



Legislative Assembly for the Australian Capital Territory

Standing Committee on Environment
and Planning

Inquiry into the procurement and delivery of MyWay+

Report of the inquiry into procurement and delivery of MyWay+

Legislative Assembly for the Australian Capital Territory
Standing Committee on Environment and Planning

Approved for publication

Report 3
11th Assembly
October 2025

About the committee

Establishing resolution

The Assembly established the Standing Committee on Environment and Planning on 3 December 2024. On 26 June 2025, the Assembly amended this resolution to establish the Standing Committee on Environment and Planning.

The Committee is responsible for the following areas:

- Environment and climate change
- Heritage
- Water and energy policy and programs
- Emissions reductions
- Environment and ecological sustainability
- Commissioner for the Environment
- Environment Protection Agency
- Parks and Conservation
- City Renewal Authority
- Suburban Land Agency
- Planning
- Land management

You can read the full establishing resolution [on our website](#).

Committee members

Ms Jo Clay MLA, Chair

Ms Fiona Carrick MLA, Deputy Chair

Ms Elizabeth Lee MLA (*to 12 February 2025*)

Mr Peter Cain MLA (*from 12 February 2025*)

Ms Caitlin Tough MLA

Secretariat

James Bunce, Committee Secretary

Nicola Straker, Assistant Secretary

Justice-Noah Malfitano, Committee Support Officer

Lydia Chung, Administrative Officer

Contact us

Mail	Standing Committee on Environment and Planning Legislative Assembly for the Australian Capital Territory GPO Box 1020 CANBERRA ACT 2601
Phone	(02) 6205 0199
Email	LACommitteeEnvironment@parliament.act.gov.au
Website	parliament.act.gov.au/parliamentary-business/in-committees

About this inquiry

At its meeting on 4 December 2024 the Assembly passed the following resolution:

“That:

- (1) this Assembly notes that:
 - a. the \$64 million MyWay+ system was intended to be fully functional at the time of its launch on Wednesday, 27 November 2024;
 - b. the system was not fully functional at launch;
 - c. pre-launch testing was clearly inadequate and having the launch at one of the busiest times of the year was an error;
 - d. the Government has already had to launch an audit of potential overcharging on the fourth day of operation; and
 - e. the failed launch has created uncertainty and stress amongst Canberrans who rely on public transport;
- (2) this Assembly requests that the Standing Committee on Environment, Planning, Transport and City Services inquire into and report on the procurement and delivery of MyWay+, including:
 - a. the initial, failed procurement of a MyWay replacement;
 - b. the decision to procure a bespoke product;
 - c. the capabilities and business case for MyWay+;
 - d. impacts and potential impacts on public transport confidence and usage;
 - e. the development and delivery of the MyWay+ system, including the adequacy of testing and consultation;
 - f. consideration of opportunities to improve the quality and transparency of public procurement processes in the ACT;
 - g. the sufficiency and quality of public communications before, during and after the launch of MyWay+;
 - h. the timing of the MyWay+ launch;
 - i. and an assessment of MyWay+ data security and any implications for users; and
- (3) this Assembly requests that, should the Committee on Environment, Planning, Transport and City Services agree to inquire into the matter, the Committee report by the last sitting day of June 2025.”¹

Under Standing Order 216, standing committees can self-initiate an inquiry into any subject area it is given responsibility for by the establishing resolution. The Standing Committee on Environment and Planning resolved to amend the terms of reference referred by the Assembly to conduct an inquiry into the procurement and delivery of MyWay+ on 9 December 2024.

¹ ACT Legislative Assembly, *Minutes of Proceedings*, No. 3, 4 December 2024, p 42.

Inquiry Terms of Reference

The Committee will inquire into and report on the procurement and delivery of MyWay+, including:

- a) the initial, failed procurement of a MyWay replacement;
- b) the decision to procure a bespoke product;
- c) the capabilities and business case for MyWay+;
- d) impacts and potential impacts on public transport confidence and usage;
- e) the development and delivery of the MyWay+ system, including the adequacy of testing and consultation;
- f) consideration of opportunities to improve the quality and transparency of public procurement processes in the ACT;
- g) the sufficiency and quality of public communications before, during and after the launch of MyWay+;
- h) the timing of the MyWay+ launch;
- i) an assessment of MyWay+ data security and any implications for users; and
- j) any other related matter.

Contents

About the committee	i
Establishing resolution	i
Committee members	i
Secretariat	i
Contact us	i
About this inquiry	iii
Inquiry Terms of Reference	iv
Acronyms & Abbreviations	vii
Recommendations	viii
1. Introduction	1
Conduct of the inquiry	1
2. Procurement	2
Process	2
Criticisms	4
3. Delivery	6
Project scope	6
Project delivery structure	7
Transition planning	8
Project milestones	10
Testing	13
Pre-launch communication	16
Decision to launch	19
4. Launch	24
User experience	24
Debit cards	24
MyWay+ cards	24
Transitioning to MyWay+	27
MyWay+ App and customer portal	31
Group accounts	35
Ticket vending machines	37
In-app ticketing	38
Accessibility	41

Seniors	45
Validators	48
Customer support	50
Real-time passenger information	51
Account balance information	53
Readiness for launch	55
Post-launch communication	57
Public confidence	59
5. Committee comment, findings and recommendations	61
6. Data security	69
The “Free Money Glitch”	70
Personal data	71
End-of-life software and encryption	74
7. Conclusion	77
Appendix A: Submissions and Exhibits	79
Submissions	79
Exhibits	82
Appendix B: Witnesses	83
Wednesday, 26 March 2025	83
Thursday, 27 March 2025	83
Thursday, 1 May 2025	84
Thursday, 3 July 2025	85
Appendix C: Private briefing attendees	86
Thursday, 13 March 2025	86
Appendix D: Questions on Notice and Questions Taken on Notice	87
Questions on Notice	87
Questions Taken on Notice	90
Appendix E: Gender distribution of witnesses	92

Acronyms & Abbreviations

Acronym or Abbreviation	Long form
AMAN	Australian Multicultural Action Network
ASD	Australian Signals Directorate
CAPTCHA	Completely Automated Public Turing test to tell Computers and Humans Apart
CIT	Canberra Institute of Canberra
CMET	Canberra Metro Operations
CMTEDD	Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate
COTA	Council on the Ageing Australia
DDTS	Digital, Data and Technology Solutions
EOI	Expression of interest
GSA	Get Skilled Access
HRIMS	Human Resources Information Management System
MaaS	Mobility as a Service
NAIDOC	National Aboriginal and Islander Day Observance Committee
NFC	Near Field Communication
PCG	Project Control Group
PIDs	Passenger Information Displays
PTCBB	Public Transport Association of Canberra
RFP	Request for proposal
RTPI	Real time passenger information
QR	Quick Response
OSVA	Office for Seniors and Veterans Affairs
QTON	Question taken on notice
QON	Question on notice
TCCS	Transport Canberra and City Services Directorate
TVM	Ticket Vending Machine
UAT	User Acceptance Testing
WCAG	Web Content Accessibility Guidelines

Recommendations

Finding 1

The Committee finds that the project scope was too large and complex, and should have focused on credit and debit card payments, real time passenger information, journey planning functionality, appropriate support services, on-board audio, and retaining previous features such as easy access to account balances.

Finding 2

The Committee finds that the change to a single-phase delivery was a poor decision. This led to a lack of clarity on project milestones, and unclear timing for when these milestones were to be delivered.

Finding 3

The Committee finds that the community testing of MyWay+ was undertaken so poorly that it was almost meaningless and does not appear to have had any impact that improved the rollout of the system.

Finding 4

The Committee finds that the ACT Government lost the trust of public transport users by promising basic features, like real-time tracking, that were not delivered at launch.

Finding 5

The Committee finds that the MyWay+ communications strategy should have provided simple, useful information such as how to use MyWay+ by tapping on and off with a credit or debit card.

Finding 6

The Committee finds that MyWay+ was clearly not ready for launch on 27 November 2024 and that multiple stakeholders had pointed this out to the ACT Government and officials. The decision to launch anyway on that date was clearly flawed.

Finding 7

The Committee finds that the concept of minimum viable product needed to be defined at the point where the transition plan was changed, and that the lack of a clear definition and shared understanding of minimum viable product with NEC led to problems in the later stages of the delivery process.

Finding 8

The Committee finds that poor project management led to an undersupply of MyWay+ cards and retailers, despite the ACT Government being told by stakeholders that access to cards was important.

Finding 9

The Committee finds that MyWay+ accounts, the app and website were poorly designed and did not work properly.

Finding 10

The Committee finds that group accounts are a core feature for families and are essential to ensure that children can catch the bus and these should have been operational on launch day.

Finding 11

The Committee finds that the decision to launch MyWay+ without providing proper coverage and access to ticket machines was flawed.

Finding 12

The Committee finds that offering a QR code payment option on a busy public transport system was a questionable choice showing poor judgment and that the QR code available at launch performed extremely poorly.

Finding 13

The Committee notes that despite clear feedback from stakeholders and members of the public, the ACT Government failed to provide services and information that met the needs of senior Canberrans.

Finding 14

The Committee finds that the rollout of MyWay+ had a significant impact on bus drivers, and thanks them for their service.

Recommendation 1

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government continue its investigations and ensure that account balance information is available on validator screens as soon as possible.

Finding 15

The Committee finds that the ACT Government should have taken a more proactive and genuine approach in acknowledging the many flaws and faults in this project.

Recommendation 2

The Committee recommends that the ACT Auditor-General consider examination of the MyWay+ project team's project documentation, as highlighted in the Projects Assured report.

Finding 16

The Committee finds that the MyWay+ project demonstrates a significant lack of appropriate risk management practices within Transport Canberra.

Recommendation 3

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government conduct an internal review of risk management within the MyWay+ project, with a view to identifying and implementing specific process changes in how risks are managed and mitigated in large digital procurements. Further,

that the Minister for Transport report to the Legislative Assembly on the process changes identified and how they are being implemented and that this report be updated in the Assembly once every six months until the end of the term.

Finding 17

The Committee finds that the MyWay+ project constitutes a significant failure to effectively manage a complex digital project and comes in the context of a series of digital projects that have been poorly managed and delivered by the ACT Government.

Finding 18

The Committee finds that there was insufficient transparency regarding the costs of the MyWay+ project which hindered its ability to determine whether the project was delivered within budget, and the financial implications of lost revenue.

Recommendation 4

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government commence a cross-directorate structured program of internal project management reform, and that a report on this program outlining the specific steps to be taken, as well as the timing of these steps, be presented to the Legislative Assembly within 12 months; and that the Assembly be updated once every 12 months on the implementation of this reform.

Recommendation 5

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government require that future annual reports of large ACT Government agencies include a section on project management, which highlights the extent to which project deliverables have been achieved on time and within budget, quantifies and explains any delays incurred, and provides sufficient detail to support effective scrutiny by Legislative Assembly committees.

Finding 19

The Committee finds that MyWay+'s non-compliance with accessibility requirements has failed the ACT community, in particular people living with disabilities.

Recommendation 6

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government require the cross-directorate structured program of internal project management reform, as per Recommendation 4, include a focus on ensuring compliance with accessibility requirements and standards, particularly in relation to projects that are subject to major contract variations that result in changes to delivery schedules.

Finding 20

The Committee finds that the MyWay+ project testing process was flawed and unable to contribute useful information that would have effectively informed the project team about the readiness of the system.

Recommendation 7

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government produce a manual for best-practice community testing programs for complex projects with important public-facing aspects or functions and that the ACT Government apply these procedures to test all major complex projects.

Finding 21

The Committee finds that there was a failure of management over the MyWay+ project and that its delivery structure was not sufficient to provide internal oversight and identify key concerns in relation to the delivery schedule.

Finding 22

The Committee finds that Transport Canberra officials failed to take the security vulnerabilities and data breaches reported by members of the public seriously, and repeatedly told the Committee that there was no basis for these concerns despite clear evidence to the contrary.

1. Introduction

Conduct of the inquiry

- 1.1. On 9 December 2024, the Committee resolved to conduct an Inquiry into the procurement and delivery of MyWay+.
- 1.2. The Committee received 109 submissions, which were published on the inquiry webpage and are listed at **Appendix A**.
- 1.3. The Committee received a number of documents from the ACT Government in-confidence, some of which it resolved to publish partially or in full, in consultation with the Minister for Transport. These were published on the inquiry webpage as exhibits, and are listed at **Appendix A**.
- 1.4. On 26 and 27 March 2025, 1 May 2025 and 3 July 2025, the Committee held public hearings. The Committee heard evidence from witnesses listed in **Appendix B**. The transcripts and video recordings are available on the Legislative Assembly website.
- 1.5. On 13 March 2025 and 1 May 2025, the Committee held *in-camera* hearings. On 5 June 2025, following consultation with witnesses the Committee resolved to publish the transcript of the 13 March 2025 hearing. The transcript is available on the Legislative Assembly website.
- 1.6. The Committee held a private briefing with the ACT Auditor-General on 13 March 2025. The attendees at this briefing are listed at **Appendix C**.
- 1.7. The Committee had 35 Questions Taken On Notice (QTONs) from the public hearings. After the hearings, the Committee lodged 57 Questions on Notice (QONs). The details of the QTONs and QONs are listed in **Appendix D**.
- 1.8. Statistics on the gender of witnesses, collected in response to an audit by the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, are at **Appendix E**. The information is collected to determine whether committee inquiries are meeting the needs, and allowing the participation of, a range of genders in the community. Participation is voluntary and there are no set responses.

2. Procurement

Process

- 2.1. The ACT Government outlined the procurement process for the MyWay+ system, noting that the process commenced in 2017, three years prior to the expiry of the legacy MyWay ticketing system in 2020.²
- 2.2. Starting with an expression of interest (EOI) being issued, potential vendors were asked to respond with proposals that incorporated advances in technology since the MyWay system was procured. Features sought included:
 - Smartphone open loop payment systems, using flash pass barcode code functionality;
 - The replacement of existing, bus-based ticketing devices with next generation ticketing devices;
 - Implementation of an account based ticketing system allowing open loop payments; and
 - Real time passenger information capabilities.³
- 2.3. While the EOI process resulted in four responses and three responses to the subsequent request for proposal (RFP), ultimately the ACT government found that none met the criteria, 'nor the ability to demonstrate experience in the change management, financial operations of the system, and operational aspects of implementing the required solution'. According to the ACT Government, this did not represent a failure but rather consistency 'with the requirements of the *Government Procurement Act 2001*'.⁴
- 2.4. This led the ACT Government to examine the possibility of joining with a state jurisdiction to use single source negotiations with that state's supplier. These negotiations did not identify a value for money solution and were discontinued in 2019. This in turn required a contract extension with the existing MyWay supplier to ensure provision of public transport and fare collection while a new approach to market was developed.⁵
- 2.5. The decision to make a second approach to market was conditioned by the risks presented as MyWay and the NXTBUS real time passenger information system approached end of life. According to the ACT Government:

Both systems relied on the 3G network which was scheduled to be decommissioned. Continued reporting from Optus was the 2100 frequency would be decommissioned in May 2022, with the 900 frequency remaining available to

² ACT Government, *Submission 59*, p 3.

³ ACT Government, *Submission 59*, p 3.

⁴ ACT Government, *Submission 59*, p 4.

⁵ ACT Government, *Submission 59*, p 4.

