significant consideration.</p> <p>It would also allow for other relevant parties – eg public transport – to partake in the labelling system as well, creating a cohesive system.</p>	
7	<p><b>5: Recommended Approach for the Adoption of the Technical Specifications</b></p> <p>Do you have any general comments to make on the adoption of the Technical Specification?</p>	<p>The adoption should be voluntary and not included in legislation as this would severely restrict choice. There should be a comprehensive education program in tandem with uptake of the Technical Specification to ensure pedestrians, motorists and industry have a clear understanding of MMDs, as there has been a fair amount of misrepresentation regarding their safe use and contribution to accidents in recent years.</p>	
8	<p><b>6.4: Recommended approach for registration of MMDs</b></p>	<p>PDCN agrees that no further action should be taken in regard to registration of MMDs. No other pedestrian is required to be registered, so it would be unfair and unnecessary to expect users of MMDs to be registered. It</p>	

#	Section	Comment	Authors response
	Do you agree with the recommendation that no further action is taken with respect to registration of MMDs? Can you please provide your reasons for this response?	would also be a costly exercise for both individuals and government.	
9	<p><b>6.5: Recommended approach for licensing of MMDs</b></p> <p>Do you agree with the recommendation that no further action is taken with respect to licensing of MMD users? Can you please provide your reasons for this response?</p>	PDCN agrees that no further action should be taken regarding MMDs as, similar to registration, other pedestrians do not require a license, and therefore users of MMDs shouldn't either. For some people a MMD is their only mode of transport, hence forcing them to get a license would be in violation of their human rights and the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, Article 20 – the right to mobility.	