



WestCycle's Response to the Ride Safe Report

Ride Safe: The Community Development and Justice Standing Committee inquiry
into the safety, regulation and penalties associated with the use of electric
powered mobility devices

March 2026

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	2
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	4
INTRODUCTION.....	5
BACKGROUND TO THE INQUIRY	5
WESTCYCLE AND E-MOBILITY.....	5
OUR ENGAGEMENT WITH THE INQUIRY	6
OUR RESPONSE TO THE RIDE SAFE REPORT	6
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT AND THANKS.....	6
WESTCYCLE'S HIERARCHY OF ACTION.....	7
POLICY MUST FOLLOW EVIDENCE.....	8
THE INFRASTRUCTURE GAP.....	8
RESPONSES TO THE RECOMMENDATIONS	10
CHAPTER 2 – GOVERNANCE OF SHARED SCHEMES.....	10
RECOMMENDATION 1.....	10
WestCycle Response.....	10
CHAPTER 3 – DATA COLLECTION AND REPORTING	11
RECOMMENDATION 2	11
WestCycle Response.....	11
RECOMMENDATION 3.....	12
WestCycle Response.....	12
RECOMMENDATION 4.....	13
WestCycle Response.....	13
CHAPTER 4 – SAFETY CONCERNS	14
RECOMMENDATION 5.....	14
WestCycle Response.....	15
RECOMMENDATION 6.....	15
WestCycle Response.....	16
CHAPTER 5 – INFRASTRUCTURE FOR ERIDEABLES AND E-BIKES.....	16
RECOMMENDATION 7.....	16
WestCycle Response.....	17
RECOMMENDATION 8.....	17
WestCycle Response.....	18
RECOMMENDATION 9.....	18
WestCycle Response.....	19
RECOMMENDATION 10.....	20
WestCycle Response.....	20
CHAPTER 6 – DEVICE STANDARDS AND CLASSIFICATION.....	21
RECOMMENDATION 11.....	21
WestCycle Response.....	21
RECOMMENDATION 12.....	22
WestCycle Response.....	22
RECOMMENDATION 13.....	23

WestCycle Response	23
RECOMMENDATION 14.....	23
WestCycle Response	24
RECOMMENDATION 15.....	24
WestCycle Response	24
RECOMMENDATION 16.....	25
WestCycle Response	25
CHAPTER 7 – REGISTRATION, LICENCING AND INSURANCE.....	26
RECOMMENDATION 17.....	26
WestCycle Response	26
RECOMMENDATION 18.....	27
WestCycle Response	27
RECOMMENDATION 19.....	28
WestCycle Response	29
CHAPTER 8 – RULES, PENALTIES AND ENFORCEMENT.....	29
RECOMMENDATION 20.....	29
WestCycle Response	30
RECOMMENDATION 21.....	30
WestCycle Response	31
RECOMMENDATION 22.....	31
WestCycle Response	31
RECOMMENDATION 23.....	32
WestCycle Response	32
RECOMMENDATION 24.....	32
WestCycle Response	32
RECOMMENDATION 25.....	33
WestCycle Response	33
CHAPTER 9 – PUBLIC EDUCATION.....	34
RECOMMENDATION 26.....	34
WestCycle Response	34
RECOMMENDATION 27.....	35
WestCycle Response	35
RECOMMENDATION 28.....	35
WestCycle Response	36
RECOMMENDATION 29.....	36
WestCycle Response	36
RECOMMENDATION 30.....	37
WestCycle Response	37
RECOMMENDATION 31.....	38
WestCycle Response	38
RECOMMENDATION 32.....	38
WestCycle Response	38
RECOMMENDATION 33.....	39
WestCycle Response	39
APPENDIX: WESTCYCLE RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY.....	40
eRideables.....	40
E-bikes	40

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

WestCycle is the peak body for bike riding and the representative body for eRideables in Western Australia. We welcome the Ride Safe report and support the majority of its recommendations. This document sets out our response to each of the Committee's 33 recommendations and the principles that underpin our positions.

The injuries and deaths that prompted this inquiry were driven primarily by: dangerous, non-compliant devices that should never have reached consumers; illegal rider behaviour; and streets that do not give riders a safe place to ride. WestCycle's approach to improving e-mobility safety follows a clear hierarchy: fix the supply of dangerous devices first; create safer streets second; invest in education third; and use enforcement as a last resort. This order of priority runs through our responses to the Committee's recommendations and should guide the Government's decisions about where to act first and where to direct resources.

WestCycle welcomes the Committee's recommendations on data collection and considers them foundational to everything that follows. The evidence base for e-mobility policy in Western Australia is incomplete, as the Committee itself acknowledges. Several recommendations in the report propose significant interventions before that evidence base exists. WestCycle's view is that policy imposing new burdens on riders of legal, compliant devices should follow evidence, not precede it. The data collection recommendations must be implemented and given time to produce results before further regulatory interventions are pursued.

On infrastructure, WestCycle agrees with the Committee's finding that unsafe streets are pushing riders onto footpaths and creating conflict with pedestrians. However, the report does not go far enough. The most effective and immediately available solutions are absent from the Committee's recommendations: lower default speeds on local streets, and allowing eRideables on all roads with a posted speed of 50 km/h or below, as recommended by the Road Safety Commission. WestCycle urges the Government to go further than the report recommends on this point. The Road Safety Commission's recommendation is already before the Government. Acting on it now would be the single most impactful measure available.

INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND TO THE INQUIRY

In June 2025, the WA Legislative Assembly referred an inquiry to the Community Development and Justice Standing Committee into the safety, regulation and penalties associated with the use of electric powered personal mobility devices. The inquiry was prompted by the death of Thanh Phan, a pedestrian killed in the Perth CBD after being struck by a hire e-scooter ridden by an intoxicated person carrying a passenger. It is believed to be the first pedestrian death from an e-scooter incident in Western Australia.

In August 2025, the scope was expanded to include e-bikes and e-dirt bikes, following the Edgewater tragedy in which a 17-year-old boy riding an illegal e-dirt bike struck and killed a 59-year-old woman in a park in Perth's northern suburbs. The Committee reported on 4 December 2025, making 33 recommendations covering governance, data, device standards, registration, penalties, education and infrastructure.

WestCycle engaged with the inquiry from the outset. We made a primary submission on eRideables in July 2025 and a supplementary submission on e-bikes following the expansion of the terms of reference. CEO Wayne Bradshaw and Active Transport Officer Tim Burns gave evidence before the Committee on 30 July 2025. We also provided the Committee with our recommendations for a national e-scooter regulatory framework and conducted a community survey following the report's publication to inform this response. The Committee specifically named and endorsed our WeRideAble school education program in Finding 100 and Recommendation 27, calling for its continued and expanded delivery.