Transport Canberra. Furthermore, ageing system equipment and the availability of obsolete parts limited the ability to extend their operational lifespans.⁶

- 2.6. These risks were realised in 2022 ‘through frequent outages across both systems’.⁷
- 2.7. A tender process for a Next Generation Ticketing Solution had commenced in July 2021, with the removal of the requirement to accommodate cash transactions. The evaluation team for the procurement process included a commercial expert from the Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate (CMTEDD), a representative of the Transport Canberra and City Services Directorate (TCCS) Chief Information Office (and later the Digital, Data and Technology Solutions (DDTS) within CMTEDD), and a facilitator drawn from Procurement ACT.⁸
- 2.8. The ACT Government stated that the result of the two-stage procurement process was a customised, rather than a bespoke, product using existing NEC platforms.⁹
- 2.9. NEC told the Committee that the product it offered was ‘based on technology elements NEC has deployed elsewhere around the world’ comprised of both NEC and partner products. The partner products included Littlepay, ePay and Windcave – all three of which are in use in both Australia and elsewhere.¹⁰
- 2.10. Furthermore, according to NEC:
- This combination of the NEC Mobility platform and the services provided by these third parties allowed for a deployment with little bespoke development apart from integration into ACT Government services.¹¹
- 2.11. In considering the responses received from NEC and others, the ACT Government noted that NEC Australia’s Smart Mobility Platform core components could be customised to meet the ACT’s requirements without developing a new or bespoke product.¹²
- 2.12. The Smart Mobility Platform provides a Mobility as a Service (MaaS) ticketing option that incorporates other functions such as journey planning, integration of multiple transport modes (including active travel¹³), customer account portal, and payment options.¹⁴ The ACT Government noted that NEC had used its technology in India and Japan, meeting the requirement to demonstrate successful delivery of projects of comparable scope and complexity.¹⁵

⁶ ACT Government, *Submission 59*, p 5.

⁷ ACT Government, *Submission 59*, p 5.

⁸ ACT Government, *Submission 59*, p 6.

⁹ ACT Government, *Submission 59*, p 6.

¹⁰ NEC, *Submission 63*, p 1.

¹¹ NEC, *Submission 63*, p 2.

¹² ACT Government, *Submission 59*, p 7.

¹³ NEC, *Driving Future Transport: NEC Mobility Platform Whitepaper*, 2024, p 4, https://www.nec.com.au/application/files/8117/1556/0224/NEC_MobilityTransport_WhitePaper.pdf, accessed 13 August 2025.

¹⁴ ACT Government, *Submission 59*, p 6.

¹⁵ ACT Government, *Submission 59*, p 7.

- 2.13. As a result, NEC and the ACT executed a contract commencing on 20 February 2023.¹⁶ The contract was to run for a period of ten years through to February 2033, including the option for two 12 month extensions,¹⁷ at a cost of \$64 million.¹⁸

Criticisms

- 2.14. While the ACT Government stated that it ‘does not believe the issues that have arisen after the launch of MyWay+ are linked to the procurement process’,¹⁹ some witnesses raised concerns with the risk management processes applied.
- 2.15. Colin Walters, Chair of the Inner South Canberra Community Council (ISCCC), drew upon his experience managing large IT projects to underscore the importance of rigorous risk management in procurement processes.²⁰ According to Mr Walters, the international standard involves identifying ‘all the risks in advance’ and having ‘a management plan to actually manage them’. Mr Walters told the Committee that this appears ‘not to have happened here’.²¹
- 2.16. The ACT Government highlighted its Procurement Reform Program, which is due to be completed in 2025.²² However, Mr Walters noted that it ‘does not even mention risk management’.²³
- 2.17. Transport Canberra officials told the Committee that risk management did play a role in the procurement process:

At the beginning of the procurement we would undertake a risk assessment. At the midpoint of the procurement we would probably do another risk assessment. At the conclusion, and around the periods of contract signing and execution et cetera, there would be another risk assessment.²⁴

- 2.18. Ross Mullen of CANAXESS argued that the accessibility issues that emerged (examined below) ‘would indicate that there were no technical experts’ involved that could ensure that the vendor provided something accessible.²⁵
- 2.19. Mr Mullen elaborated on this view:

My thought on the procurement side is that, whilst there was a line item indicating that the asset must be accessible, there is no-one with the necessary technical background assessing what is being produced. The vendor might say all

¹⁶ ACT Government, *Submission 59*, p 7.

¹⁷ Contract GS0314302, pp 7–8, <https://www.tenders.act.gov.au/contract/attachments?id=204268>, accessed 13 August 2025.

¹⁸ Tenders ACT website, *Contract GS0314302*, <https://www.tenders.act.gov.au/contract/view?id=204268>, accessed 13 August 2025.

¹⁹ ACT Government, *Submission 59*, p 7.

²⁰ *Committee Hansard*, 27 March 2025, p 103 and p 105.

²¹ *Committee Hansard*, 27 March 2025, p 103.

²² ACT Government, *Submission 59*, p 7.

²³ *Committee Hansard*, 27 March 2025, p 103.

²⁴ Mark White, Executive Branch Manager, Transport Canberra and Business Services, Transport Canberra, *Committee Hansard*, 13 March 2025, p 9.

²⁵ Ross Mullen, Director, CANAXESS, *Committee Hansard*, 26 March 2025, p 42.

the right things, but my assumption is: do not necessarily believe everything that is said. A vendor might have the best will in the world to deliver an accessible product, but, if you believe a vendor, you are sort of allowing them to mark their own homework.²⁶

- 2.20. The Public Transport Association of Canberra (PTCBA) noted that the 2021 Statement of Requirements that preceded the procurement ‘placed considerable emphasis’ on the provision of a MaaS platform. According to PTCBA:

While MaaS is an interesting concept, there are very few examples of it being successfully implemented in other cities. For example, NSW piloted ‘Opal+’ in 2022, which promised a ‘Netflix-style’ subscription to transport services, but ended this trial after only a year.²⁷

- 2.21. PTCBA told the Committee that the inclusion of a MaaS platform was ‘overly ambitious’ for a jurisdiction the size of the ACT, and ‘may have led to the procurement of a platform with features passengers were not demanding’.²⁸
- 2.22. The Committee was provided with a copy of the procurement risk management plan that, while undated, appears to reflect the early stages of the procurement process and certainly prior to engaging in the contract with NEC. Two items in the plan support the ACT Government’s contention that the procurement process is not linked to the issues that have emerged.²⁹
- 2.23. Specifically, Risk 17 in this document proposes treatments that include aspects such as undertaking technical assessment of the responses to procurement, establishing a register of specifications, conducting reference checks on the vendors’ proposals, and establishing a technical reference group.³⁰
- 2.24. Accessibility was also a feature of the risk management plan, via the establishment of a ‘customer Accessibility Reference Group’, and through a requirement that the outcome of the procurement ‘meet accessibility standards and needs’.³¹

Committee comment

- 2.25. In light of the evidence considered by the Committee in relation to the procurement process, it appears unlikely that the procurement process itself is the source of the problems with MyWay+.
- 2.26. While the comments from PTCBA about the ambition of the procurement being above and beyond the desires of system users are valid, and could have introduced a level of complexity that was unnecessary, it would seem that the issues with MyWay+ emerged later in the life of the project. Complexity does introduce potential points of failure that

²⁶ Ross Mullen, Director, CANAXESS, *Committee Hansard*, 26 March 2025, p 44.

²⁷ Public Transport Association of Canberra, *Submission 104*, p 4.

²⁸ Public Transport Association of Canberra, *Submission 104*, p 4.

²⁹ *Exhibit 2*, ‘Attachment 3: Risk Management Plan’, pp 5 and 9.

³⁰ *Exhibit 2*, ‘Attachment 3: Risk Management Plan’, p 9.

³¹ *Exhibit 2*, ‘Attachment 3: Risk Management Plan’, p 5.

need to be the focus of careful contract and project management following the procurement phase.

3. Delivery

- 3.1. At the outset of any discussion of delivering MyWay+, it is important to note that according to the ACT Government, at the time of writing this report the system remains in its delivery phase.

Project scope

- 3.2. The scope of the MyWay+ project is large and complex, but the core functions defined in the scope of the project contract were to provide:

- A cashless fare collection solution;
- A real-time passenger information system;
- A MaaS platform;
- Support services; and
- Additional goods and services.³²

- 3.3. The MaaS platform was a key component in providing the core functions, particularly as they relate to the experience of public transport users. According to the ACT Government:

MaaS is a term used to describe a user focussed transport service which combines multiple transport modes and ancillary services, such as payment and journey planning functionality, in one central application for a seamless customer transaction (i.e. mobile application and online account portal).³³

- 3.4. MyWay+ as procured is a MaaS platform built on NEC's Smart Mobility Platform.³⁴ In terms of ticketing, according to NEC it offered 'a flexible platform for citizens to choose the way they pay for travel' allowing for the use of a 'MyWay+ closed loop card', credit or debit cards, or using a mobile phone.³⁵
- 3.5. An account-based ticketing system that allowed for payment by credit or debit card as well as traditional travel card was a goal from as early as 2016. PTCBR told the Committee that this goal 'correctly identified the changing community expectations' of ticketing systems, particularly in light of its use in Oyster in London and Opal in Sydney.³⁶
- 3.6. Ticketing using a mobile phone was available through a QR code, generated by the MyWay+ app and drawing on the stored balance in a MyWay+ account. NEC told the

³² Contract GS0314302, p 14, <https://www.tenders.act.gov.au/contract/attachments?id=204268>, accessed 13 August 2025.

³³ ACT Government, *Submission 59*, pp 6–7.

³⁴ ACT Government, *Submission 59*, p 6.

³⁵ NEC Australia, *Submission 63*, p 2.

³⁶ Public Transport Association of Canberra, *Submission 104*, p 2.

Committee that QR codes are not ‘intended to replace any existing ticketing technology but to augment or enhance it’ and have been increasingly used in the last five years.³⁷

- 3.7. According to NEC, QR codes offer ‘convenience in distribution’, as they can be accessed immediately, do not require the purchase of a closed loop card, and allow users not wishing to use a debit or credit card to ‘have an option that is simpler to get their hands on’. It is ‘not intended to be central to the ticketing system’, but rather ‘an aspect of the different types of options’ and flexibility intended by MyWay+.³⁸

Finding 1

The Committee finds that the project scope was too large and complex, and should have focused on credit and debit card payments, real time passenger information, journey planning functionality, appropriate support services, on-board audio, and retaining previous features such as easy access to account balances.

Project delivery structure

- 3.8. The ACT Government stated that the NEC project team was mobilised in March 2023. This was supplemented in August 2023 by Transport Canberra’s engagement of two Executive Branch Managers to support delivery, as well as a ‘Contract Manager; Project Manager; Organisational Change Manager; and Project Support Officer’. In addition to the Transport Canberra staff, the ACT Government noted that ‘the program team was also supported by other positions within Transport Canberra’, more widely within TCCS, and DDTS.³⁹
- 3.9. Importantly, an independent report on the project found that Transport Canberra’s initial ‘support structure was insufficient for managing a program of this magnitude and complexity’. This report further states that the subsequent team established in June 2023 ‘appears appropriately sized and skilled for the delivery’.⁴⁰ This report, undertaken by Projects Assured, is a key document and its findings will be examined in greater detail below.
- 3.10. A range of forums were established to ‘implement a formal governing structure for decisions’ of the project.⁴¹ These included:
- The Senior Representatives Group, including the Director-General and a Deputy Director-General from TCCS and the senior executives and Vice-President of NEC, which at first held quarterly meetings with an increased frequency to weekly meetings as the go-live date approached.
 - The Government Steering Committee, which met monthly to consider project risks and decision points, including senior officials from TCCS, DDTS and CMTEDD.

³⁷ Kylie Gorham, Senior Product Manager, NEC, *Committee Hansard*, 26 March 2025, p 16.

³⁸ Kylie Gorham, NEC, *Committee Hansard*, 26 March 2025, pp 16-17.

³⁹ ACT Government, *Submission 59*, p 8.

⁴⁰ Chris Steel MLA, Minister for Transport, *answer to QTON 18, 1 May 2025 (received 13 May 2025)*, Attachment A, p 16.

⁴¹ ACT Government, *Submission 59*, p 8.

- The Project Steering Meeting, held monthly between Transport Canberra officials and NEC ‘to discuss project status, risks and matters as advised by NEC’. This meeting was able to escalate matters to the Government Steering Committee as required.
- The Technical Advisory Group, which met fortnightly and included program staff, the Chief Information Officer of TCCS, DDTS, ACT Digital Account and NEC.
- The Project Control Group (PCG), which included Transport Canberra, DDTS, ACT Digital Account and NEC and met weekly to discuss status, risk and activities within the program.⁴²

Transition planning

- 3.11. NEC told the Committee that it had initially developed a ‘multi-phase transition in approach spanning 20 months’. This proposal envisaged installing and commissioning MyWay+ hardware in the operational bus fleet while the existing MyWay hardware remained in use. According to NEC, this ‘approach permitted development, integration and testing of MyWay+ without disrupting MyWay services’ and ‘supported a minimal transition period’.⁴³
- 3.12. According to NEC, the 20-month transition proposed was informed by the late-2023 date for the 3G network closure, and NEC’s opinion that having both systems running parallel would result in a smoother transition.⁴⁴
- 3.13. NEC stated that ‘Transport Canberra brought in new program management’ in mid-2023.⁴⁵ The 20-month transition plan was then jointly reviewed by NEC and Transport Canberra and some earlier decisions and risks were reconsidered. Specifically, NEC noted that the change in the 3G network closure from late-2023 to 2024 meant it ‘was not going to be a driving factor’ in the transition plan.⁴⁶
- 3.14. Additionally, NEC expressed its belief that ‘Transport Canberra did some research around messaging’, and as a result ‘determined that it would be more efficient’ and ‘less confusing to the public’ to have the MyWay systems switched off and MyWay+ activated.⁴⁷
- 3.15. The ACT Government also highlighted the latter aspect, stating that it considered the phased transition plan in August and September 2023. It assessed that NEC’s plan ‘would have presented significant customer confusion’ through the ‘concurrent presence of both old and new systems on the bus fleet’ for up to 12 months. As a result, Transport Canberra determined that the phased transition approach presented ‘an unacceptable risk likely to undermine public confidence in both systems’ and would have ‘degraded revenue collection’ during transition.⁴⁸

⁴² ACT Government, *Submission 59*, pp 8–9.

⁴³ NEC, *Submission 63*, pp 3–4.

⁴⁴ Mark Messenger, Head of Smart Transport ANZ, NEC, *Committee Hansard*, 26 March 2025, p 19.

⁴⁵ Mark Messenger, NEC, *Committee Hansard*, 26 March 2025, p 19.

⁴⁶ Mark Messenger, NEC, *Committee Hansard*, 26 March 2025, p 19.

⁴⁷ Mark Messenger, NEC, *Committee Hansard*, 26 March 2025, p 19.

⁴⁸ ACT Government, *Submission 59*, p 9.

- 3.16. NEC stated that it was directed by Transport Canberra to develop a single-phase transition, which NEC initially envisioned including a ‘go-live date around 7th October 2024’.⁴⁹ Transport Canberra outlined the key perceived benefits of the revised transition plan:
- The progress in procuring ‘the majority of required hardware’ enabled the pre-installation of ‘hardware not visible to the community’ during maintenance without any effect on operations.⁵⁰
 - It removed the need to integrate legacy systems with MyWay+.⁵¹
 - It moved the initial focus to ‘development, integration and testing of core system elements’, and shifted the schedule from a ‘hardware install and test led’ approach to a ‘system development and integration led’ one.⁵²
 - Less potential for ‘public confusion and negative sentiment’ than ‘a protracted period of both fare collection systems running concurrently’, and the fare free period would be limited to the ‘accelerated hardware installation phase’ estimated at four to six weeks.⁵³
- 3.17. Officials elaborated on the assessment of these risks, noting that while fare revenue was a component, ‘user behaviour and customer experience was the primary driver’.⁵⁴ System integrity was put forward as another key risk that Transport Canberra sought to mitigate through the shift in transition plan.⁵⁵
- 3.18. In terms of the community and customers, officials told the Committee that having ‘multiple systems operating on buses’, where some buses ‘might have two card readers on them, some might have one, and some might have none at all’ could cause confusion.⁵⁶ This confusion - coupled with revenue impacts, risks to the support systems reliant on the 3G network, and staffing and workforce impacts – were all ‘taken into consideration’ in making the decision to change the transition process.⁵⁷
- 3.19. The complexity of the supporting systems was also highlighted by officials. Specifically:
- Running two systems off two different networks, off two different communication protocols, off two absolutely non-integrateable ticketing systems, is the level of complexity that we are talking about. So when you use the word “simplification”

⁴⁹ NEC, *Submission 63*, pp 4.

⁵⁰ ACT Government, *Submission 59*, p 9.

⁵¹ ACT Government, *Submission 59*, p 9.

⁵² ACT Government, *Submission 59*, p 9.

⁵³ ACT Government, *Submission 59*, p 10.

⁵⁴ Ben McHugh, Deputy Director General, Transport Canberra and Business Services, City and Environment Directorate, *Committee Hansard*, 3 July 2025, p 178.

⁵⁵ Ben McHugh, Transport Canberra and Business Services, City and Environment Directorate, *Committee Hansard*, 3 July 2025, p 178.

⁵⁶ Ben McHugh, Transport Canberra and Business Services, City and Environment Directorate, *Committee Hansard*, 3 July 2025, p 185.

⁵⁷ Ben McHugh, Transport Canberra and Business Services, City and Environment Directorate, *Committee Hansard*, 3 July 2025, p 185.

in there, it is not about convenience; it is about removing the huge risks there are in trying to run such a massively complex dual system.⁵⁸

- 3.20. According to Transport Canberra, a revised plan was received from NEC in December 2023, and was agreed by Cabinet in June 2024.⁵⁹

Project milestones

- 3.21. Officials told the Committee that the shift from multiphase to single phase transition outlined above was the primary ‘driver for change in the project’s program’.⁶⁰
- 3.22. Importantly, while this variation was signed by the authorised ACT delegate in December 2023, it was not signed by NEC until July 2024, which also aligns with the Cabinet approval process noted above. The Minister for Transport told the Committee that the delay was ‘due to numerous factors, including project leadership absences, organisational changes and access to authorised officers’. According to the Minister, ‘Transport Canberra accepted the intent and good will’ of NEC in providing ‘agreement to proceed in principle with work as described in the variation’, but acknowledged that the delay in NEC’s signature was nonetheless ‘regrettable’.⁶¹
- 3.23. The Minister for Transport stated that the overall contract contained two parts: the transition or project delivery phase, and the operating phase. According to the Minister, the transition phase contained 30 milestones and upon completion and acceptance of Milestone 30 by the ACT Government, the project moved into the Operating Period.⁶² As a result, rather than setting a specific time for the completion of the delivery phase and the commencement of the operating phase, Transport Canberra defined it in terms of progress against delivering the preceding milestones.⁶³
- 3.24. It is important to note that while the variation envisaged practical completion in April 2025,⁶⁴ officials subsequently advised that by May 2025 the expected completion date had been moved forward to September 2025.⁶⁵ At the time this report was prepared, the project had not been completed.
- 3.25. The ACT Government told the Committee that the first of the 30 project milestones – reaching proof of concept for the API development – was achieved and accepted by the PCG in April 2024. Integration between the NEC Smart Mobility Platform and the ACT

⁵⁸ Mark White, Executive Branch Manager, Transport Canberra and Business Services, City and Environment Directorate, *Committee Hansard*, 3 July 2025, pp 186–187.

⁵⁹ ACT Government, *Submission 59*, p 10.

⁶⁰ Ben McHugh, Transport Canberra and Business Services, City and Environment Directorate, *Committee Hansard*, 3 July 2025, p 178.

⁶¹ Chris Steel MLA, Minister for Transport, *answer to QTON 29, 3 July 2025 (received 17 July 2025)*, p 2.

⁶² Chris Steel MLA, Minister for Transport, *answer to QTON 2, 27 March 2025 (received 8 April 2025)*, p 1.

⁶³ Mark White, Executive Branch Manager, Transport Canberra and Business Services, City and Environment Directorate, *Committee Hansard*, 1 May 2025, p 161.

⁶⁴ *Committee Hansard*, 3 July 2025, p 178.

⁶⁵ Mark White, Transport Canberra and Business Services, City and Environment Directorate, *Committee Hansard*, 1 May 2025, p 161.

Digital Account (Project Milestone 2) was achieved in July 2024, and systems development (Project Milestone 3) was achieved in September 2024.⁶⁶

- 3.26. MyWay+ hardware commenced with three demonstration buses in April 2024 to provide passengers with a demonstration of the new system and expose bus drivers and workshop staff to operating and maintaining MyWay+ hardware.⁶⁷
- 3.27. Project Milestone 4 – the ‘accelerated installation phase’ for visible hardware, testing and commissioning on the bus fleet and light rail platforms – commenced on 20 September 2024.⁶⁸
- 3.28. The remaining milestones are redacted from the published contract, in accordance with the ACT procurement rules under which the vendor ‘are the determiners of what should or should not be redacted’.⁶⁹
- 3.29. Officials from Transport Canberra provided some additional detail on the various project milestones not discussed in the ACT Government’s written submission. The Committee heard that:

In that single-phase delivery approach, those milestones clearly articulate five groups of functionality. For example, “platform hardware” has a stream of activities—on-bus hardware, mobile application, software services et cetera.⁷⁰

- 3.30. Nonetheless, officials told the Committee that, as of 1 May 2025, the only ‘key milestone that we have not achieved and the key milestone that we are working towards is project completion, which is the last one’.⁷¹
- 3.31. In planning for the delivery of the key functions, as noted above the shift to a single-phase transition necessitated various aspects of MyWay+ functionality being delivered after its public launch.⁷²
- 3.32. Officials told the Committee that, prior to the go live date, the minimum viable product development approach was applied.⁷³ According to Transport Canberra, for MyWay+ the minimum viable product had two key aspects. One related to the ‘system and its operation’ – would payment methods be usable and safe, and would it be functional ‘from a back-end perspective’.⁷⁴

⁶⁶ ACT Government, *Submission 59*, pp 10–11.

⁶⁷ ACT Government, *Submission 59*, p 11.

⁶⁸ ACT Government, *Submission 59*, p 13.

⁶⁹ Mark White, Executive Branch Manager, Transport Canberra and Business Services, City and Environment Directorate, *Committee Hansard*, 1 May 2025, p 161.

⁷⁰ Mark White, Transport Canberra and Business Services, City and Environment Directorate, *Committee Hansard*, 1 May 2025, p 161.

⁷¹ Mark White, Executive Branch Manager, Transport Canberra and Business Services, City and Environment Directorate *Committee Hansard*, 1 May 2025, p 162.

⁷² Mark White, Executive Branch Manager, Transport Canberra and Business Services, City and Environment Directorate *Committee Hansard*, 1 May 2025, p 161–162.

⁷³ Mark White, Executive Branch Manager, Transport Canberra and Business Services, City and Environment Directorate *Committee Hansard*, 1 May 2025, p 162.

⁷⁴ Ben McHugh, Deputy Director General, Transport Canberra and Business Services, City and Environment Directorate, *Committee Hansard*, 1 May 2025, p 167.

3.33. The second aspect related to hardware. Officials told the Committee that:

The other was around hardware and the minimum number of buses on the road—noting that we were installing four or five more buses per day in the fit-out phase of the project—so that number changed fairly rapidly. What was the minimum number that we needed, to give the best customer experience outcome from day one and minimise the risk that someone was encountered with a bus that did not have the technology on it for a minimum period?⁷⁵

3.34. Following the launch of MyWay+ at go live, a range of other functions would continue to be rolled out and made available to the public before the project's delivery phase was completed and the operational phase commenced. These included functions and improvements such as:

- Full compliance with disability accessibility requirements (discussed in further detail later in the report);
- Installation of ticket vending machines;
- Real-time passenger information sharing;
- Group accounts allowing parents and guardians to manage their children's travel cards;
- Institutional accounts to enable schools, charities and others to generate on-demand tickets;
- Park and ride registration through a MyWay+ account; and
- Cycle and ride facility integration into MyWay+ accounts.⁷⁶

3.35. Officials told the Committee that the project completion milestone will be achieved 'when we make the assessment that all elements of contracted requirements have been delivered, both functional and non-functional'.⁷⁷

3.36. In the leadup to the public launch of MyWay+ independent project assurance was undertaken by Projects Assured to assess whether it was appropriate for the system to go live.⁷⁸ Projects Assured was asked to:

- assess whether sufficient functional and non-functional requirements had been delivered to launch the system;
- validate system performance under real-world conditions;
- verify the resilience, security and compliance of the system; and

⁷⁵ Ben McHugh, Deputy Director General, Transport Canberra and Business Services, City and Environment Directorate, *Committee Hansard*, 1 May 2025, p 167.

⁷⁶ ACT Government, *Submission 59*, Attachment B, pp 5–7.

⁷⁷ Mark White, Executive Branch Manager, Transport Canberra and Business Services, City and Environment Directorate, *Committee Hansard*, 1 May 2025, p 162.

⁷⁸ Mark White, Transport Canberra and Business Services, City and Environment Directorate, *Committee Hansard*, 1 May 2025, p 168.

- identify any risks and make recommendations for improvement.⁷⁹
- 3.37. The resulting report is dated 24 October 2024 and was undertaken on the assumption that the go-live date was 11 November 2024.⁸⁰ Officials stated that the report ‘highlighted various risks’ and was ‘quite balanced’, but ‘on the balance of their assessment, they felt it was appropriate for us to go live’.⁸¹
- 3.38. The Projects Assured report noted that the “just in time” nature of the program delivery and the availability of the systems at such close proximity to go-live’ led to ‘planned activities being highly compressed’.⁸² This is evidenced by the commencement of ‘accelerated’ installation of hardware on 20 September 2024, two months prior to the ultimate go live date. According to the Projects Assured report, this situation could be expected to lead to impacts on quality.⁸³

Committee Comment

- 3.39. The Committee notes that this ‘just-in-time’ schedule had serious implications for the testing process. Specifically, this approach to transition left little time to conduct effective testing, and implement the solutions to problems identified. The advice provided by officials that MyWay+ had reached minimum viable product and was ready for launch was flawed. The decision to launch the project before it was complete was also flawed. These issues are examined in greater detail below.

Finding 2

The Committee finds that the change to a single-phase delivery was a poor decision. This led to a lack of clarity on project milestones, and unclear timing for when these milestones were to be delivered.

Testing

- 3.40. The testing involved both user acceptance testing (UAT) undertaken by the project team and NEC, as well as community-based testing undertaken by users prior to the wider installation of hardware across the public transport fleet. According to the ACT Government, the UAT undertaken involved ‘factual, system-based assessment in response to specific, scripted “test cases”, which are then used to determine any modifications to system functionality required before operational launch. UAT testing undertaken within

⁷⁹ Chris Steel MLA, Minister for Transport, *answer to QTON 035, 3 July 2025 (received 17 July 2025)*, p 2.

⁸⁰ Chris Steel MLA, Minister for Transport, *answer to QTON 018, 1 May 2025 (received 13 May 2025)*, Attachment A, p 1 and 5.

⁸¹ Mark White, Executive Branch Manager, Transport Canberra and Business Services, City and Environment Directorate, *Committee Hansard*, 1 May 2025, p 168.

⁸² Chris Steel MLA, Minister for Transport, *answer to QTON 018, 1 May 2025 (received 13 May 2025)*, Attachment A, p 11.

⁸³ Chris Steel MLA, Minister for Transport, *answer to QTON 018, 1 May 2025 (received 13 May 2025)*, Attachment A, p 11.

the program found that MyWay+ ‘satisfied the defined UAT requirements for operational launch’.⁸⁴ This inquiry focused on the community-based testing.

- 3.41. An EOI was issued on 16 September 2024 to find volunteers to test functionality and found 209 successful applicants. The community testing commenced on 30 September 2024 and included:
- Participants being given pre-loaded MyWay+ cards to test their ability to tap on and off bus validators;
 - Access to the MyWay+ account portal from the last week in October 2024 along with instructions on its use but not including balance transfer or link debit/credit card functions;
 - Access to the mobile application in the final one to two weeks before operational launch; and
 - Feedback across the seven weeks of testing until the go-live date on 25 November 2025.⁸⁵
- 3.42. According to the ACT Government, there were delays in some aspects of system testing and commissioning that led to credit and debit card tap on and loading funds to MyWay+ accounts being unavailable for community testing.⁸⁶ Nonetheless, the ACT Government valued the community testing for providing important feedback on the user experience. Specifically, it provided insights into the formatting and layout of the online account, identified performance issues with public information displays and validator activation that resulted in further investigation by Transport Canberra.⁸⁷
- 3.43. However some aspects of the community testing feedback were unable to be addressed prior to Go-Live. The ACT Government stated that this was due to ‘the need to prioritise items related to the critical functionality of the system’.⁸⁸
- 3.44. The Committee received feedback on the community testing process directly from participants.
- 3.45. Bill Gemmell was one of the volunteer community testers. Mr Gemmell told the Committee that his participation in the process reinforced his view that the Transport Canberra ‘customer experience can probably be best summarised as Pythonesque’. He noted that MyWay+ was ‘like the proverbial airplane being built while it is flying’, and ‘not fit for purpose at launch’.⁸⁹
- 3.46. Another community tester was Andrew Donnellan. He characterised MyWay+ as a ‘system seemingly designed by people who don’t use public transport’ and felt as though his input as a tester was ‘pointless’.⁹⁰

⁸⁴ ACT Government, *Submission 59*, p 11–12.

⁸⁵ ACT Government, *Submission 59*, p 12.

⁸⁶ ACT Government, *Submission 59*, p 12.

⁸⁷ ACT Government, *Submission 59*, p 13.

⁸⁸ ACT Government, *Submission 59*, p 13.

⁸⁹ Bill Gemmell, *Submission 57*, p 1.

⁹⁰ Andrew Donnellan, *Submission 105*, pp 1–2.

- 3.47. According to Mr Donnellan, the process was poorly organised from the outset. He stated that he received an email inviting him to pick up his MyWay+ card from the Transport Canberra office, only to discover on arrival that the email ‘had been sent out too early’ and that cards were not available. This was, in Mr Donnellan’s view, ‘a sign as to what was to come’.⁹¹
- 3.48. Mr Donnellan told the Committee that the advice given to testers was ‘entirely useless’, as it was ‘a list of route numbers where you might, at some point over a multi-day period, happen to see a testing bus’. Even when this advice was changed to include daily updates with lists of buses with routes and times, it was ‘still incomplete and inaccurate’.⁹²
- 3.49. Another community tester – Ms Alexandra Vickery – told the Committee that she received emails detailing ‘buses you could catch in the morning and early afternoon’. However, given she was a student attending classes, the times were not feasible for her to catch.⁹³
- 3.50. Council on the Ageing ACT (COTA) and other members of the Ministerial Advisory Council on Ageing were asked to test aspects of the system as well, however ‘there were very few buses to test on’.⁹⁴
- 3.51. Similarly, the Public Transport Association of Canberra (PTCBA) noted that the community testing program was ‘poorly administered and confusing for participants’. It stated that testers ‘were provided with nothing more than a MyWay+ card and a confusing daily list of buses’. Furthermore, the ‘slow rollout’ under the accelerated installation phase meant that ‘in practice, a tester would have to actively seek out an equipped bus, rather than being able to use the system in the course of their regular travel’.⁹⁵
- 3.52. Ms Vickery made similar comments, noting that Transport Canberra seemed to be ‘just hoping that one of the 200’ testers ‘would have a timetable that aligned’ with the bus routes, and that ‘the route selection seemed a little bit bizarre’. According to Ms Vickery, there were no explicit instructions given to testers aside from communications about picking up MyWay+ cards and the daily lists of buses.⁹⁶
- 3.53. Other testers noted that instructions were unclear and minimal. Mr Donnellan stated that:

We were initially sent an email saying, “There are two buses currently fitted with validators that will be operating any one of these dozen different routes over the next 48 hours, or whatever; try and catch one”—which is not terribly helpful advice. Then, if you do happen to find one, what are you supposed to test? I did encounter buses with the MyWay+ demonstrator branding, where I got on and was immediately told by the driver, “The validator is not working.” So I am supposed to just tap on and tap off? Am I supposed to note anything about that experience?⁹⁷

⁹¹ Andrew Donnellan, *Submission 105*, p 2.