WESTCYCLE AND E-MOBILITY

For several years, WestCycle has strongly supported the use of e-bikes and promoted their value as means of transport and recreation that makes bike riding possible for more people. WestCycle supports Western Australians using e-bikes for transport, recreation, health and independence.

In 2024, WestCycle's work in schools grew to include eRideables. In partnership with the Road Safety Commission, WestCycle developed WeRideAble, a school-based education initiative that offers workshops, resources, and learning modules to 16–18-year-olds and their parents or caregivers so they stay safe, make smart

choices, and understand the laws applying to eRideables. This program was recommended for additional funding and expansion by the Committee.

In July 2025, WestCycle formally launched as the representative body for eRideables, supported by funding from the WA Department of Transport. This expanded role recognises the growing importance to Western Australia of diverse transport options and infrastructure development, as well as the natural alignment between bikes and eRideables as sustainable mobility choices that contribute to healthier, more connected communities.

OUR ENGAGEMENT WITH THE INQUIRY

In September 2025, WestCycle invited members of the Committee to experience e-bikes and e-scooters firsthand at a practical session in Perry Lakes

Following the release of the Ride Safe report in December 2025, WestCycle surveyed riders and eRideable users to understand their views on the Committee's recommendations. Where survey data is cited in this document, it reflects the views of Western Australian e-bike and eRideable users and provides community context for our responses.

OUR RESPONSE TO THE RIDE SAFE REPORT

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT AND THANKS

WestCycle thanks the Community Development and Justice Standing Committee for the significant work involved in conducting this inquiry. The breadth of evidence gathered spans government agencies, industry bodies, community organisations, and members of the public, and reflects the complexity of the issues under consideration and the genuine public interest in getting the policy settings right.

We acknowledge the organisations whose submissions shared WestCycle's vision for a mature, multimodal transport system that gives people genuine choices about how they travel. Their contributions strengthened the evidence base available to the Committee and we are encouraged by the degree of alignment across the sector on the fundamentals.

We also wish to acknowledge the individuals who took the time to share their personal experiences. Commuters who have replaced car trips, families who ride together, older riders who have rediscovered mobility, and people with disability who have found in e-bikes and eRideables a genuine means of independence –

their voices are a reminder that the decisions flowing from this inquiry have real consequences for real people.

WESTCYCLE'S HIERARCHY OF ACTION

WestCycle welcomes the Committee's report and supports the majority of its recommendations. Our responses to individual recommendations are set out in detail below. Before addressing them, we want to state clearly the framework that underpins our position.

The central problem this inquiry was convened to address, injuries and deaths involving e-bikes and eRideables, is driven primarily by two things: dangerous, non-compliant devices that should never have entered the market, and streets that are not designed to accommodate people riding at speeds between walking pace and motor traffic. Regulation that does not address these root causes will not solve the problem. It will instead burden the many people using legal, compliant devices safely in order to manage risks created by a much smaller number of non-compliant devices and an infrastructure environment that was not built with riders in mind.

WestCycle's approach to improving e-mobility safety follows a clear order of priority:

1. **Fix the source of the problem.** Reform import regulations and point-of-sale requirements so that dangerous, non-compliant devices cannot enter the country or be sold legally. This is the highest-leverage intervention available and it operates before any harm occurs.
2. **Create safer places to ride.** Lower default speeds on local streets and adopt the Road Safety Commission's recommendation to allow eRideables on all 50 km/h streets. Safer streets reduce conflict between riders and both pedestrians and motor vehicles, and give riders legitimate space without requiring new infrastructure spend.
3. **Invest in education.** Support riders and the broader community to understand the rules, the risks, and how to share space safely. The WeRideAble program is a proven model that should be expanded.
4. **Enforcement as a last resort.** Penalties and enforcement have a role, but they should target non-compliant devices and dangerous behaviour, not impose new burdens on people riding legal devices safely.

This hierarchy is not a reason to delay action. Several of these steps can and should proceed in parallel. But it should guide which interventions the Government prioritises and where it directs its resources. Where the Committee's recommendations align with this hierarchy, WestCycle supports them. Where they do not, particularly where they risk penalising compliant riders to address

problems caused by non-compliant devices, WestCycle has reservations, and these are explained in our responses below.

POLICY MUST FOLLOW EVIDENCE

A recurring feature of the Ride Safe report is the Committee's own acknowledgement that the data needed to support sound policy does not yet exist. Crash data is incomplete, device type is rarely recorded, and the distinction between compliant and non-compliant devices is largely absent from incident reporting. WestCycle welcomes Recommendations 3 and 4 on data collection unreservedly. They are among the most important in the report and should be treated as foundational, not optional.

This matters because several recommendations propose significant interventions, including new registration requirements and increased penalties, based on an evidence base the Committee itself describes as inadequate. WestCycle's concern is not with the goal of improving safety. It is with the sequencing. Policy that imposes new burdens on riders of legal, compliant devices before the data exists to justify those burdens risks getting the response wrong and eroding public confidence in the regulatory framework.

The evidence that does exist points clearly to non-compliant devices as a primary driver of serious incidents. Riders on legal e-bikes and eRideables are not the problem the report is trying to solve. Treating them as such, through registration schemes, increased penalties, or additional licensing requirements, would penalise law-abiding users while doing little to address the conduct and devices causing harm. WestCycle urges the Government to let the data collection recommendations bed in before implementing interventions that the current evidence cannot support.

THE INFRASTRUCTURE GAP

The Committee's findings on infrastructure align closely with WestCycle's position: riders are on footpaths because the street environment gives them nowhere better to go, and reducing conflict between riders and pedestrians requires creating legitimate, safer space for riding. WestCycle is encouraged that the Committee recognised this connection.

However, the report stops short of recommending the most effective solutions available. Beyond directing DTMI to identify infrastructure suitable for eRideables, the Committee did not recommend lowering default speed limits on local streets or allowing eRideables on all streets with posted speeds of 50 km/h or below, despite this being a specific recommendation of the Road Safety Commission.

These are the interventions most likely to make a practical difference at scale, and they are conspicuously absent.

This is a significant gap. The Committee identified the right problem but did not follow it to the most effective conclusion. WestCycle is not raising this as a criticism of the report. We are identifying an opportunity for the Government to go further than the report recommends. Lower default speeds on local streets and access to 50 km/h roads for eRideables are low-cost, high-impact measures that the Government can implement now, without waiting for further review or new infrastructure investment. They sit at the second level of WestCycle's hierarchy of action and the case for them is already well established.

The Government has before it a Road Safety Commission recommendation it has not yet acted on. Acting on it now, in response to this inquiry, would be the single most effective infrastructure measure available.