⁹² Andrew Donnellan, *Submission 105*, p 2.

⁹³ Alexandra Vickery, Private capacity, *Committee Hansard*, 27 March 2025, p 83.

⁹⁴ Jennifer Mobbs, Chief Executive Officer, COTA, *Committee Hansard*, 1 May 2025, p 147.

⁹⁵ Public Transport Association of Canberra, *Submission 104*, p 8.

⁹⁶ Alexandra Vickery, Private capacity, *Committee Hansard*, 27 March 2025, pp 83-84.

⁹⁷ Andrew Donnellan, Private capacity, *Committee Hansard*, 26 March 2025, p 52.

- 3.54. There was no feedback survey provided, which prompted Mr Donnellan to provide his feedback in an email, three days prior to the launch date.⁹⁸ It was unclear to Mr Donnellan whether there was any systematic method of collecting the feedback of testers,⁹⁹ and ‘there was not any method for testers to communicate’ more widely – indeed, they were required to sign a confidentiality agreement.¹⁰⁰
- 3.55. Similarly, Ms Vickery told the Committee the communication with testers was ‘patchy at best’, and there was no systematic attempt to solicit feedback from community testers or any sort of survey of their experience.¹⁰¹
- 3.56. According to PTCBR, even the conclusion of the testing period itself was unclear. While the Minister for Transport announced that testing had been completed on 11 November 2024, daily messages to testers continued until launch day. As late as 26 November 2024, testers were advised by email to ‘keep an eye on your email for notification of new functionality that will be available for testing soon’.¹⁰²
- 3.57. Transport Canberra noted that in ‘establishment of the project program and the scope of work’, the importance of ‘user experience testing, specifically testing of the on-bus systems’ was underestimated. According to officials, this is the ‘risk that played out as being most visible and most obvious on day one’.¹⁰³

Finding 3

The Committee finds that the community testing of MyWay+ was undertaken so poorly that it was almost meaningless and does not appear to have had any impact that improved the rollout of the system.

Pre-launch communication

- 3.58. According to the ACT Government submission, a ‘comprehensive public communication campaign’ was undertaken ‘to support the Canberra community in the transition to MyWay+’.¹⁰⁴
- 3.59. This campaign involved four stages. The first occurred between May and August 2024, where the branding was introduced along with demonstration buses, to communicate to the public that the new ticketing system was coming. Stage one involved radio advertising, social media posts, pop-up events, presentations at community council meetings, attendance at events like expos, market days, and university and CIT open days.

⁹⁸ Andrew Donnellan, Private capacity, *Committee Hansard*, 26 March 2025, p 51.

⁹⁹ Andrew Donnellan, Private capacity, *Committee Hansard*, 26 March 2025, pp 52-53.

¹⁰⁰ Andrew Donnellan, Private capacity, *Committee Hansard*, 26 March 2025, p 55.

¹⁰¹ Alexandra Vickery, Private capacity, *Committee Hansard*, 27 March 2025, pp 82-83.

¹⁰² PTCBR, *Submission 104*, p 9.

¹⁰³ Ben McHugh, Deputy Director General, Transport Canberra and Business Services, City and Environment Directorate, *Committee Hansard*, 3 July 2025, pp 197-198.

¹⁰⁴ ACT Government, *Submission 59*, p 16.

Additionally, surveys were undertaken to gauge awareness of the public information campaign.¹⁰⁵

- 3.60. Phase two commenced on 14 August 2024 and ran until 20 September 2024. It built on the work already undertaken and focused more on preparing public transport users for the transition. It emphasised the need to register legacy MyWay cards and involved similar methods of communication to phase one.¹⁰⁶
- 3.61. The focus of phase two shifted between 20 September 2024 until 14 November 2024, due to the caretaker period during the 2024 ACT elections.¹⁰⁷ On 20 September 2024, the legacy MyWay system and NXTBUS were disabled and the fare free period commenced.¹⁰⁸
- 3.62. Paid public engagement was constrained by the caretaker conventions, with the focus instead going towards Transport Canberra staff attending events such as Floriade, NAIDOC Family Day, and community council meetings. The focus of communications was 'operational in nature', again due to the caretaker period, and emphasised the fare free period while the transition to MyWay+ took place and hardware was installed on buses.¹⁰⁹
- 3.63. The third phase took place between 14 November 2024 and 27 November 2024, and sought to build on previous phases and commenced with the public announcement of the 27 November public launch date. Paid advertising recommenced and focused on the convenience and ease of MyWay+, including the ticketing and live service update functions. Use of the app and portal were emphasised, and tutorial videos were developed and published. As with previous phases, presentations were made to community council meetings, paid social media posts were made, and advertising was undertaken in news media, radio and streaming services.¹¹⁰
- 3.64. Phase four commenced on 27 November 2024, and was focused on educating the public about the features offered by MyWay+ and assisting in the transition. The ACT Government noted that it included paid advertising, which was later paused due to the need to improve functionality. It utilised both existing channels of communication from earlier phases, and introduced human billboards to answer questions, provide information on MyWay+, and encourage users to download the app.¹¹¹
- 3.65. This phase also sought to collect feedback from users, which was passed to the project team and informed communications about updates disseminated via the Transport Canberra website, social media, the Contact Centre at Access Canberra and bus drivers.¹¹²
- 3.66. Despite these efforts, the Committee received criticism on the communication campaign from contributors to the inquiry.

¹⁰⁵ ACT Government, *Submission 59*, Attachment A, pp 2–7.

¹⁰⁶ ACT Government, *Submission 59*, Attachment A, pp 7–9.

¹⁰⁷ ACT Government, *Submission 59*, Attachment A, p 9.

¹⁰⁸ Chris Steel MLA, Minister for Transport, Media release, *Free public transport during MyWay+ transition*, 5 September 2025, https://www.cmtedd.act.gov.au/open_government/inform/act_government_media_releases/chris-steel-mla-media-releases/2024/free-public-transport-during-myway-transition, accessed 22 October 2025.

¹⁰⁹ ACT Government, *Submission 59*, Attachment A, pp 9–12.

¹¹⁰ ACT Government, *Submission 59*, Attachment A, pp 12–16.

¹¹¹ ACT Government, *Submission 59*, Attachment A, pp 16–19.

¹¹² ACT Government, *Submission 59*, Attachment A, p 19.

3.67. PTCBR was critical of the focus of the public communication. It told the Committee that:

We saw significant emphasis on choice and flexibility, but little guidance on practical aspects of the system such as tapping on and off with a credit/debit card, using the QR code or setting up an online account. It took far too long for Transport Canberra to adopt a simple line of instruction that should have been employed from the start: “The easiest way to pay with the new MyWay+ system is by simply tapping on and off with your debit or credit card, smartphone, smartwatch or MyWay+ card.”¹¹³

3.68. According to PTCBR, users of public transport needed ‘straightforward messaging to explain how the system would work and what it would do’, while instead ‘they were left to piece together details from news articles’, social media posts, official websites and other sources.¹¹⁴

3.69. Furthermore, PTCBR argued that the branding used in public posters was inconsistent with existing Transport Canberra branding and with the published Transport Canberra Style Guide.¹¹⁵ According to PTCBR, this added ‘unnecessary confusion to the passenger experience’:

It does not make sense for our ticketing system to use these same colours for its branding, as this disrupts the system of meaning laid out in the Transport Canberra branding guide and implemented across various aspects of our public transport system including its logo, website, signage, and vehicle liveries.¹¹⁶

3.70. In terms of engagement with community councils, the Belconnen Community Council told the Committee that while it appreciated Transport Canberra’s attendance at a public meeting the week before the launch, ‘the tricky thing was that what we heard on that night did not match what happened the next week’.¹¹⁷ According to Belconnen Community Council, this mismatch ‘has made it harder to rebuild public trust and confidence in the system’.¹¹⁸

3.71. Respondents to a survey conducted by Belconnen Community Council found that:

One of the most frustrating aspects for passengers was the misleading promotion of MyWay+ features. Real-time tracking was advertised as a key feature, with signage at every bus stop reinforcing this message. However, at launch, this feature was unavailable, and no clear timeline was provided for its rollout. The signage highlighting real-time tracking as ‘available now’ remained at bus stops even when it was evident post-launch it was not available. This discrepancy between expectations and reality led to frustration and confusion.¹¹⁹

¹¹³ Public Transport Association of Canberra (PTCBR), *Submission 104*, pp 9–10.

¹¹⁴ PTCBR, *Submission 104*, p 9.

¹¹⁵ PTCBR, *Submission 104*, p 11.

¹¹⁶ PTCBR, *Submission 104*, p 11.

¹¹⁷ Lachlan Butler, Belconnen Community Council, *Committee Hansard*, 27 March 2025, p 97.

¹¹⁸ Belconnen Community Council, *Submission 62*, p 3.

¹¹⁹ Belconnen Community Council, *Submission 62*, p 3.

- 3.72. The Minister for Transport responded to these concerns, noting that the ACT Government ‘could have done better in terms of communicating’ that the launch was a transition, and avoiding the expectation that everything would go as planned. The Minister elaborated:

Communicating about it being a minimum viable product rather than delivering every single thing that people expected of a new ticketing system all at once would have been a better approach, and that work would need to be done on some of the elements of the system, going back to the on-the-day issues that played out as a result of some of the issues around not doing enough user testing and the like.¹²⁰

Finding 4

The Committee finds that the ACT Government lost the trust of public transport users by promising basic features, like real-time tracking, that were not delivered at launch.

Finding 5

The Committee finds that the MyWay+ communications strategy should have provided simple, useful information such as how to use MyWay+ by tapping on and off with a credit or debit card.

Decision to launch

- 3.73. The risks in relation to the go live date were outlined in the September 2024 Projects Assured report. For example, its primary recommendation identified ‘an immediate need to workshop exactly what has been delivered and in what state’ prior to the launch.¹²¹
- 3.74. NEC told the Committee that it provided feedback to Transport Canberra on ‘what functionality would be live at various points’ throughout the program. Seemingly in reference to the shift to a single-phase transition, NEC noted the ‘changes to scope’ that ‘created trade-offs about what functionality needed to be at go live, versus functionality to be delivered later’.¹²²
- 3.75. According to NEC, in the lead-up to the launch date there was a ‘list of elements’ that NEC ‘wanted to be satisfied were ready’.¹²³ Similarly, Transport Canberra officials emphasised that there were a series of internal conversations about what was required to achieve a minimum viable product that could provide confidence that the system would be operational.¹²⁴

¹²⁰ Chris Steel MLA, Minister for Transport, *Committee Hansard*, 3 July 2025, p 198.

¹²¹ Chris Steel MLA, Minister for Transport, *answer to QTON 018, 1 May 2025 (received 13 May 2025)*, Attachment A, p 16.

¹²² Mark Messenger, Head of Smart Transport ANZ, NEC, *Committee Hansard*, 26 March 2025, p 19.

¹²³ Kylie Gorham, Senior Product Manager, NEC, *Committee Hansard*, 26 March 2025, p 21.

¹²⁴ Ben McHugh, Deputy Director General, Transport Canberra and Business Services, City and Environment Directorate, *Committee Hansard*, 1 May 2025, p 167.

- 3.76. The Committee sought to see if there was a shared understanding between NEC and Transport Canberra on these elements in the leadup to go live. On 24 October 2024, Projects Assured recommended that Transport Canberra and NEC ‘clearly articulate and agree’ on ‘what constitutes a minimum viable product’. This recommendation was made in the context of findings that hardware installation was behind schedule and access to software delayed, ‘limiting business exposure and ability to commence testing and training’.¹²⁵
- 3.77. The response to this recommendation noted that it had been actioned, with NEC providing a ‘final statement’ of minimum viable product in a ‘Go-Live Functionality Register’.¹²⁶
- 3.78. The Projects Assured report ultimately stated that the ‘products available at go-live will be sub-optimal but functional’.¹²⁷ However, the report notes key documents requested by Projects Assured were either not provided or were so incomplete that Projects Assured were unable to assess their ‘fitness for use’.¹²⁸
- 3.79. In terms of validating that the MyWay+ system would perform under real-world conditions and would be secure, the report notes that Projects Assured were unable to access the systems, and while NEC advised that ‘load testing has been performed’, Projects Assured was not provided with the method or result of this testing for assurance.¹²⁹
- 3.80. Additionally, the Projects Assured report makes multiple references to the ‘significant schedule pressure’ within the program. For example, the report states that time pressures associated with the then 11 November 2024 go live date led to any detailed agreement between Transport Canberra and NEC on minimum viable product not being documented. This in turn led to ‘the parties operating under different assumptions’ about what ‘specific functionality’ would be delivered, and how it would be delivered.¹³⁰
- 3.81. The lack of some key documentation was similarly put down to the ‘significant schedule pressure’ and the need to ‘replan deployment’ in line with the shift to a minimum viable product approach discussed above. According to the Projects Assured report, this led to limited availability of resources for both NEC and Transport Canberra to complete documentation.¹³¹
- 3.82. Schedule pressures led to a decision by the Minister for Transport to delay the proposed 11 November 2024 go live date. Specifically, the Minister told the Committee that:

Each bus was being fitted out with the MyWay+ validator hardware to operate the new ticketing system. We had expected that a greater number of those buses would have been fitted out with the hardware. But it came to a point where

¹²⁵ Chris Steel MLA, Minister for Transport, *answer to QTON 018, 1 May 2025 (received 13 May 2025)*, Attachment A, p 16.

¹²⁶ Chris Steel MLA, Minister for Transport, *answer to QTON 018, 1 May 2025 (received 13 May 2025)*, Attachment A, p 16.

¹²⁷ Chris Steel MLA, Minister for Transport, *answer to QTON 018, 1 May 2025 (received 13 May 2025)*, Attachment A, p 11.

¹²⁸ Chris Steel MLA, Minister for Transport, *answer to QTON 018, 1 May 2025 (received 13 May 2025)*, Attachment A, p 7.

¹²⁹ Chris Steel MLA, Minister for Transport, *answer to QTON 018, 1 May 2025 (received 13 May 2025)*, Attachment A, p 8.

¹³⁰ Chris Steel MLA, Minister for Transport, *answer to QTON 018, 1 May 2025 (received 13 May 2025)*, Attachment A, p 5.

¹³¹ Chris Steel MLA, Minister for Transport, *answer to QTON 018, 1 May 2025 (received 13 May 2025)*, Attachment A, p 7.

Transport Canberra and NEC had not reached the target. And so I made a decision that we would push back the go-live date on that basis.¹³²

- 3.83. This is supported by a ministerial brief dated 8 November 2024. According to this brief, the bus hardware installation was one to two weeks behind schedule, due to ‘issues that were only identifiable by undertaking the install process’ including ‘inconsistent bus configurations and quality issues with their componentry’.¹³³
- 3.84. The ministerial brief of 8 November brief put forward two options. Both recommended that the MyWay+ portal and account registration commence on 11 November 2024. Option one recommended go live and fare collection recommence in the week commencing 18 November 2024 but noted that the timing of the first fare free Friday fell at the end of the first sitting week of the 11th Assembly, ‘when there may be a priority for other Government announcements’. It also forecast all light rail stops and ‘more than 80 per cent of buses’ being fitted out with card reading hardware.¹³⁴
- 3.85. Option two proposed go-live and fare collection recommencing in the week of 25 November 2024, taking into consideration the separation between the first sitting week of the 11th Assembly and the first fare free Friday to allow for ‘a desire to prioritise other announcements’. The brief also states that option two would allow for bus hardware installation to ‘reach circa 100 per cent’.¹³⁵
- 3.86. Both options discuss the installation of ticket vending machines at light rail stops, noting that these were scheduled to commence on 18 November 2024, and that the 25 November 2024 go-live day would allow for 15 out of 35 ticket vending machines to be operational.¹³⁶
- 3.87. One of the benefits highlighted in this brief stated that ministerial approval of the go-live proposals would strengthen ‘the ACT Government’s reputation in delivering on-time’ and delivering ‘products that enhance our community’.¹³⁷ The Minister for Transport endorsed the proposal to go live in the week of 25 November 2024.¹³⁸
- 3.88. On 25 November 2024, the Minister for Transport received a ministerial brief requesting that public transport fare collection commence on 27 November 2024. The critical reason for this recommendation was that public communication had already put forward 27 November 2024 as the date when the fare-free period would end and MyWay+ fare collection would commence.¹³⁹
- 3.89. The brief goes on to outline the relevant issues. These include:

¹³² Chris Steel MLA, Minister for Transport, *Committee Hansard*, 1 May 2025, p 166.