RESPONSES TO THE RECOMMENDATIONS

WestCycle's responses to each of the Ride Safe report recommendations are detailed below, organised by report chapter.

CHAPTER 2 – GOVERNANCE OF SHARED SCHEMES

RECOMMENDATION 1

That the State Government develop a policy framework that outlines minimum safety and other obligations, including model contract provisions; which ensures consistency across the State; and which supports local government authorities in managing shared scheme operations in their jurisdiction. Such minimum safety and other obligations should be regularly reviewed to keep pace with emerging best practice as e-mobility technology continues to evolve. The policy framework and contract provisions should include mechanisms which empower local governments to enforce contract terms and conditions.

WESTCYCLE RESPONSE

WestCycle Position	Applicable Devices	Key Points
Support	eRideables	WestCycle supports the development of a state policy framework for shared e-scooter schemes. We recommend it also address public transport integration and the potential for subsidised share scheme expansion.

We support this recommendation. The absence of a legislative and policy framework has left local governments managing shared schemes largely through contracts, with limited power to enforce compliance and little consistency across the State. A clear framework is overdue.

The framework should include minimum technology requirements, particularly geofencing to enforce speed limits, no-ride zones, and parking compliance, as well as standards for safety education, maintenance, and

data sharing. WestCycle's submission to the inquiry set out detailed suggested inclusions for such a framework.

The framework should also address the integration of shared schemes with the State's public transport network. E-scooters are well suited to first and last-mile journeys connecting people to train stations, bus interchanges, and ferry terminals. Without deliberate design, this potential will not be realised. A state-subsidised model may be necessary to make share schemes affordable and accessible to a wider range of people, particularly those on lower incomes who stand to benefit most.

We note that the number of shared scheme providers operating in Western Australia has declined, with the remaining two operators having recently merged. This reduces competitive tension and the ability of local governments to negotiate favourable terms. The policy framework should be designed with this market reality in mind, ensuring local governments retain meaningful leverage regardless of the number of providers.

In some regional areas, a share scheme may be the only viable public transport option available. This reinforces the case for State Government involvement in supporting scheme expansion beyond the metropolitan area.

CHAPTER 3 – DATA COLLECTION AND REPORTING

RECOMMENDATION 2

That the State Government mandate data sharing in a consistent manner for commercial operators of shared schemes under contract with local government authorities.

WESTCYCLE RESPONSE

WestCycle Position	Applicable Devices	Key Points
Support	eRideables	WestCycle supports mandatory data sharing by commercial share scheme operators. Datasets should be published

		on the Data WA platform, consistent with the State's open data policy.
--	--	--

We support this recommendation. Share scheme operators already collect comprehensive real-time data on trip routes, speeds, device compliance, and rider behaviour. Mandating consistent data sharing across all operators is a logical and low-cost step that builds directly on existing capability.

Commercial operators benefit from access to public infrastructure and from operating within a regulatory framework that enables their business. Contributing data is a reasonable expectation in return, and one that serves the broader goal of building a mature, evidence-based transport system. All datasets should be published on the Data WA platform, consistent with Western Australia's Whole of Government Open Data Policy.

RECOMMENDATION 3

That the Minister for Transport take steps to ensure that data collection and dissemination is incorporated into the national regulatory framework which is currently being developed.

WESTCYCLE RESPONSE

WestCycle Position	Applicable Devices	Key Points
Support	All	WestCycle supports incorporating data collection and dissemination into the national regulatory framework. We also recommend all data be published on the Data WA platform.

We support this recommendation and welcome the committee's thorough treatment of data gaps in Chapter 3. The findings closely reflect concerns WestCycle raised in our submission, particularly the absence of a consistent framework for collecting and reporting eRideable and e-bike incident data, and the consequences of that absence for evidence-based policy.

The committee was right to identify data collection as a foundational issue. Without reliable data on injuries, crashes, device types, and rider behaviour, it is not possible to accurately target safety interventions, plan infrastructure investment, or evaluate whether regulatory changes are having the intended effect. Several other recommendations in this report, including those addressing infrastructure, penalties, and device classification, will be weakened without the data to underpin them.

Incorporating data collection and dissemination into the national regulatory framework also supports the State and Commonwealth's commitments under the National Road Safety Strategy and the Western Australia Road Safety Action Plan 2024-2026, both of which identify improving road safety data as a priority. This recommendation is therefore not a minor procedural step. It is a prerequisite for good policy. We urge the Government to pursue this actively as the national framework is developed. All resulting data should be published on the Data WA platform, consistent with the State's Whole of Government Open Data Policy.

RECOMMENDATION 4

As a priority, that the State Government investigate and fund the development of a whole-of-government reporting system which captures data on e-bikes and eRideables.

WESTCYCLE RESPONSE

WestCycle Position	Applicable Devices	Key Points
Support with concerns	All	WestCycle supports a whole-of-government reporting system but cautions against framing that implies compliant e-bikes are riskier than traditional bicycles. E-bike data should align with the bicycle category, and improvements to bicycle data collection should be included alongside e-bikes and eRideables.

We support this recommendation and consider it one of the most important in the report. Without a whole-of-government reporting system, it is not possible to make evidence-based decisions about infrastructure, regulation, or enforcement. We urge the Government to treat this as a genuine priority.

We do have concerns about some of the findings that led to it. Several findings imply that compliant e-bikes are riskier than traditional bicycles. The evidence does not support this. E-bikes meeting the EN15194 standard use the same infrastructure and travel at similar speeds as traditional bicycles. The safety concerns raised in this report relate primarily to illegal, high-powered devices that should not be classified alongside compliant e-bikes. Conflating the two risks disproportionate regulation of a low-risk, high-benefit device.

E-bike data should be collected as a distinct subset within the bicycle category, not treated as a separate vehicle class. We also recommend that improvements to data collection for traditional bicycles be included alongside e-bikes and eRideables.

Accurate data collection also depends on consistent knowledge among first responders, emergency department staff, and other medical personnel about device classifications. At present, the distinction between a pedal bike, a compliant e-bike, and an illegal high-powered device is not consistently captured in trauma data, and minor injuries are believed to be widely underreported. The whole-of-government reporting system should include clear definitions and standardised recording protocols across all agencies involved in data collection, from police through to hospitals.

CHAPTER 4 – SAFETY CONCERNS

RECOMMENDATION 5

That the State Government require electric mobility devices in WA to be fitted with an Acoustic Vehicle Alerting System (AVAS), as is now required under the Australian Design Rules for electric vehicles sold in Australia. The State Government should also advocate for this requirement to be included in future national standards for personal mobility devices, in line with requirements for other electric vehicles.