¹³³ Chris Steel MLA, Minister for Transport, *answer to QTON 017, 1 May 2025 (received 13 May 2025)*, Attachment A, p 3.

¹³⁴ Chris Steel MLA, Minister for Transport, *answer to QTON 017, 1 May 2025 (received 13 May 2025)*, Attachment A, pp 4–5.

¹³⁵ Chris Steel MLA, Minister for Transport, *answer to QTON 017, 1 May 2025 (received 13 May 2025)*, Attachment A, p 5.

¹³⁶ Chris Steel MLA, Minister for Transport, *answer to QTON 017, 1 May 2025 (received 13 May 2025)*, Attachment A, p 5.

¹³⁷ Chris Steel MLA, Minister for Transport, *answer to QTON 017, 1 May 2025 (received 13 May 2025)*, Attachment A, p 7.

¹³⁸ Chris Steel MLA, Minister for Transport, *answer to QTON 017, 1 May 2025 (received 13 May 2025)*, Attachment A, p 2.

¹³⁹ Freedom of information disclosure, reference 24-174, p. 503, https://www.cityservices.act.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0010/2827261/FOI-24-174-Disclosure-log-publication_Redacted.pdf, accessed 16 September 2025.

- 70 per cent of buses had been fitted with MyWay+ equipment. This number was expected to rise to 75 per cent in the two days before launch, with a plan for 100 per cent by 12 December 2024. The brief notes that Transport Canberra and NEC are working closely to ‘accelerate the program’.¹⁴⁰ This is lower than the ‘circa 100 per cent’ previously forecast in the brief dated 8 November 2024.
 - While validators at light rail platforms were installed, ticket vending machines were delayed with the expectation that at least some should be installed in early December 2024 and the remainder expected before 25 December 2024.¹⁴¹ Again, this is a delay from the previous expectation that vending machines installation would commence on 18 November 2024.
 - ‘Considerable testing’ by both staff and community volunteers has provided ‘assurance’ in relation to functions like charging correct fares, ‘transacting with multiple mediums’ and creating and using accounts.¹⁴²
 - 1,500 MyWay+ cards had been sold as at 22 November 2024, and ‘issues’ including ‘card stocks’ for retailers are ‘currently’ being addressed, with the contractor spending the ‘week with vendors ensuring they are trained and sufficiently stocked to sell and top up cards’.¹⁴³
- 3.90. The Minister for Transport agreed with the MyWay+ system being launched to the public on 27 November 2024.¹⁴⁴
- 3.91. PTCBR noted that it became ‘increasingly concerned about the state of MyWay+’ as launch day approached. It had previously expressed concern to Transport Canberra about validators not activating at the appropriate point on buses. One week before the public launch, PTCBR again expressed concern, this time to the Minister for Transport, that the MyWay+ application was ‘frustrating to use and lacking features’, and that users ‘could not link their credit/debit card to their account’.¹⁴⁵
- 3.92. Similarly, the Council on the Ageing ACT (COTA) sought to provide pre-launch feedback on the needs of seniors in relation to the system. COTA told the Committee that it expressed

¹⁴⁰ Freedom of information disclosure, reference 24-174, p. 504, https://www.cityservices.act.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0010/2827261/FOI-24-174-Disclosure-log-publication_Redacted.pdf, accessed 16 September 2025.

¹⁴¹ Freedom of information disclosure, reference 24-174, p. 505, https://www.cityservices.act.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0010/2827261/FOI-24-174-Disclosure-log-publication_Redacted.pdf, accessed 16 September 2025.

¹⁴² Freedom of information disclosure, reference 24-174, p. 505, https://www.cityservices.act.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0010/2827261/FOI-24-174-Disclosure-log-publication_Redacted.pdf, accessed 16 September 2025.

¹⁴³ Freedom of information disclosure, reference 24-174, p. 506, https://www.cityservices.act.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0010/2827261/FOI-24-174-Disclosure-log-publication_Redacted.pdf, accessed 16 September 2025.

¹⁴⁴ Freedom of information disclosure, reference 24-174, p. 503, https://www.cityservices.act.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0010/2827261/FOI-24-174-Disclosure-log-publication_Redacted.pdf, accessed 16 September 2025.

¹⁴⁵ Public Transport Association of Canberra (PTCBR), *Submission 104*, p 13.

frustration about important information being provided only on a website and raised its expectation that many seniors would seek to purchase a physical card.¹⁴⁶

- 3.93. The 25 November 2024 brief references feedback from community groups and others, characterising it as an ‘invaluable contribution [that] has already resulted in changes’ to the mobile app, customer portal and drivers’ console. The brief notes that ‘NEC need to be applauded for accommodating and implementing such late change’, which demonstrates NEC’s ‘agility to respond to [Transport Canberra’s] late requests’.¹⁴⁷
- 3.94. One day before the public launch, PTCBR again approached Transport Canberra as ‘it was clear that none of the substantive issues’ PTCBR had raised had been resolved. According to PTCBR, Transport Canberra officials ‘did not appear to be aware’ that basic issues such as validators not activating at bus stops, were still present.¹⁴⁸
- 3.95. PTCBR told the Committee that, on 26 November 2024, it became clear that ‘MyWay+ was not going to be launched in a ready state’, and that it was unclear why the decision to launch was made ‘with so many obvious, public-facing issues unresolved’.¹⁴⁹ Or, as stated by COTA, it appeared that the launch ‘was going to go ahead whether the system was ready or not – and clearly it was not ready’.¹⁵⁰
- 3.96. The Minister for Transport acknowledged this, stating that ‘in hindsight, certainly some elements were not as ready as they could have been’ and that a ‘slightly later commencement’ probably would have provided a better outcome.¹⁵¹

Finding 6

The Committee finds that MyWay+ was clearly not ready for launch on 27 November 2024 and that multiple stakeholders had pointed this out to the ACT Government and officials. The decision to launch anyway on that date was clearly flawed.

Finding 7

The Committee finds that the concept of minimum viable product needed to be defined at the point where the transition plan was changed, and that the lack of a clear definition and shared understanding of minimum viable product with NEC led to problems in the later stages of the delivery process.

¹⁴⁶ COTA, *Submission 109*, p 4.

¹⁴⁷ Freedom of information disclosure, reference 24-174, pp. 507-508, https://www.cityservices.act.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0010/2827261/FOI-24-174-Disclosure-log-publication_Redacted.pdf, accessed 16 September 2025.

¹⁴⁸ PTCBR, *Submission 104*, p 13.

¹⁴⁹ PTCBR, *Submission 104*, p 13.

¹⁵⁰ COTA, *Submission 109*, p 4.

¹⁵¹ Chris Steel MLA, Minister for Transport, *Committee Hansard*, 3 July 2025, p 181.

4. Launch

- 4.1. This section examines the user experience of problems that emerged following the launch of MyWay+ on 27 November 2024.

User experience

Debit cards

- 4.2. Credit and debit card payment, a key feature of the new MyWay+ system, appears to have worked reliably and consistently since the launch of MyWay+ with many passengers describing the ease and convenience of this new payment option.¹⁵²
- 4.3. Belconnen Community Council commented that MyWay+ introduced ‘long-overdue improvements to Transport Canberra’s ticketing system, particularly the ability to pay with debit and credit cards.’¹⁵³
- 4.4. PTCBR noted that ‘50 per cent of public transport trips under the MyWay+ system are now paid for using a credit/debit card’ which ‘demonstrates the clear demand for this feature’.¹⁵⁴
- 4.5. PTCBR’s only criticism of this feature was that early communications from Transport Canberra didn’t promote it strongly enough which led to an overuse of the ‘poorly conceived and incompetently implemented QR code ticketing feature’ which caused significant issues in the days and weeks after go live.¹⁵⁵

MyWay+ cards

- 4.6. Many submitters shared the difficulties they encountered trying to obtain MyWay+ cards due to the limited availability of cards at a small number of retailers¹⁵⁶ and delays in online orders.¹⁵⁷
- 4.7. PTCBR pointed out that ‘initial travel card supplies were inconsistent, causing uncertainty. This worsened during launch week, with many users lacking MyWay+ cards, awaiting delivery after online applications, or unable to obtain them from retail suppliers’.¹⁵⁸
- 4.8. On 27 November 2024 PTCBR reported in its MyWay+ updates:

There are only 30 or so retailers who offer MyWay+ cards and they are frequently selling out. Apparently they’re only getting batches of 200 or so at a time, which

¹⁵² See for example, Nicole Brown, *Submission 88*, p 3; Name withheld webform responses, *Submission 042*, p 67; Andrew Wadey, *Submission 22*, p 4.

¹⁵³ Belconnen Community Council, *Submission 62*, p 3.

¹⁵⁴ Public Transport Association of Canberra (PTCBR), *Submission 104*, p 2.

¹⁵⁵ PTCBR, *Submission 104*, p 2.

¹⁵⁶ See for example, Radha Ravi, *Committee Hansard*, 26 March 2025 p 63; Ian Robertson, *Submission 30*, 19 February 2025 p 2; Jon Lawrence, *Submission 14*, 30 January 2025, p 3; Name withheld webform responses, *Submission 42*, p 49 and p 11; Nathan Rickerby, *Submission 26*, p 2; Sarah Miller, *Submission 79*, p 2; Victor Kalkman, *Submission 31*, p 2.

¹⁵⁷ See for example, Anna Orlova, *Committee Hansard*, pp 90–91; Name withheld webform responses, *Submission 42*, pp 33–34; Name withheld, *Submission 12*, p 6.

¹⁵⁸ Public Transport Association of Canberra (PTCBR), *Submission 104*, p 13.

isn't enough when approximately 40,000 people use public transport in Canberra every day.¹⁵⁹

4.9. Similarly, COTA commented on the lack of card retailers and the limited supply of cards:

Once we looked at the website, we saw that there were not enough places distributing the MyWay+ card, and the ones that had the cards for early distribution did not have enough. They ran out of the cards, so people were doubly frustrated over the issue.¹⁶⁰

4.10. One submitter reported that they had not been able to purchase a physical MyWay+ card until more than six weeks into the launch.¹⁶¹ Jon Lawrence told the Committee that he 'had great difficulty finding a retailer with cards in stock' and 'although the list of retailers is growing, almost none of them are actually close to active bus stops'.¹⁶² COTA also noted that it would have liked to see more accessible locations for MyWay+ card sales.¹⁶³

4.11. Jonathan Campton also described difficulties in obtaining a card, stating that:

When I finally got cards from the newsagent I actually purchased a lotto ticket as it was clearly my lucky day. While my lotto ticket produced a win, the three MyWay+ cards have only produced continued headaches and disappointment.¹⁶⁴

4.12. Other submitters expressed their frustration about the considerable time taken and inconvenience incurred to obtain a card,¹⁶⁵ including when purchasing cards online.¹⁶⁶

4.13. Several submitters told the Committee they resented having to pay \$5 for a new card and felt they should have been provided free,¹⁶⁷ especially for students¹⁶⁸:

The needs for families to have to replace multiple cards at a fee lacks any consideration of cost of living. Students are by nature concessional and new student cards should have been offered for free.¹⁶⁹

4.14. For some, the lack of a physical card was compounded by other means of fare payment not functioning or being inoperable. The Australian Multicultural Action Network told the Committee that:

¹⁵⁹ PTCBR website: [MyWay+ : what's working, what's not, and what we still need to see | Public Transport Association of Canberra](#), 27 November 2024, accessed 23 October 2025.

¹⁶⁰ Jennifer Mobbs, Chief Executive Officer, COTA, *Committee Hansard*, 1 May 2025, p 145.

¹⁶¹ Name withheld webform responses, *Submission 42*, p 49.

¹⁶² Jon Lawrence, *Submission 14*, pp 2–3.

¹⁶³ Council on the Ageing, *Submission 109*, p 6.

¹⁶⁴ Jonathan Campton, *Submission 36*, 11 February, pp 3–4.

¹⁶⁵ See for example, Name withheld, *Submission 12*, p 6; Greta Nielson, *Submission 5*, p 2; COTA, *Submission 109*, p 4; Mary McDonald, *Submission 29*, p 2.

¹⁶⁶ See for example, see Name withheld webform responses, *Submission 42*, pp 33–34; Anna Orlova, *Committee Hansard*, 27 March 2025, pp 90–91; Ian Neville PSM, *Submission 54*, p 2.

¹⁶⁷ See for example, Name withheld webform responses, *Submission 42*, p 43; Omer Mohsin Mubarak, *Submission 41*, p 2; John Guilfoyle, *Submission 38*, p 2; Name withheld webform responses, *Submission 042*, p 2, p 43 and p 67.

¹⁶⁸ Name withheld webform responses, *Submission 42*, p 67.

¹⁶⁹ Jonathan Campton, *Submission 36*, p 2.

... there were no cards available on day one, and I think they were not available for a long time, which is why people had to get the app on their phone; then the app did not work. It was a case of thinking, “What do we do now? We don’t have the card and we have an app that doesn’t work in the way it is supposed to work.”¹⁷⁰

- 4.15. COTA told the Committee that its advice to Transport Canberra in November 2023 that many seniors would want a physical MyWay+ card had initially not been agreed:

Transport Canberra did not support this, thinking perhaps that Canberrans were to use a credit card or the App. In actual fact as at end of January 2025 over 53,000 physical cards have been issued.¹⁷¹

- 4.16. The ACT Government’s response to this issue came after issues emerged. In late November and early December 2024 Transport Canberra indicated in its Facebook updates that it was working with its supplier NEC to ensure that they kept up with demand for MyWay+ cards and additional retailers would be added in the coming month.¹⁷²

- 4.17. On 15 January 2025 Transport Canberra announced on its Facebook page that it had significantly increased the number of retail agents for MyWay+ card, and that there were over 60,000 cards in circulation and 100,000 available.¹⁷³

- 4.18. On 22 January 2025, Transport Canberra advised parents and guardians to avoid a last-minute rush before school returned. The delays in cards ordered online was also acknowledged on 22 January, but Transport Canberra nonetheless encouraged public transport users to continue ordering cards online.¹⁷⁴

- 4.19. NEC told the Committee that it had not expected, or been sufficiently prepared for, the demand for MyWay+ cards when the system was launched but was satisfied the problem had now been addressed:

We had not foreseen the number of people that would require cards through the retail network that we put in place. Around 27 agencies at the time were not sufficiently stocked to support that uptake. We have since addressed that and there are now close to 45 retailers across greater Canberra that support the distribution of cards, as well as the management of concessions and top-ups.¹⁷⁵

- 4.20. In March 2025 the Public Transport Association of Canberra (PTCBA) advised the Committee that while MyWay+ card availability ‘appears to have resolved’, retailer availability was still relatively limited. It noted that there were no retailers in Molonglo;

¹⁷⁰ Radha Ravi, Private capacity, *Committee Hansard*, 26 March 2025, p 63.

¹⁷¹ COTA, *Submission 109*, p 4.

¹⁷² Transport Canberra Facebook, 2 December 2024, <https://www.facebook.com/share/1RdSuKAXDJ/?mibextid=WC7FNe>, accessed 19 September 2025; 28 November 2024, <https://www.facebook.com/share/1FVyHtVRpw/?mibextid=WC7FNe>, accessed 19 September 2025.

¹⁷³ Transport Canberra Facebook, <https://www.facebook.com/share/p/1QoHmZt1Wh/?mibextid=WC7FNe> accessed 19 September 2025.

¹⁷⁴ Transport Canberra Facebook, <https://www.facebook.com/share/p/16so6djWoz/?mibextid=WC7FNe> accessed 19 September 2025.

¹⁷⁵ Mark Messenger, *Committee Hansard*, 26 March 2025, p 20.

supermarkets had not become part of the network despite earlier communications from Transport Canberra; and it was unclear why availability hadn't been extended to other retailers in the ePay network.¹⁷⁶

Finding 8

The Committee finds that poor project management led to an undersupply of MyWay+ cards and retailers, despite the ACT Government being told by stakeholders that access to cards was important.

Transitioning to MyWay+

- 4.21. Transitioning to MyWay+ involved creating a standalone MyWay+ account or using the ACT Digital Account to create a MyWay+ account. Users could then link their preferred contactless payment methods (Mastercard or Visa), register a concession (if eligible) and link a new MyWay+ travel card.¹⁷⁷
- 4.22. The MyWay+ app could be downloaded from the Google Play Store or Apple App Store, and logged into using MyWay+ account details to access functions including the ability to access accounts. The balance of an old MyWay card could be transferred to MyWay+ through the MyWay+ account using the card number on the old card.
- 4.23. Some public transport users struggled with various aspects of the process for transitioning to the new system, many finding it complex, confusing and time consuming:

I had a lot of trouble setting up my digital ACT [Government] account. My only device is a phone, which didn't help, but surely this should have been easier?¹⁷⁸

- 4.24. An experienced federal public servant experienced in IT questioned the complexity of the transitional process and pointed out the real world impacts of failure to navigate them:

I am at least familiar with technology and of a reasonable skill level to use it. If I struggled with the app and took significant time to get my account working as intended, what chance do senior citizens or those with physical, intellectual, or learning disabilities have? I am a middle class male with a family, I have a spouse who can help, our family has two cars and I have a bike - I can make other arrangements. Many of these people cannot and would not be able to use this system, leaving them stranded.¹⁷⁹

¹⁷⁶ PTCBR, *Submission 104a*, p 6.

¹⁷⁷ Transport Canberra website, <https://www.transport.act.gov.au/tickets-and-myway/account#Link%20your%20payment%20method,%20concession%20status%20and%20travel%20card> accessed 8 October 2025.

¹⁷⁸ Judith Elizabeth Dodd, *Submission 102*, p 2.

¹⁷⁹ Andrew Wadey, *Submission 22*, p 4.

- 4.25. In particular, the Committee received evidence from people who had difficulties transferring funds from their old card to their new card.¹⁸⁰
- 4.26. Brendan Halloran told the Committee that he tried numerous times to transfer funds from his legacy card, but received ‘a range of error messages’ in response. Mr Halloran tried calling the support line, ‘but gave up after waiting at least 30 minutes’. The transfer process continued to fail, and following another call to the support line, Mr Halloran was told there was an issue with his card for which Transport Canberra ‘did some sort of reset’. Mr Halloran’s balance transfer failed yet again, prompting yet another call to the support line during which he was told ‘to wait a week before trying again’. Finally, after weeks of effort and multiple calls, Mr Halloran was able to transfer his funds. He told the Committee that:

The process to transfer funds from my old card to the new was so cumbersome and tedious and so full of issues, it wouldn’t surprise me that millions of dollars remain on old accounts and people have simply given up transferring their funds.¹⁸¹

- 4.27. Andrew Bleeze shared that he also had difficulties transferring the balance from his old card to his new card and, after raising several complaints with Transport Canberra, was told a refund form would be sent to him which he never received.¹⁸²
- 4.28. Ian Robertson was of the view that ‘Transport Canberra had an obligation to contact card holders whose money they were holding and facilitate a transfer to the new MyWay+’.¹⁸³ However, the Committee notes that this would not have been possible in the case of unregistered cards and cardholders.
- 4.29. Some users found the process took multiple attempts.¹⁸⁴ Andrew Donnellan told the Committee that:

When the system launched, people were complaining that linking credit cards to your online account was working very unreliably. I remember at the time trying to link my credit card and having to try several times before the accounts linked. I do not know whether that was just a system load issue or something like that. I got a new credit card a couple of months ago and I have been trying to link that to my account ever since, and I can confirm that, as at midnight last night, I still cannot link it.¹⁸⁵

- 4.30. PTCBR reported on card linking problems on its website following launch day, stating that:

¹⁸⁰ See for example, Name withheld webform responses, *Submission 042*, p 69; David Archbold, *Submission 48*, p 2; Sally Walker, *Submission 43*, p 2.

¹⁸¹ Brendan Halloran, *Submission 55*, p 2.

¹⁸² Andrew Bleeze, *Submission 15*, pp 2-3.

¹⁸³ Ian Robertson, *Submission 30*, p 3.

¹⁸⁴ Evan Slayter, *Submission 19*, p 2.

¹⁸⁵ Andrew Donnellan, *Committee Hansard*, 26 March 2025, p 53.

Owners of iPhones are having trouble linking their bank cards to their MyWay+ account. Apparently this is because the Safari browser automatically blocks the pop-up window for the account-linking service.¹⁸⁶

- 4.31. One submitter reported that he gave up trying to link his debit card and chose just to rely on his physical MyWay+ card.¹⁸⁷ He found the video tutorials provided to be incomplete and unhelpful:

The video tutorials should have been tested with actual users and should have shown all the steps to log in and link an actual credit/debit card and confirm success.¹⁸⁸

- 4.32. The Australian Multicultural Action Network also commented on the online credit card linking process:

The online facility for linking the MyWay+ system to credit card payments is overly complex and not user-friendly. Many users have reported difficulty navigating the interface, resulting in incomplete or failed registrations. This has become a major barrier to adoption for those who rely on digital payment options.¹⁸⁹

- 4.33. PTCBR reiterated some of the evidence the Committee heard from users about their difficult experiences setting up their accounts:

The online account transfer process was complex and confusing, requiring multiple logins and causing delays in balance updates on MyWay+ cards and linked payment cards. Balance transfer functionality was then withdrawn for several days shortly after MyWay+ was launched without any explanation.¹⁹⁰

- 4.34. Several submitters also reported difficulties registering and accessing their concessions.¹⁹¹ Alexandra Vickery told the Committee that although she was able to register her student concession she had tried unsuccessfully to help others, some of whom just gave up and accepted the adult fares.¹⁹²

- 4.35. The setup process posed particular challenges for seniors and those with less familiarity with, or with less access to, technology and digital services. COTA told the Committee that seniors really struggled with setting up accounts when all the information was online.¹⁹³

- 4.36. Roy William Lupton told the Committee that the registration process was not simple or intuitive:

¹⁸⁶ PTCBR website, [MyWay+ : what's working, what's not, and what we still need to see | Public Transport Association of Canberra](#), accessed 24 September 2025.

¹⁸⁷ Name withheld webform responses, *Submission 42*, pp 17-18.

¹⁸⁸ Name withheld webform responses, *Submission 42*, pp 17-18.

¹⁸⁹ Australian Multicultural Action Network, *Submission 4*, p 2.

¹⁹⁰ Public Transport Association of Canberra, *Submission 104*, p 13.

¹⁹¹ See for example, Harry Morgan, *Submission 2*, p 2; Alexandra Vickery, *Committee Hansard*, 27 March 2025, p 88; Alex Vickery, *Submission 39*, p 2; Name withheld webform responses, *Submission 42*, pp 23-24.

¹⁹² Alexandra Vickery, *Committee Hansard*, 27 March 2025, p 88.

¹⁹³ Jennifer Mobbs, Chief Executive Officer, COTA, *Committee Hansard*, 1 May 2025, p 147.

I challenge you to hand out MyWay cards to 20 or 30 pensioner volunteers and watch them while they go through the registration process.¹⁹⁴

- 4.37. Madeleine Harwood told the Committee that she tried to get assistance from Transport Canberra but the wait times were long:

.....because I am a worker and a full time employee, I could never actually get through to try and set it up. I persevered for over a week to try and work out how to create a digital account. I downloaded the app. I tried to use the app to make a digital account, but the app actually had something wrong with its functionality where you cannot actually create the digital account through the app even though it says you can. Then you have to go through a web page. It was a mess.¹⁹⁵

- 4.38. COTA told the Committee there was insufficient customer service capacity and training to assist people with things they were struggling with such as balance transfers and refunds.¹⁹⁶ COTA reported a huge influx of requests for assistance from many seniors when they could not get hold of Transport Canberra or received inconsistent information.¹⁹⁷

- 4.39. On launch day, issues with accessing MyWay+ accounts through the ACT Digital Account Pathway were reported. The ACT Government advised that ‘this was identified to be a capacity issue within the MyWay+ system due to the server load balancing not being set to automatic, thus not adjusting the capacity of the system to accommodate shifts in demand, particularly during peak travel period’. According to Transport Canberra this issue was resolved on the same day.¹⁹⁸

- 4.40. Users also encountered various other issues getting set up in the new MyWay+ system due to system errors, technical and reliability issues, many of which have subsequently been rectified. Some examples are listed below:

*Logged out of the app and have never been able to get back into it - EVER! Recover password codes never come. The sheer lack of structured help information on the internet is truly hard to believe. Contacted the 13 17 10 line and I learnt that my firstname.lastname is my username and not my email address that I signed up with. Still, this information is not on the Internet as an FAQ. A total of 3 phone calls totalling 1 hour to 13 17 10 and they still can't explain why my account won't allow me to reset a password. BTW I experienced various levels of staff knowledge on each call.*¹⁹⁹

Moving my MyWay account to MyWay+ on a desktop was a nightmare.

...When I thought it would be ready, just a few weeks ago, I found the website to be one of the clumsiest, most user-hateful of the modern era. A task I

¹⁹⁴ Roy William Lupton, *Submission 23*, p 2.

¹⁹⁵ Madeleine Harwood, *Committee Hansard*, 26 March 2025, pp 69-70.

¹⁹⁶ Council on the Ageing (COTA), *Submission 109*, pp 4-5.

¹⁹⁷ COTA, *Submission 109*, pp 4-5.

¹⁹⁸ ACT Government, *Submission 59*, Attachment B, p 1.

¹⁹⁹ Andrew Hutt, *Submission 20*, p 2.

thought would be a few minutes took well over an hour, as fields I had filled in were reset if I changed something unrelated, passwords were always invisible (guys, this is 2025...) and instructions were ambiguous at best.

*Having got the desktop account fully functional, and transferred my MyWay balance to MyWay+, I then went about setting up the mobile app. Brand new phone (Samsung S25). First day, everything worked fine. Next time I turned my phone on, it told me my card had "expired". Checking my balance *in the same app* I'm told the card is not only alive and well, but has a balance of \$40. However, I can't use the app because one half of the app thinks my card has "expired"²⁰⁰*

I haven't had a chance to use the account. There was problem with the setup of my account and I am unable to log into the account as yet. I contact the help line and was advised that it would take 2 weeks to fix the issue. It has now been 4 weeks and I am still waiting for the problem to be corrected. Not really sure how to escalate the problem either.²⁰¹

.....I was unable to add credit to my MyWay+ card using funds transfer or card payment, due to some inexplicable technical glitch - I have been told I have to go to a shopfront to add credit to my card. I have still not been able to get to a shopfront, so am effectively denied access to the public transport system.²⁰²

I've encountered several problems in the short time since the rollout. These include: - Connecting my card to my concession entitlement; this was difficult to begin with as it required several steps to make it through the app, to the portal, and finally to the correct page. Furthermore, my preferred bank card was not accepted initially by the system (although this has now been rectified).²⁰³

MyWay+ App and customer portal

- 4.41. User feedback received by the Committee in relation to the MyWay+ app and web portal was resoundingly negative. Users reported that both platforms initially failed to meet expectations in terms of functionality, useability and design.²⁰⁴
- 4.42. Immediately after launch the app was unstable and unreliable.²⁰⁵ Users reported frequent crashes,²⁰⁶ logouts and login failures.²⁰⁷ Andrew Donnellan, a user tester noted:

²⁰⁰ John Storey, *Submission 85*, pp 2-3

²⁰¹ Vanessa Lester, *Submission 37*, p 2.

²⁰² Andrew Bleeze, *Submission 15*, pp 2-3.

²⁰³ Harry Morgan, *Submission 58*, p 2

²⁰⁴ See for example, Sally Walker, *Submission 43*, p 2; Sarah Miller, *Submission 79*, p 3; Tina Smith, *Submission 75*, p 2; Cameron Gosley, *Submission 21*, p 3.

²⁰⁵ Sarah Miller, *Submission 79*, p 2.

²⁰⁶ Name withheld webform responses, *Submission 42*, p 71.

²⁰⁷ See for example, Name withheld webform responses, *Submission 42*, p 13 and 62.

The system did not appear to have had a great deal of thought put into how those users interact with it.... there was also the reliability issues that it faced when the launch day came around.²⁰⁸

- 4.43. Some users described the design and user interface as unintuitive and clunky.²⁰⁹ PTCBR went further:

It is a very ugly piece of software. It is a very ugly user interface. It is not intuitive. It is not fun to use. It is not easy to use. So, straight off the bat, we knew something was deeply wrong with this.²¹⁰

- 4.44. The Belconnen Community Council told the Committee that the app was too complicated:

It should be simple and easy to use. Because there are so many features in there, it makes it complicated, harder to learn and harder to understand how to use it. When all the features do not work, it is impossible to know how it is meant to work. It should just be a simple matter of opening it up and using it straightaway.²¹¹

- 4.45. Other witnesses commented on functional limitations of the app including incorrect or unhelpful information²¹² confusing route planning and sorting of transport methods,²¹³ glitchy maps and bus times that were difficult to interact with,²¹⁴ inaccurate platform information,²¹⁵ missing journey and transaction history,²¹⁶ and difficulties locating bus routes and where buses are.²¹⁷

- 4.46. The journey planning function appears to have been particularly unusable for many witnesses to this inquiry. Users described the planner as ‘time consuming and difficult to use’,²¹⁸ ‘user-unfriendly’,²¹⁹ ‘cumbersome and unhelpful’,²²⁰ ‘offers all sorts of irrelevancies and doesn't filter well’²²¹ and providing ‘erroneous advice including not displaying all route options or suggesting circuitous journeys.’²²²

- 4.47. One user noted that the journey planner’s default was to sort by the healthiest modes of transport. As a result, in planning a trip from the city to Tuggeranong, the top three results were an almost five hour walk, a 20.9 kilometre bicycle ride, and a 16 minutes motorcycle

²⁰⁸ Andrew Donnellan, *Committee Hansard*, 26 March 2025, p 51.

²⁰⁹ See for example, Sarah Miller, *Submission 79*, p 2; Edward Seychelles, *Submission 034*, p 2.

²¹⁰ Ryan Hemsley, Chair, Public Transport Association of Canberra, *Committee Hansard*, 26 March 2025, p 9.

²¹¹ Lachlan Butler, Chair, Belconnen Community Council, *Committee Hansard*, 27 March 2025, p 95.

²¹² Name withheld webform responses, *Submission 042*, p 41.

²¹³ Alex Vickery, *Submission 39*, p 2.

²¹⁴ Andrew Wadey, *Submission 22*, p 3.

²¹⁵ Andrew Wadey, *Submission 022*, p 3.

²¹⁶ Public Transport Association of Canberra, *Submission 104*, pp 6-7.