WESTCYCLE RESPONSE

WestCycle Position	Applicable Devices	Key Points
Oppose	All	WestCycle opposes mandatory AVAS for devices up to 25 km/h. A bell or horn requirement already applies; separated infrastructure and good street design are more effective at protecting pedestrians. AVAS may be appropriate for the proposed new 25-45 km/h device category.

We do not support this recommendation. ERideables, e-bikes, and bicycles are already required to have a bell or horn. The more effective approach to protecting pedestrians is separated infrastructure, lower vehicle speeds, and good street design, not additional noise requirements on devices that already travel at similar speeds to traditional bicycles.

The argument for AVAS also overstates its effectiveness. Pedestrians may not hear any approaching vehicle due to hearing loss, headphones, wind, or ambient traffic noise. Mandating AVAS would not reliably address this risk. The Australian Design Rule specification for AVAS is also complex and falls outside EN15194 specifications for e-bikes, meaning compliance would reduce the range of devices available in Australia and increase costs for consumers. WestCycle's community survey in January 2026 found that less than 29% of respondents supported making AVAS compulsory.

For the proposed new category of faster devices (25-45 km/h), acoustic warning requirements may warrant separate consideration given these devices would operate at higher speeds in traffic. That consideration should not extend to devices in the up-to-25 km/h category.

RECOMMENDATION 6

That the Minister for Road Safety address the current gaps in counselling support for road safety incidents funded out of the Road Trauma Trust Account. Provision should be made to include people impacted by eRideable and e-bike trauma, regardless of where the incident occurs or how the device is captured by licencing and registration requirements.

WESTCYCLE RESPONSE

WestCycle Position	Applicable Devices	Key Points
Support	All	WestCycle supports extending Road Trauma Trust Account counselling support to people impacted by e-bike and eRideable trauma. We recommend this be extended to cover traditional bicycle incidents as well.

We support this recommendation. People who experience trauma as a result of eRideable or e-bike incidents deserve access to counselling support regardless of where the incident occurred or how their device is captured by licensing and registration requirements. The current gap is an anomaly that should be addressed.

We recommend that traditional bicycle incidents be included within the scope of this extension. The Road Trauma Trust Account should support all active transport users who experience serious trauma, not only those involved in incidents with motor vehicles.

CHAPTER 5 – INFRASTRUCTURE FOR ERIDEABLES AND E-BIKES

RECOMMENDATION 7

That the State Government determine and designate dismount zones that could include Protected Entertainment Precincts.

WESTCYCLE RESPONSE

WestCycle Position	Applicable Devices	Key Points
Partial Support	eRideables	WestCycle accepts that dismount zones are appropriate in high-pedestrian areas, but notes they will not be effective without safe alternative routes. Allowing eRideables on all 50 km/h streets would help to encourage riders away from footpaths.

We partly support this recommendation. Dismount zones are appropriate in areas of very high pedestrian traffic, and there is a clear case for State Government to designate them in areas under its direct control, such as Elizabeth Quay. However, dismount zones will not achieve their intended outcomes if there is no safe alternative route for riders. Prohibition without a viable alternative simply shifts the problem elsewhere.

The most effective way to reduce conflict between riders and pedestrians is to give riders somewhere safe to go. Under current State law, eRideables cannot be used on streets with a median island or centre line markings, regardless of the speed limit. This means a rider cannot legally use Oxford Street in Leederville even in the 30 km/h section, despite it being a low-speed environment well suited to eRideable use. Allowing eRideables on all streets up to 50 km/h, as recommended by the Road Safety Commission, would enable riders to use the carriageway rather than footpaths and shared paths, reducing the circumstances in which dismount zones are needed in the first place. Where dismount zones are established, geofencing should be the primary enforcement mechanism for shared scheme devices.

RECOMMENDATION 8

That the State Government empower local governments to declare other areas as dismount zones.

WESTCYCLE RESPONSE

WestCycle Position	Applicable Devices	Key Points
Partial Support	eRideables	WestCycle supports dismount zones in high-pedestrian areas and recommends mandatory geofencing for all shared scheme operators to enforce them. Allowing eRideables on all streets up to 50 km/h would give riders a legal alternative to footpaths, reducing conflict with pedestrians and the need for dismount zones over time.

We support the use of dismount zones in high-pedestrian areas. For shared scheme operators, geofencing already provides an effective and reliable mechanism for enforcing them, managing speed limits, and directing parking. Mandatory geofencing requirements for all shared scheme operators should be included in the policy framework recommended under Recommendation 1.

Addressing pedestrian and rider conflict in entertainment precincts also requires giving riders a viable alternative to footpaths. Under current road rules, eRideables cannot legally ride on streets with a dividing line or median strip, even where speed limits are low. This forces riders onto footpaths in the very areas where conflict with pedestrians is most acute. Allowing eRideables on all streets up to 50 km/h, as recommended by the Road Safety Commission, would give riders a legal and safer option, reducing pressure on footpaths and the need for dismount zones over time.

RECOMMENDATION 9

That the State Government prioritise the development of dedicated eRideable infrastructure, and work with local government authorities to develop a state-wide strategy for funding and implementation. This could be undertaken in alignment with the WA Bicycle Network Plan and incorporated into development of the new WA Active Travel Strategy.

WESTCYCLE RESPONSE

WestCycle Position	Applicable Devices	Key Points
Support with concerns	All	WestCycle supports this recommendation but notes that lower speeds on local streets and permitting eRideables on all roads up to 50 km/h, as recommended by the Road Safety Commission, are the most effective and immediately available interventions. Additional dedicated funding will also be needed.

We support this recommendation. The alignment with the WA Bicycle Network Plan and the WA Active Travel Strategy is welcome, though we note the Active Travel Strategy has not yet been published. Finalising and resourcing that strategy should be an early priority for the Government, and the infrastructure investment called for in this recommendation should be reflected in it.

The current funding available to local governments for active transport infrastructure is not sufficient to deliver the step-change in infrastructure that the committee's findings identify as necessary. Additional dedicated funding will be needed, and giving local governments greater flexibility to direct road funding toward active transport outcomes would allow councils to respond to local needs more effectively.

Fully separated infrastructure is expensive, takes time, and requires space that is not always available. Lowering the default speed limit in built-up areas, reducing through traffic on local streets, and reallocating carriageway space to active transport users can be implemented more quickly and at far lower cost, with meaningful safety benefits.

The committee's report identified the need for safer environments for eRideable users but did not recommend the most effective and immediately available intervention. The Road Safety Commission has recommended that eRideables be permitted on all roads with a speed limit of up to 50 km/h. WestCycle supports this recommendation and urges the Government to act on it. Allowing eRideable users onto appropriate

streets would reduce conflict with pedestrians without requiring any capital expenditure and should not wait on the development of a broader infrastructure strategy.