²¹⁷ Tony Hill, *Submission 101*, p 3.

²¹⁸ Mark Dando, *Submission 64*, p 3.

²¹⁹ Name withheld, *Submission 1*, pp 2-3.

²²⁰ Name withheld, *Submission 12*, p 5.

²²¹ Name withheld, *Submission 108*, p 4.

²²² Bill Gemmell, *Submission 57*, p 4.

ride. This user noted that this could have been avoided by considering user needs before the launch,²²³ and was particularly scathing of the decision:

The 'sorted by healthiest' as the default sort in the real-time journey planner reeks of a bureaucrat who has read up on nudge theory and thought they had a clever idea to push citizens towards better health choices and lower emissions transit. Instead they have simply made public transport more difficult to use. I just want to know when the bus is coming.²²⁴

- 4.48. Sebastian Stallard told the Committee that 'the app suggests absurd trips such as walking 10+ kilometres along a freeway, rather than public transport'.²²⁵ Andrew Donnellan noted that 'it will happily tell you to do, for example, an 8 hour walk from Tuggeranong to Gungahlin over any practical option'.²²⁶
- 4.49. For Mark Dando, at launch 'the default transport solution promoted was the fastest, which may have been private car or motorcycle'.²²⁷ He posed a question raised by other submitters²²⁸ – 'Why would a public transport app's users want to see non-public transport options first'?²²⁹
- 4.50. One user said it was a tool 'clearly designed by people who do not use public transport'.²³⁰
- 4.51. PTCBR considered the system elements to be 'unsalvageable' and 'in need of complete redesign'.²³¹ Similarly, Shaun Fulham described a 'horrible [user experience] for both the app and web portal'²³² and recommended a 'complete rewrite' of both with user experience in mind.²³³
- 4.52. Evidence to the inquiry also said there was a lack of integration of account management within the app.²³⁴ PTCBR told the Committee that one of its key concerns was that accessing your MyWay+ account from the MyWay+ app required multiple logins and a redirection to the MyWay+ web portal.²³⁵ Kaab Qureshi suggested that all MyWay+ functionality should be added to the app directly,²³⁶ while Tony Hill identified basic features that he said should be available in the app rather than being sent to the portal, including 'the amount of money available in an account' and account top ups.²³⁷

²²³ Name withheld, *Submission 12*, p 1.

²²⁴ Name withheld, *Submission 12*, p 2.

²²⁵ Sebastian Stallard, *Submission 86*, p 2.

²²⁶ Andrew Donnellan, *Submission 105*, p 11.

²²⁷ Mark Dando, *Submission 64*, p 3.

²²⁸ See for example, Public Transport Association of Canberra, *Submission 104*, p 7; Name withheld, *Submission 1*, pp 2-3; Andrew Donnellan, *Submission 105*, p 11.

²²⁹ Mark Dando, *Submission 64*, p 3.

²³⁰ Name withheld, *Submission 12*, p 5.

²³¹ Public Transport Association of Canberra, *Submission 104*, pp 6-7.

²³² Shaun Fulham, *Submission 78*, p 2.

²³³ Shaun Fulham, *Submission 78*, p 3.

²³⁴ Name withheld webform responses, *Submission 42*, p 68.

²³⁵ Public Transport Association of Canberra, *Submission 104*, pp 6-7.

²³⁶ Kaab Qureshi, *Submission 25*, p 3.

²³⁷ Tony Hill, *Submission 101*, p 3.

- 4.53. According to Andrew Wadey, the lack of some features on the app ‘shows that very little thought has been put into the actual usability of the app’. Mr Wadey told the Committee that:

Low balance alerts are impossible using this system set up. It seems to have been designed around what information was easiest to implement in an app, not what information users are most likely to use or need. What's the point of knowing when the next bus is coming if my account is in negative and I can't use it? Most-used information and the order of display of information is basic user interface design.²³⁸

- 4.54. The feedback received on the MyWay+ portal was similarly negative. Andrew Donnellan raised an extensive list of concerns about the design and useability of the MyWay+ account portal:

Items are arranged illogically. Various graphic elements are in strange locations. My favourite discovery during the initial launch was the worst attempt at a captcha that I have ever seen: some JavaScript that generates a random number, then injects it as text on the page with a random font size, making it look kind of like a real captcha but serving absolutely no purpose. This has thankfully been fixed, but is indicative of the quality of the web portal engineering work more broadly.²³⁹

- 4.55. PTCBR noted that ‘the passenger experience of these public-facing elements of the system is poor, and will continue to be poor until significant changes are made that put the needs of the passenger front and centre’.²⁴⁰
- 4.56. Transport Canberra highlighted that changes to the layout and formatting of the account portal were made in response to feedback it received from users.²⁴¹ Additionally, it undertook to continue to improve individual users’ experience.²⁴²

Committee comment

- 4.57. Elements of the app and website design, such as features resembling CAPTCHA that did not serve the security purposes of CAPTCHA, were poorly considered. IT and phone support provided was slow and insufficient to assist customers. These have all had a negative impact on many users and have had a particularly negative impact on those who should have received concessional fares and paid full fare, and on seniors.

Finding 9

The Committee finds that MyWay+ accounts, the app and website were poorly designed and did not work properly.

²³⁸ Andrew Wadey, *Submission 22*, pp 3-4.

²³⁹ Andrew Donnellan, *Submission 105*, pp 5-6.

²⁴⁰ Public Transport Association of Canberra, *Submission 104*, pp 6-7.

²⁴¹ ACT Government, *Submission 59*, pp 12-13.

²⁴² ACT Government, *Submission 59*, Attachment B, p 5.

Group accounts

- 4.58. Parents, carers and community organisations expressed frustration and disappointment that MyWay+ did not offer the ability to manage multiple cards within a single account.²⁴³
- 4.59. Without group account functionality parents either needed to purchase MyWay+ travel cards for their children, in short supply after the launch of the system, or set up separate accounts with unique email addresses for each child.
- 4.60. Many parents and carers were of the view that this was impractical and too complicated:
- Needing an email address for my 6 year old to have his own card seems unnecessarily complicated. The advice from the card vendor that I could use the app is even less helpful - what 6 year old has their own phone?!?²⁴⁴
- 4.61. One submitter was of the view that parents should not be forced to create digital accounts for children with unique email addresses and it should be possible for parents to use their accounts to manage their children as dependents.²⁴⁵
- 4.62. A grandparent told the Committee that she didn't want to set up accounts for her grandchildren who did not have email addresses, she just wanted 'to be able to monitor what funds they have left on their cards'.²⁴⁶
- 4.63. Another submitter pointed out the difficulty in having children rely on their device being charged and working.²⁴⁷
- 4.64. The Committee heard that the lack of a 'group account' feature and the lack of a reliable and manageable system for children's transport caused considerable stress and uncertainty for parent and students.²⁴⁸
- 4.65. Jonathan Campton told the Committee that Transport Canberra should have been communicating with schools about the changes and provided free cards to replace existing ones.²⁴⁹ He considered that public transport should be free to all school children until families can properly manage their children's accounts.²⁵⁰
- 4.66. Dr Amy Jelacic from the Public Transport Association of Canberra acknowledged the considerable impact on families:
- We know that school drop off is a real horror show around many schools, and families around the community do not feel particularly confident about using MyWay+ as a family and how they administer a card for their children. We know that group-based or family-based ticketing is a feature that will be incoming,

²⁴³ See for example, Omer Moshin Mubarak, *Submission 41*, pp 3-4; Pat Tandy, *Submission 93*, p 3.

²⁴⁴ Andrew Wadey, *Submission 22*, p 4.

²⁴⁵ Name withheld webform responses, *Submission 42*, p 15.

²⁴⁶ Pat Tandy, *Submission 93*, p 3.

²⁴⁷ Gill Smile, *Submission 46*, p 2.

²⁴⁸ See for example, Jonathan Campton, *Submission 36*, p 3-4; Liana Harrington, *Submission 10*, p 2.

²⁴⁹ Jonathan Campton, *Submission 36*, p 3.

²⁵⁰ Jonathan Campton, *Submission 36*, p 3.

but....., the uncertainty that that creates is something extremely impactful that is very hard to repair or walk back from.²⁵¹

- 4.67. The ACT Council of Parents and Citizens Association (the Council) noted that parents are required to manage the interim process and later set up a group account when this functionality becomes available which is ‘an unnecessary burden.’²⁵²
- 4.68. The Council also noted that ‘A more robust consultation process would have identified this as a critical feature and recommended delaying the rollout until all core functions were operational’.²⁵³
- 4.69. In late February 2025, the ACT Government told the Committee that a new ‘Group Account’ function would allow users to link secondary accounts to the main account to centralise payment methods and travel history. This function was listed as ‘In Progress (Testing)’ with a target completion date of the first quarter of 2025.²⁵⁴
- 4.70. In late March 2025, the Minister for Transport stated that a due diligence review of this functionality was underway with selected account holders which would inform the timing of the functionality going live.²⁵⁵
- 4.71. In early April 2025, the Minister advised that group accounts were not considered to be a key functionality in the development of the MyWay+ system:

The Group Account Functionality is considered additional functionality (i.e was not included in the ‘original scope of work’ at the time of contract execution.....Group Accounts will provide another option for how people manage MyWay+ accounts (e.g payment methods and travel history) through a centralised ‘primary’ account.’²⁵⁶

- 4.72. NEC advised the Committee in May 2025 that it had finished its own testing of the group account function and was waiting for Transport Canberra to complete its testing:

Transport Canberra are now managing a process where they have a test group that has access to the feature to test it in the real world. We look forward to their feedback so that we can finalise the feature and make it available to the broader community. It will be Transport Canberra’s decision as to when it will ultimately be launched, but we are supporting them by delivering it as quickly as we can’.²⁵⁷

- 4.73. In May 2025 the ACT Government provided an update to the Committee on unresolved issues and system improvements scheduled to be implemented in the first quarter of 2025.²⁵⁸ The update noted that the availability of the group accounts function had been pushed back to the second quarter of 2025:

²⁵¹ Dr Amy Jelacic, Deputy Chair, Public Transport Association of Canberra, *Committee Hansard*, 26 March 205, p 12.

²⁵² ACT Council of Parents and Citizens Association, *Submission 13*, p 3.

²⁵³ ACT Council of Parents and Citizens Association, *Submission 13*, p 3.

²⁵⁴ ACT Government, *Submission 59*, Attachment B, p 6.

²⁵⁵ Chris Steel MLA, Minister for Transport, *answer to QON 012, 3 April 2025* (received 10 April 2025), p 1.

²⁵⁶ Chris Steel MLA, Minister for Transport, *answer to QON 012, 3 April 2025* (received 10 April 2025), p 1.

²⁵⁷ Ms Kylie Gorham, Senior Product Manager, NEC Australia, *Committee Hansard*, 26 March 2025, p 24.

²⁵⁸ ACT Government, *Submission 059.1*, Attachment A, pp 1-5.

The availability of this function has been pushed back in order to implement web accessibility improvements to customer-facing element within the portal, based on recommendations from the first stage of the GSA review. It is anticipated this function will become available in the coming months.²⁵⁹

- 4.74. At the time of writing this report the Transport Canberra website indicated that group account functionality will be available in the coming months.²⁶⁰

Finding 10

The Committee finds that group accounts are a core feature for families and are essential to ensure that children can catch the bus and these should have been operational on launch day.

Ticket vending machines

- 4.75. As noted above, MyWay+ was launched prior to the full deployment of ticket vending machines (TVMs). Many public transport users believed that TVMs should have been installed before launch and expressed disappointment and frustration at the lack of access to a TVM where they could top up their MyWay+ cards, check card balances and purchase paper tickets.²⁶¹
- 4.76. PTCBR noted that promised TVMs at light rail stations and bus interchanges were not available on launch and remained unavailable as of late February 2025.²⁶² It commented that lack of access to TVMs created barriers for passengers especially those who preferred or relied on physical infrastructure rather than digital platforms.²⁶³
- 4.77. According to COTA, Transport Canberra had provided assurances that paper ticket options would be available at launch, paper tickets at TVMs were still widely unavailable in March 2025.²⁶⁴
- 4.78. Transport Canberra acknowledged these delays, noting in late February 2025 that ‘all units have now been delivered and fitted out for the new system’ with installation to occur ‘following independent certification of the units’.²⁶⁵
- 4.79. On 30 April 2025, Transport Canberra told the Committee that independent certification has been received and installation was scheduled to be completed by the end of May

²⁵⁹ ACT Government, *Submission 059.1*, Attachment A, p 3.

²⁶⁰ Transport Canberra website, MyWay+ Account: [Tickets & MyWay+ - Transport Canberra](#), accessed 23 October 2025.

²⁶¹ See for example, Ian Robertson, *Submission 30*, p 3; Tangyao Zhang, *Submission 82*, p 2; Jason Barnes, *Submission 47*, p 2; Andrew Gruber, *Submission 17*, p 3; Name withheld webform responses, *Submission 42*, p 2, p 13, p 20, p 44, pp 54-55, p 64.

²⁶² Public Transport Association of Canberra, *Submission 104*, p 13.

²⁶³ Public Transport Association of Canberra, *Submission 104*, p 13.

²⁶⁴ Council on the Ageing ACT, *Submission 109*, p 4.

²⁶⁵ ACT Government, *Submission 59*, Attachment B, pp 5-6.

2025.²⁶⁶ On 23 May 2025, the Minister for Transport noted a further delay, with installation expected to be complete in the first week of June 2025.²⁶⁷

- 4.80. On 3 July 2025, the Minister for Transport noted that two TVMs – located at the Woden and City bus interchanges, have problems with water ingress. The Minister told the Committee that ‘NEC Australia is working with their overseas supplier to provide onsite attendance to resolve this issue. This work is being prioritised and will be completed soon’.²⁶⁸
- 4.81. As at 10 October 2025, the Transport Canberra website stated that ticket machines at the City bus interchange platform 4 and the Woden temporary bus interchange platform 6 will be ‘operational soon’.²⁶⁹ According to the website, cashless TVMs are available at:
- Gungahlin Place bus interchange - platform 4;
 - Westfield Belconnen bus interchange - inside the shopping centre entrance off Lathlain Street;
 - Tuggeranong bus interchange - between platforms 3 and 8;
 - Canberra Airport - next to the baggage claim area; and
 - all light rail stops.²⁷⁰

Finding 11

The Committee finds that the decision to launch MyWay+ without providing proper coverage and access to ticket machines was flawed.

In-app ticketing

- 4.82. The QR code (MyWay+ pass (in-app ticket)) is a digital ticket that can be used by MyWay+ account holders to pay for bus and light rail services. Users open the MyWay+ app, select the MyWay+ pass option and a QR will be displayed that can be scanned on the QR reader located on MyWay+ validators on board buses or at light rail stations.²⁷¹
- 4.83. The use of this method was met with widespread criticism and posed significant operational challenges for public transport users.²⁷² Many witnesses questioned the choice of the technology and recommended that it be completely removed or replaced.²⁷³

²⁶⁶ ACT Government, *Supplementary Submission 59.1*, p 14.

²⁶⁷ Chris Steel MLA, Minister for Transport, *answer to QON 39, 13 May 2025* (received 23 May 2025).

²⁶⁸ Chris Steel MLA, Minister for Transport, *answer to QON 53, 4 July 2025* (received 14 July 2025).

²⁶⁹ Transport Canberra website, [Ticket vending machines - Transport Canberra](#), accessed 10 October 2025

²⁷⁰ Transport Canberra website, [Ticket vending machines - Transport Canberra](#), accessed 10 October 2025.

²⁷¹ Transport Canberra website, <https://www.transport.act.gov.au/tickets-and-myway/ways-to-pay>, accessed 9 October 2025.