RECOMMENDATION 10

That the State Government, as a priority, undertake a study to: identify where eRideable and e-bike conflicts occur; collect data on trip origins and destinations, peak times of use, and device and user profiles; identify where current infrastructure could be re-purposed for e-mobility use. This study should inform development of a state-wide strategy for the provision of dedicated infrastructure for electric mobility devices, in line with existing strategies and plans, as outlined in Recommendation 9.

WESTCYCLE RESPONSE

WestCycle Position	Applicable Devices	Key Points
Support with concerns	All	WestCycle supports this study but emphasises that research must proceed alongside infrastructure delivery, not delay it. The study should also investigate re-purposing car lanes for micromobility.

We support this recommendation. Research into where conflicts occur, how infrastructure is used, and where existing assets could be repurposed will provide a stronger evidence base for investment decisions. That research must proceed alongside infrastructure delivery, not as a precondition for it. The evidence already available is sufficient to justify action now, and delay would be costly.

Re-purposing existing infrastructure should include converting narrow, paint-only cycle lanes into barrier-protected lanes and, where appropriate, reallocating car lanes to create dedicated micromobility corridors. These interventions can improve safety and capacity for all riders, including e-bike and eRideable users, without waiting for new infrastructure to be built.

CHAPTER 6 – DEVICE STANDARDS AND CLASSIFICATION

RECOMMENDATION 11

That the State Government continues to advocate for Commonwealth-led reform, including the development of national standards for all personal mobility devices which are enforced at importation.

WESTCYCLE RESPONSE

WestCycle Position	Applicable Devices	Key Points
Support	All	WestCycle strongly supports Commonwealth-led reform and national standards for personal mobility devices enforced at importation. This is the most effective way to prevent dangerous, non-compliant devices from entering the market.

We strongly support this recommendation. Preventing dangerous, non-compliant devices from entering the Australian market is the most effective intervention available to government, and the one most likely to produce lasting safety improvements. Addressing the problem at the border is more efficient than attempting to enforce compliance after non-compliant devices are already in circulation.

The current situation, in which personal mobility devices can be imported without formal approval or compliance with a recognised standard, has created significant enforcement challenges for state and territory governments. It has also allowed cheaper, lower-quality devices, including batteries with a higher fire risk, to reach consumers who may not be aware they are purchasing something that does not meet the specifications required for legal use.

WestCycle has advocated for national standards enforced at importation as a core element of any effective regulatory framework. We welcome that this work is now being led by the WA Transport Minister through the

national regulatory process, and we encourage the State Government to continue pressing for an outcome that is both comprehensive and timely.

RECOMMENDATION 12

That the State Government undertake a review of state legislation governing the classification of eRideables and e-bikes with a view to redefining them under a new vehicle category. This should be done in a way that facilitates the collection of data for reporting purposes.

WESTCYCLE RESPONSE

WestCycle Position	Applicable Devices	Key Points
Partial	All	WestCycle supports a review of eRideable classification but strongly opposes including compliant e-bikes in a new vehicle category. EN15194 e-bikes should remain under bicycle law.

We partly support this recommendation but do not support including e-bikes in a new vehicle category.

The Commonwealth has reinstated EN15194 (the European standard for e-bikes) as the design specification. E-bikes that comply with this specification should remain under existing bicycle legislation. They are not significantly different from standard bicycles and do not require separate laws.

We agree a review of the current eRideable "up-to-25 km/h" category could be undertaken. This could include increasing the weight limit and maximum length to align with share-system e-scooters.

A review of heavier and faster electric mobility devices with the possible of creating a new 25 to 45 km/h category of device is covered in Recommendation 16 below. WestCycle generally supports the new category.

We also recommend a review of the traditional bicycle category to ensure cargo bikes and electric cargo bikes are supported. The European

standard EN17860 for electric cargo bikes expands on EN15194 to cover the engineering requirements of the heavier bikes.

RECOMMENDATION 13

That the State Government update the definition of eRideable in line with the recommended review of current classifications (see Recommendation 18) ensuring consistency in the regulation of privately owned and shared scheme eRideables.

WESTCYCLE RESPONSE

WestCycle Position	Applicable Devices	Key Points
Partial	eRideables	WestCycle supports aligning specifications for privately owned eRideables with share scheme devices. We do not support linking this review to registration requirements for the up-to-25 km/h category.

We partly support this recommendation. We welcome a review of the eRideable class to improve consistency, including maximum weight and length and greater national alignment, and we support aligning the specifications of privately owned eRideables with share system e-scooters. Share scheme devices require greater durability and safety features for intensive use, and aligning privately owned device specifications with those standards would remove this inconsistency while ensuring all users have access to appropriately designed equipment. However, we do not support introducing registration for the up-to-25 km/h eRideable class, as proposed in Recommendation 18.

RECOMMENDATION 14

That the State Government advocate that the Commonwealth Government include anti-tampering mechanisms in vehicle design standards for personal mobility devices, mandated at the point of manufacture and enforced on importation.

WESTCYCLE RESPONSE

WestCycle Position	Applicable Devices	Key Points
Support	All	WestCycle supports mandating anti-tampering mechanisms in vehicle design standards at the point of manufacture. Anti-tampering is already required under EN15194 for e-bikes, and similar provisions should apply to e-scooter standards.

We support this recommendation. Anti-tampering is already a requirement under EN15194 for e-bikes, and a similar requirement exists under EN17128, the European standard for Personal Light Electric Vehicles, which covers e-scooters and similar devices. Australia should consider adopting EN17128 as the basis for eRideable standards, which would bring anti-tampering requirements and a range of other manufacturing safety provisions into the regulatory framework without the need to develop new standards from scratch.

RECOMMENDATION 15

That the State Government ensure that device modifications are prohibited by law under anti-tampering provisions. This should include a penalty for retailers who provide advice on, or otherwise assist in, device modification.

WESTCYCLE RESPONSE

WestCycle Position	Applicable Devices	Key Points
Support	All	WestCycle supports prohibiting device modifications by law and penalising retailers who advise on or assist with modification. Seventy percent of WestCycle community survey respondents also support this recommendation.

We support this recommendation. Device modification is one of the primary ways compliant devices are rendered unsafe and non-compliant, and prohibiting it by law addresses a genuine gap in the current regulatory framework. Penalties for retailers who advise on or assist with modification are equally important: liability should sit with those who facilitate unsafe behaviour, not only those who carry it out.

This recommendation complements Recommendation 14 on anti-tampering requirements at the point of manufacture. Together, they address the problem at both ends: preventing devices from being built or sold in a way that makes modification easy, and penalising those who assist with modification after the fact. A WestCycle community survey conducted in January 2026 found that 70% of respondents supported this recommendation.

RECOMMENDATION 16

That the State Government revise the classifications of e-mobility devices, providing for a category which can travel between 25 km/h to 45 km/hr with the following qualifications: electric mobility devices on which the rider stands are not permitted; use on footpaths and shared paths is not permitted; their design includes mandated safety features.

WESTCYCLE RESPONSE

WestCycle Position	Applicable Devices	Key Points
Support	All	WestCycle supports creating a new 25 to 45 km/h device category, which would provide a legal pathway for currently unregulated higher-powered devices and reduce the enforcement burden.

We support this recommendation. Creating a new 25 to 45 km/h device category would provide a legal pathway for higher-powered devices that are currently unregulated, reduce the enforcement burden, and give users greater clarity about what is and is not permitted. The approach is broadly consistent with how mopeds are treated as a distinct category within the motorcycle class.

We do not consider a seated rider requirement to be necessary if other mandated safety features are included in the device design.

CHAPTER 7 – REGISTRATION, LICENCING AND INSURANCE

RECOMMENDATION 17

That the State Government mandate compliance labelling for all personal mobility devices, consistent with any developments at the national level relating to vehicle, product and/or information standards and regulation. Compliance labels should be affixed to all devices and be highly visible. It should be an offence to remove them, with appropriate penalties prescribed for non-compliance.

WESTCYCLE RESPONSE

WestCycle Position	Applicable Devices	Key Points
Support with concerns	All	WestCycle supports compliance labelling at point of sale, aligned with national standards and consistent with EN17128. It should be an offence to use or sell a non-compliant device, with penalties applying to both users and retailers. The obligation to ensure compliance should sit with importers and retailers, not require registration.

We support compliance labelling for all personal mobility devices. Labelling should align with national standards and, where applicable, with the relevant device standard: EN15194 for e-bikes and EN17128 for eRideables and other personal light electric vehicles.

Compliance labelling should be meaningful. It should be an offence to use or sell a non-compliant device, with penalties applying to users and retailers alike. The obligation to ensure only compliant devices reach

consumers should sit with importers and retailers, not be displaced onto individual users through a registration requirement.

There are already a large number of devices in use across Western Australia, and import reform alone cannot address this. A voluntary compliance pathway would give existing owners a way to demonstrate that their device meets the required standard, whether for their own confidence or for safe second-hand sales, though the practical mechanism for such a scheme would need to be developed in consultation with industry. Creating a mandatory registration system to achieve this outcome would impose significant administrative costs on the State while doing little to prevent non-compliant devices from being used.

RECOMMENDATION 18

That the State Government, when reviewing the current classification of eRideables and e-bikes, also investigate commensurate licencing and registration requirements for each category of device: For devices speed-limited to 25 km/h -- minimal, one off, registration at point of sale to log device compliance and ownership details. For faster and heavier devices able to travel up to 45 km/h -- registration of the device and licencing of the owner, with access to compulsory third-party insurance (CTP) cover.

WESTCYCLE RESPONSE

WestCycle Position	Applicable Devices	Key Points
Oppose (<=25 km/h) / Support (25-45 km/h)	All	WestCycle strongly opposes registration for devices up to 25 km/h. Registration would burden law-abiding users, reduce participation, and do nothing to address the illegal devices causing the most serious safety concerns. We support registration and licensing for the proposed new 25-45 km/h category.

We consider that this recommendation should be assessed in two parts: (1) devices speed-limited to 25 km/h and e-bikes with power assistance that cuts out at 25 km/h; (2) devices able to travel up to 45 km/h.

Part 1: Devices up to 25 km/h

We do not support registration for eRideables speed-limited to 25 km/h. We also do not support registration for e-bikes with power assistance cutting out at 25 km/h. E-bikes meeting EN15194 travel at similar speeds to unpowered bicycles.

Registration would create a significant barrier to participation and would disproportionately affect people on lower incomes who rely on these devices for affordable transport. Our survey showed 77% of e-bike users and 61% of eRideable users oppose registration for compliant devices.

In addition to creating an expensive new administration burden for the State, registration would not address the problem of illegal devices. It would burden legal users while doing nothing about the fast, non-compliant motorcycles causing the most serious safety concerns. The Committee's own findings show that most serious incidents involve illegally modified or non-compliant devices, not legal eRideables or e-bikes.

Part 2: Devices 25-45 km/h

We agree that registration and licensing could be considered for faster, heavier devices that fit into a new vehicle category, as described in Recommendation 16.

Note: The reference to Recommendation 14 in Recommendation 18 appears to be an error. Recommendation 14 refers to anti-tampering measures, not compliance labelling, which is in Recommendation 17.

RECOMMENDATION 19

That the State Government consider how compulsory third-party insurance might cover electric mobility devices under a revised classification structure (see Recommendation 18).

WESTCYCLE RESPONSE

WestCycle Position	Applicable Devices	Key Points
Oppose for <=25 km/h / Conditional for 25-45 km/h	All	WestCycle opposes CTP insurance for devices up to 25 km/h, which should be treated consistently with bicycles. If a new 25-45 km/h category is created, CTP insurance would be appropriate for that category.

Compulsory third-party insurance should only apply to the new category of faster, heavier devices if that is created.

For eRideables up to 25 km/h and e-bikes, the State Government should consider how to ensure people who are injured are covered, but not via compulsory third-party insurance.

eRideables and e-bikes in the up-to-25 km/h category are similar to standard bicycles and should be treated the same way. Compulsory third-party insurance would be equivalent to registration, and we do not consider this appropriate for these devices.

We do not require pedestrians to have compulsory third-party insurance to walk our streets. The same principle should apply to people using smaller mobility aids such as bicycles and electric powered devices with low-speed capability.

CHAPTER 8 – RULES, PENALTIES AND ENFORCEMENT

RECOMMENDATION 20

That the Minister for Road Safety review the helmet standard for eRideables with a view to requiring a standard that is more suitable for eRideables.

WESTCYCLE RESPONSE

WestCycle Position	Applicable Devices	Key Points
Oppose	eRideables	WestCycle opposes reviewing the helmet standard for devices up to 25 km/h. The current standard is adequate, and requiring heavier helmets would add cost, undermine share schemes, and not address the primary causes of injury.

We do not consider that a review is required. The current helmet standard is adequate for devices travelling at 25 km/h, and the legal requirement for eRideable helmets should remain the same as for bicycles or e-bikes.

Requiring heavier helmets, such as full-face helmets as suggested in some report findings, would add cost and complexity without addressing the main causes of serious injury: vehicle speeds and inadequate infrastructure. Helmets protect individuals in a crash, but they do not prevent crashes. Lower speed limits and separated paths are more effective in this regard.

Full-face helmets would also be difficult for e-scooter share systems to provide, reducing the viability of share schemes in Western Australia. New Zealand considered similar issues and decided not to make helmets compulsory when e-scooters were legalised, prioritising participation levels.

Our survey showed 50% of respondents oppose requiring full-face or motorcycle helmets for eRideable users, with only 30.4% in support.

RECOMMENDATION 21

In reviewing the regulatory framework governing eRideables, the State Government should ensure that speed limiting technology is mandated in vehicle design standards for eRideables. The State Government should also advocate for its inclusion in national standards when they are developed by the Commonwealth.

WESTCYCLE RESPONSE

WestCycle Position	Applicable Devices	Key Points
Support	eRideables	WestCycle supports mandating speed-limiting technology for eRideables at 25 km/h and advocates for this requirement to be included in national standards.

We support speed limiting of eRideables to 25 km/h and for this to be included in national standards.

RECOMMENDATION 22

That the State Government initiate a consultation process with children and young people to better understand the underlying factors influencing their use of eRideables and e-bikes. This should be undertaken with a view to implementing effective strategies to encourage compliance and safe riding within this cohort. It should also seek to understand how legislative changes enacted as a result of recommendations made in this report might impact children and young people.

WESTCYCLE RESPONSE

WestCycle Position	Applicable Devices	Key Points
Support	All	WestCycle welcomes consultation with young people on eRideable and e-bike use.

We welcome further investigation into how people under 16 use eRideables and e-bikes. Young people and their parents clearly want mobility options that include these devices. We encourage this consultation to proceed in parallel with implementation of other recommendations that do not require further study.

RECOMMENDATION 23

That the Minister for Road Safety ensure that eRideables are removed from legislative provisions under the Road Traffic Code 2000 which apply to riding under the influence of alcohol and drugs, allowing them to be treated consistently as a motor vehicle under the Road Traffic Act 1974.

WESTCYCLE RESPONSE

WestCycle Position	Applicable Devices	Key Points
Support	eRideables	WestCycle supports applying drink and drug laws consistently across all vehicles.

We support applying drink and drug laws consistently across all vehicles. We note it is already an offence to ride any vehicle (including eRideables, e-bikes, or traditional bicycles) while under the influence of alcohol or drugs.

RECOMMENDATION 24

That the Minister for Road Safety, as part of the review of current penalties (see Recommendation 26) include provisions which mean that if a person under the age of 16 is apprehended riding an eRideable or e-bike, liability rests with the registered owner with appropriate penalties prescribed.

WESTCYCLE RESPONSE

WestCycle Position	Applicable Devices	Key Points
Concerns	All	WestCycle has concerns about linking parental liability to registration, which is impractical given how frequently devices change hands.

We have concerns about this recommendation. We agree that parents and caregivers bear responsibility for the devices they purchase for young people, and that accountability for unsafe use by under-16s should rest

with adults. However, linking this liability to registration is not workable in practice. Devices change hands frequently, often without any formal record, making it difficult to establish who the registered owner is at the time of an offence and costly to prosecute.

Existing legislation already provides mechanisms to hold parents accountable where they have failed to exercise proper supervision of a child. Rather than creating a new registration-linked liability, we recommend that existing laws be used and that enforcement agencies be resourced to apply them. The more effective long-term approach is to address the systemic causes: ensuring non-compliant devices cannot be freely sold, investing in safe infrastructure, and supporting education programs like WeRideAble that reach young people before problems occur.

RECOMMENDATION 25

That the Minister for Road Safety review and increase current penalties for eRideable offences to reflect the increase in eRideable use and the risks associated with non-compliance. Where appropriate, penalties should be aligned with similar offences in other jurisdictions. Under a future regulatory framework these penalties should be aligned with the regulation of all electric mobility devices.

WESTCYCLE RESPONSE

WestCycle Position	Applicable Devices	Key Points
Concerns	eRideables	Enforcement should be a last resort after addressing the upstream causes of non-compliance.

Evidence suggests that higher penalties alone do not achieve the desired compliance outcomes. Penalties that target individuals do not address the underlying causes of unsafe behaviour: inadequate infrastructure, confusing laws, and streets designed primarily for motor vehicles.

We consider that penalties should be proportionate to the harm posed.

CHAPTER 9 – PUBLIC EDUCATION

RECOMMENDATION 26

That the Minister for Road Safety work with other relevant portfolios to roll out a high-profile road safety media campaign on eRideable road rules, safety risks, and rider courtesy. Visuals should include showing how severe injuries can result when laws are not followed.

WESTCYCLE RESPONSE

WestCycle Position	Applicable Devices	Key Points
Support	eRideables	WestCycle supports public awareness campaigns but notes they are most effective when supported by safer infrastructure and reduced street speeds. Education campaigns cannot substitute for addressing the availability of dangerous non-compliant devices.

We support this recommendation. A well-designed public education campaign has an important role to play in improving safety for eRideable users and the broader community. The campaign should address both rider behaviour and driver behaviour around people on bikes and eRideables, and should be funded alongside infrastructure improvements.

As mentioned previously, our position is that education is most effective when it sits within a broader hierarchy of action. WestCycle considers that the priority should first be preventing dangerous devices from entering the market, second creating safer places to ride, third investing in education, and enforcement as a last resort. A campaign that asks people to ride safe while non-compliant devices remain freely available and safe infrastructure remains limited is unlikely to achieve meaningful reductions in injury.

RECOMMENDATION 27

That the State Government boost funding for the delivery of eRideable education across all schools in Western Australia, including continued and expanded delivery of the WeRideAble program.

WESTCYCLE RESPONSE

WestCycle Position	Applicable Devices	Key Points
Support	eRideables	WestCycle strongly supports expanded funding for the WeRideAble program and eRideable education in schools. We recommend the State review the ages at which WeRideAble training is delivered to ensure it reaches young people before they begin using these devices.

We support this recommendation. Education is valuable, though it is most effective when paired with safe infrastructure and lower vehicle speeds. Teaching children to ride safely works best when there are safe places for them to apply what they learn.

We recommend the State also review what age students receive WeRideAble training to ensure it reaches young people before they start using these devices.

RECOMMENDATION 28

That the State Government incorporate eRideable and e-bike awareness into school programs such as Keys4Life, the Drive Safe handbook, and the driver's licence theory test in Western Australia.

WESTCYCLE RESPONSE

WestCycle Position	Applicable Devices	Key Points
Support	All	WestCycle supports incorporating eRideable and e-bike awareness into driver training programs, including hazard perception content for heavy vehicle drivers. Minimum safe passing distance requirements should also be included.

We support the inclusion of eRideable and e-bike awareness in driver training, including differences in where eRideables can be used compared with bikes, and that e-bike regulations and use are the same as for standard bicycles. More detailed information about the minimum safe passing distance laws also needs to be included in all programs. Expanding the driving licence theory tests, including heavy vehicle, with more hazard perception questions relating to interaction with eRideables and bicycles (including e-bikes).

RECOMMENDATION 29

That the State Government consider implementing a rider skill test as part of any future registration and licencing requirements for electric mobility devices.

WESTCYCLE RESPONSE

WestCycle Position	Applicable Devices	Key Points
Partial (not mandatory for ≤ 25 km/h)	All	WestCycle supports optional skills training for eRideable and e-bike riders but does not support making it a legal requirement for devices up to 25 km/h. A skills component may be appropriate as part of licensing requirements for the proposed 25-45 km/h category.

We support providing optional skill training for eRideable users and e-bike riders but not as a legal requirement for devices in the up-to-25 km/h category. WestCycle is already delivering skills training in collaboration with local governments.

As described in our response to Recommendation 18, we do not support registration for eRideables speed-limited to 25 km/h. We also do not support registration for e-bikes with power assistance cutting out at 25 km/h. These e-bikes, meeting the EN15194 standard, travel at similar speeds to unpowered bicycles.

We also do not support licences being a legal requirement for people riding e-bikes or eRideables in this low-speed category.

For the proposed new category of faster devices (25-45 km/h), a skills component may be appropriate as part of licensing requirements.

RECOMMENDATION 30

That the State Government provide ongoing education including by way of public awareness campaigns on lithium-ion battery safety. This should include: the importance of buying quality and compliant devices; undertaking certified repairs; installing suitable smoke alarms; avoiding direct sunlight when storing electric powered devices.

WESTCYCLE RESPONSE

WestCycle Position	Applicable Devices	Key Points
Support	All	WestCycle supports ongoing education on lithium-ion battery safety. We note that compliance with EN15194 for e-bikes and EN17128 for eRideables is an important component of battery safety, and that DTMI's existing guidance for government agencies should be more widely distributed.

We support this recommendation. Battery safety education should cover correct charging, storage, and disposal. Ensuring e-bikes comply with the

EN15194 standard and eRideables with the EN17128 standard will be an important part of applying the recommendation.

Department of Transport and Major Infrastructure produced guidance for State Government agencies to safely manage staff devices on site. This should be more widely distributed and publicised.

RECOMMENDATION 31

That the State Government, as part of delivering all recommended education initiatives and training programs, ensure that they are regularly evaluated to measure effectiveness.

WESTCYCLE RESPONSE

WestCycle Position	Applicable Devices	Key Points
Support	All	WestCycle supports regular evaluation of education and training programs to measure effectiveness.

We support this recommendation. Evaluation should measure both safety outcomes and participation levels.

RECOMMENDATION 32

That the State Government provide publicly available rider training programs for eRideables, including an online training course on the theory of eRideable road rules and safety.

WESTCYCLE RESPONSE

WestCycle Position	Applicable Devices	Key Points
Support	eRideables	WestCycle supports publicly available rider training programs and online resources. We recommend these be extended to include e-bikes and traditional bicycles.

We support this recommendation. It should also include practical training programs for e-bikes and traditional bicycles.

RECOMMENDATION 33

That the State Government amend consumer protection legislation to mandate certain responsibilities for retailers at the point of sale, including: ensure proof of compliance with current standards; check the buyer is over 16; provide prescribed information such as warnings about the risks and penalties for modifications.

WESTCYCLE RESPONSE

WestCycle Position	Applicable Devices	Key Points
Support	eRideables	WestCycle supports point-of-sale obligations for retailers. Given that many eRideables are purchased online from interstate, we recommend a national approach to ensure these requirements are not easily circumvented.

We support this recommendation. Point-of-sale obligations for retailers are an important complement to import standards: even where national standards are enforced at the border, retailers remain the last line of defence before a device reaches a consumer. Requiring proof of compliance, age checks, and information about modification risks addresses each of these functions and places accountability where it belongs.

Many eRideables are purchased online from retailers in other states or directly from overseas. State-level point-of-sale obligations will have limited reach if they can be easily circumvented by buying online. We recommend that the State Government advocate for a national approach to point-of-sale requirements, consistent with the national regulatory framework being developed through the Infrastructure and Transport Ministers Meeting process.

APPENDIX: WESTCYCLE RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

ERIDEABLES

- Fast track implementation of the *Road Safety Action Plan 2024-2026* (Road Safety Commission, 2024) and the recommendations from the *Review of the eRideable Road Rules* (Road Safety Commission, 2025).
- Create guidelines for local governments that maximise safety and community benefit of e-scooter hire schemes
- Change the road rules so eRideables can be used on all 50kph streets (as recommended in the *Review of the eRideable Road Rules*)
- Make it easier and quicker for local governments to set safer speed limits in activity centres, entertainment precincts and other areas with high place value
- Enforce existing laws related to illegal devices, and work with other states to lobby for federal changes to import regulations to limit the availability of high powered and poor-quality devices.
- Require retailers to take responsibility at point of sale for ensuring devices are legal and safe, and consumers are aware of what they are purchasing.
- Invest the appropriate level of resources in developing clear processes for high quality data collection, analysis and publications.

E-BIKES

- Ensure all official communications and government statements use accurate, regulation-defined terms that clearly distinguish e-bikes from electric motorcycles and eRideables.
- Update WA regulations to reference EN15194 without a date limit, remove the "up to 250W" wording from the definition, and remove the obsolete 200W "pedelec" category.
- Add EN17404 (electric mountain bikes) and EN17860 (cargo bikes) to WA regulations
- Provide a throttle exemption for disabled riders who cannot use pedal-assist.
- Require mandatory EN15194 compliance labelling on all e-bikes at point of sale, including continuous rated power output.

- Require retailers to understand and communicate legal requirements for e-bike use, including age restrictions and where devices can be ridden.
- Lobby the federal government to require mandatory evidence of EN15194 compliance before e-bikes can be imported into Australia.
- Ban the sale of non-compliant high-powered devices as e-bikes, including where sellers use "private use only" disclaimers.
- Create a new classification for higher-powered devices – with appropriate licensing and CTP insurance – to move illegal electric motorcycles into legitimate regulatory categories.
- Oppose licensing or registration requirements for EN15194-compliant e-bikes.
- Adopt a battery passport system to ensure only compliant lithium-ion batteries are sold, and oppose bans on compliant e-bikes from public transport.
- Apply the share scheme governance recommendations from WestCycle's eRideables submission equally to e-bike share schemes.