²⁷² See for example, Alex Vickery, *Submission 039*, p 2; Anne Rowlands, *Submission 32*, p 2; Cameron Gosley, *Submission 21*, pp 2-3; Name withheld webform responses, *Submission 42*, p 13, 43, 68;

²⁷³ Karen Mobbs, *Submission 94*, p 2; Oliver Hulin, *Submission 50*, p 3; Sarah Miller, *Submission 79*, p 3; Sebastian Stallard, *Submission 86*, p 2; Belconnen Community Council, *Submission 62*, p 4; James Manwaring, *Submission 40*, p 2; Name withheld webform responses, *Submission 42*, p 64; Nick Dowling, *Submission 18*, p 3; Nicole Brown, *Submission 88*, p 3.

- 4.84. Intended to be another account-based, digital payment option, its implementation revealed significant usability and reliability issues. Users reported that on launch day QR codes failed to scan meaning they could not be used to tap on and off. One of the reasons for this was the QR codes were originally too large to be easily scanned.²⁷⁴
- 4.85. Witnesses also reported that when they tried to scan a QR code the reader picked up or activated their credit card and digital phone wallet.²⁷⁵ One witness told the Committee that if a phone was held too close to the NFC reader, the reader would detect it and cause people to unintentionally tap with their credit/debit card.²⁷⁶
- 4.86. NEC explained that although the digital wallet opens, it does not lead to any interaction with the person's credit card.²⁷⁷ However, guidance on how to scan QR codes on the Transport Canberra website, accessed in October 2025, advises that inadvertent interaction between a validator and a user's credit card may occur when scanning a QR code:

Please note if you're using an iPhone to scan on and off, avoid holding your phone too close to the contactless payment icon. If you do, the contactless payment may be automatically activated. This could result in being charged twice through the QR code scanner and contactless payment if you unlocked your iPhone by scanning your FaceID or typing your passcode.²⁷⁸

- 4.87. More generally, many public transport users found that QR codes were difficult to use and that effective guidance was lacking.
- 4.88. Anna Orlova, a digital accessibility specialist, told the Committee there was nothing on the validator to explain where to position your phone to scan the code and there was no visual or audible to indicate a successful scan.²⁷⁹ Another witness shared this view:

It defies belief that someone could have thought it acceptable or a good idea to have no indication on the reader devices of how to use one of the promoted options to pay.²⁸⁰

- 4.89. Similarly, Bill Gemmell told the Committee that there was 'no dedicated signage or tray for placing the device so the onboard equipment can reliably read the code.'²⁸¹
- 4.90. Some witnesses reported that the QR code was overly sensitive. One told the Committee that '...the scanners have issues when the sunlight hits phone screens and the phone needs to be placed in such a way that leave little room for movement'.²⁸² Lilly Platt commented that 'the QR code wouldn't work unless it was held in exactly the right

²⁷⁴ Andrew Donnellan, *Submission 105*, p 6.

²⁷⁵ Anna Orlova, *Committee Hansard*, 27 March 2025, p 90; Ms Harwood, *Committee Hansard*, 26 March 2025, p 69; Name withheld webform responses, *Submission 42*, p 64.

²⁷⁶ Name withheld webform responses, *Submission 42*, p 64.

²⁷⁷ Kylie Gorham, Senior Product Manager, NEC Australia, *Committee Hansard*, 1 May 2025, p 131.

²⁷⁸ Transport Canberra website, [Scanning QR codes - Transport Canberra](#), accessed 9 October 2025.

²⁷⁹ Anna Orlova, *Committee Hansard*, 27 March 2025, p 90.

²⁸⁰ Name withheld, *Submission 1*, p 2.

²⁸¹ Bill Gemmell, *Submission 57*, p 4.

²⁸² Name withheld webform responses, *Submission 42*, p 13.

angle’.²⁸³ Madeleine Harwood told the Committee that like any QR code it had to be read and many things can affect that:

.....if the shadows are incorrect on the screen—I have sat there with my hands around my screen, tilting it, lifting it up a little bit, lifting it down a little bit. I have probably at times stood there for maybe two minutes to try and get this QR code to actually scan. Again, I have given up on the back of the bus because if it is not the right distance, and if it is not scanned perfectly, it will not work.²⁸⁴

4.91. Several witnesses told the Committee that the QR code payment option was overly complicated. Mark Dando described it as a ‘complicated and high-risk niche option’.²⁸⁵ He thought the fact that Transport Canberra advised users on its Facebook page to take a tutorial to learn how to scan the code was evidence that it was not fit for purpose.²⁸⁶

4.92. PTCBR also felt the QR code was far too complicated:

....it is never going to provide that seamless, low-cognitive activity that people really need when they are actually just wanting to pay for their public transport fare. The fare payment itself should be the simplest component of a public transport journey. The QR code complicates that needlessly.²⁸⁷

4.93. The Committee heard that people abandoned the QR code in favour of physical MyWay+ cards or bank cards,²⁸⁸ or only persisted with it for long enough to use up previous MyWay card credit.²⁸⁹

4.94. Several submitters thought the QR code should be replaced with a ‘contactless NFC payment integrated with platform wallets’²⁹⁰, a digital wallet MyWay card²⁹¹ or being able to add your MyWay+ card to your digital wallet such as Google Wallet or Apple Pay.²⁹²

4.95. Some of the QR code issues that were present upon the launch of the system, including issues with QR code size and scannability, were solved or improved quickly to improve scan rates. The ACT Government reported that the issue of QR codes not generating was resolved on 27 November 2024 and the issue of QR codes expiring too quickly was resolved by extending the expiry period by early January 2025.²⁹³

4.96. The ACT Government reported that ‘a number of improvements to the in-app QR code and in-built reader on validators have been implemented to improve, as best possible, the scanning performance of the QR code from a technical perspective’.²⁹⁴

²⁸³ Lilly Platt, *Submission 69*, p 2.

²⁸⁴ Madeleine Harwood, *Committee Hansard*, 26 March 2025, pp 72-73.

²⁸⁵ Mark Dando, *Submission 64*, p 5.

²⁸⁶ Mark Dando, *Submission 64*, p 2.

²⁸⁷ Ryan Hemsley, Chair, Public Transport Association of Canberra, *Committee Hansard*, 26 March 2025 p, 13.

²⁸⁸ Anne Rowlands, *Submission 032*, p 2; Andrew Hutt, *Submission 20*, p 3; Bruce Pittard, *Submission 049*, p 3.

²⁸⁹ Bruce Pittard, *Submission 49*, p 3; John Guilfoyle, *Submission 38*, pp 2-3.

²⁹⁰ Andrew Donnellan, *Submission 105*, p 6.

²⁹¹ James Manwaring, *Submission 40*, p 2; Name withheld webform responses, *Submission 42*, p 64.

²⁹² Shaun Fulham, *Committee Hansard*, 26 March 2025, p 30; Patrick Reid, *Committee Hansard*, 26 March 2025, p 37.

²⁹³ ACT Government, *Submission 59*, Attachment B, pp 2-3; Kylie Gorham, NEC, *Committee Hansard*, 26 March 2025, p 22.

²⁹⁴ ACT Government, *Supplementary submission 059.1*, p 3.

- 4.97. It noted that outstanding issues would continue to be addressed through customer education and encouraging behavioural change.²⁹⁵ User feedback indicated that QR codes have been more reliable in 2025, but still erratic.²⁹⁶
- 4.98. Transport Canberra acknowledged the limitations of the QR code as a payment method and indicated that it was considering alternatives:
- QR codes represent the least efficient payment method in MyWay+ and account for less than 9% of all transactions. Given this, Transport Canberra are investigating alternative payment options available under the contract, including functions provided through digital wallet services or a MyWay+ Near Field Communication (NFC) travel token.²⁹⁷
- 4.99. Andrew Donnellan stated that the inclusion of QR codes as a method of payment was ‘bizarre’,²⁹⁸ while John Dow told the Committee that ‘the idea that a QR code in a busy public transport system is convenient or even workable’ is ‘laughable’.²⁹⁹
- 4.100. All of this left many witnesses questioning why the QR code technology was chosen for inclusion in the new system in the first place and why it was so heavily emphasised and promoted.³⁰⁰ PTCBR argued that this ‘feature has to go’.³⁰¹

Finding 12

The Committee finds that offering a QR code payment option on a busy public transport system was a questionable choice showing poor judgment and that the QR code available at launch performed extremely poorly.

Accessibility

- 4.101. Digital accessibility company CANAXESS undertook a partial accessibility audit of the MyWay+ website following its launch and found serious accessibility defects. These included medium and high severity accessibility defects on both the sign up and login pages for MyWay+ that, according to CANAXESS, ‘effectively shuts out disabled passengers using the website’.³⁰²
- 4.102. Specifically, the CANAXESS accessibility audit found that both the pages it examined did not meet the technical criteria for building websites contained in the Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG). This further meant that the pages ‘did not follow Government

²⁹⁵ ACT Government, *Submission 59*, Attachment B, pp 2-3.

²⁹⁶ Peter Enzerink, *Submission 45*, p 2.

²⁹⁷ ACT Government, *Submission 059*, Attachment B, p 3; Chris Steel MLA, Minister for Transport, *answer to QON 15*, 3 April 2025 (received 7 April 2025), p 1.

²⁹⁸ Andrew Donnellan, *Submission 105*, p 6.

²⁹⁹ John Dow, *Submission 6*, p 2.

³⁰⁰ Name withheld webform responses, *Submission 42*, p 47; Andrew Donnellan, *Submission 105*, p 6.

³⁰¹ Ryan Hemsley, Chair, Public Transport Association of Canberra, *Committee Hansard*, 26 March 2025, p 13.

³⁰² CANAXESS, *Submission 11*, pp 1-2.

accessibility policy’ as outlined in the ACT Government Web Accessibility Policy.³⁰³ The result of these defects was that public transport users with vision impairments would be unable to use key input fields such as entering their name, password, email address and mobile number while using a screen reader and thus unable to perform simple tasks like loading value onto MyWay+ cards.³⁰⁴

- 4.103. CANAXESS concluded that given compliance with WCAG was an explicit part of the contract with NEC, the vendor has not followed the WCAG guidelines and Transport Canberra had not independently assessed the accessibility of the website.³⁰⁵ Furthermore, CANAXESS noted that it had assessed only two pages of the MyWay+ website and that if both were not accessible, it indicates that all the pages and the app have similar problems.³⁰⁶
- 4.104. Anna Orlova similarly found that the MyWay+ app and web portal both had ‘multiple barriers for people with disabilities and people who use assistive technology’. Specifically, Ms Orlova noted that people who use a screen reader were effectively blocked from using the portal on a mobile device. They would be unable to top up a card, link a card, set up an automatic top up, buy a card, or apply for a concession. In Ms Orlova’s view, this was an indication that accessibility had not been considered as the project was being developed.³⁰⁷
- 4.105. CANAXESS also discussed the lack of audio announcements on buses, noting that vision impaired travellers would not know where they were and would need to ‘rely on the passengers around’ them for assistance.³⁰⁸
- 4.106. CANAXESS told the Committee that given people with disabilities such as visual impairments ‘often have fewer opportunities to travel and have limited funds’, they ‘would rely on public transport more’.³⁰⁹ As noted by Ms Orlova, approximately one in five Canberrans identify as living with a disability and want to live independently.³¹⁰ Heather Fitzpatrick, who is vision impaired, found that attempting to set up her MyWay+ account via the website was ‘clunky and not easy’ and that she had to call Transport Canberra for assistance.³¹¹
- 4.107. According to CANAXESS, not only does this make it harder to use public transport, but ‘more broadly, it does not instil confidence in government services’. When mechanisms intended to make things accessible are not followed, it gives the impression that ‘people with disabilities are not important enough for this digital asset to be built correctly’, leading them to ask why they should use it when it is not built for them.³¹²
- 4.108. PTCBR provided an update on the state of MyWay+ in March 2025, which noted that WCAG requirements were still not being met. This update further stated that information on the wheelchair accessibility of buses was unavailable, no audio announcements were

³⁰³ CANAXESS, *Submission 11*, pp 1-2.

³⁰⁴ Ross Mullen, Director, CANAXESS, *Committee Hansard*, 26 March 2025, p 42-43.

³⁰⁵ CANAXESS, *Submission 11*, p 2.

³⁰⁶ Ross Mullen, Director, CANAXESS, *Committee Hansard*, 26 March 2025, p 43.

³⁰⁷ Anna Orlova, *Committee Hansard*, 27 March 2025, pp 86-87.

³⁰⁸ Ross Mullen, Director, CANAXESS, *Committee Hansard*, 26 March 2025, p 47.

³⁰⁹ Ross Mullen, Director, CANAXESS, *Committee Hansard*, 26 March 2025, p 44.

³¹⁰ Anna Orlova, *Committee Hansard*, 27 March 2025, p 86.

³¹¹ Heather Fitzpatrick, *Committee Hansard*, 26 March 2025, p 79.

³¹² Ross Mullen, Director, CANAXESS, *Committee Hansard*, 26 March 2025, p 49.

available for vision impaired travellers, and that other accessible features required in the contract had yet to be delivered.³¹³

- 4.109. Transport Canberra confirmed that following the launch of MyWay+ the system did not meet accessibility standards and ‘would be considered partially compliant’.³¹⁴ Officials told the Committee that, in the lead up to the public launch, information about accessibility was not included in ministerial briefs as Transport Canberra had not been provided with information about compliance with accessibility legislation by NEC. Indeed, it was not until the days following the public launch when Transport Canberra asked NEC directly about the compliance of the customer portal that it was made aware that elements of the system were non-compliant.³¹⁵
- 4.110. NEC related its interactions with Transport Canberra on accessibility to the readiness assessment checklists discussed earlier in this report. Specifically, NEC noted that these checklists ‘did include considerations around accessibility’ and that priority was ‘given to different features in the system for the go-live and the ability to achieve them’ in the time available. Further, according to NEC, there was no opportunity to undertake an accessibility assessment prior to launch.³¹⁶
- 4.111. The Minister for Transport noted that the MyWay+ contract includes an expectation that the system meet WCAG 2.1 standards.³¹⁷ Officials stated that compliance with accessibility standards was included in the delivery phase of the contract, which had not been completed when the hearings were held. Once all the deliverables in this phase were completed, and the contract entered the operations and maintenance phase, Transport Canberra expected that the accessibility requirements would be met.³¹⁸
- 4.112. NEC also expressed awareness of the non-compliance with WCAG 2.1 standards for parts of its MyWay+ product, and noted that under the contract, compliance with these guidelines is required when the delivery phase was complete. In late March 2025, NEC stated that these requirements were expected to be met ‘progressively over the next six months’.³¹⁹
- 4.113. The ACT Government noted in late April 2025 that accessibility improvements were ongoing. It highlighted steps already taken, including:
- Changes to the MyWay+ customer portal and mobile app (e.g. font colour and menu structure) to improve web accessibility;
 - Volume of the audio confirmation noise for successful tap on/off on validators has been increased;

³¹³ PTCBR, *Submission 109*, Attachment A, pp 2-4.

³¹⁴ Ben McHugh, Transport Canberra, *Committee Hansard*, 27 March 2025, p 110.

³¹⁵ Ben McHugh, Transport Canberra, *Committee Hansard*, 1 May 2025, p 170.

³¹⁶ Kylie Gorham, Senior Product Manager, NEC, *Committee Hansard*, 1 May 2025, p 135.

³¹⁷ Chris Steel MLA, Minister for Transport, *Committee Hansard*, 27 March 2025, p 109.

³¹⁸ Ben McHugh, Transport Canberra, *Committee Hansard*, 27 March 2025, pp 109-110.

³¹⁹ Kylie Gorham, Senior Product Manager, NEC, *Committee Hansard*, 26 March 2025, p 27.

- Updates to content and readability of information for the on-board Passenger Information Displays in response to community feedback; and
- Roll-out of on-board audio announcements on vehicles to provide notifications of the upcoming bus stops.³²⁰

4.114. Additionally, in March 2025 NEC commenced a comprehensive accessibility review ‘of the MyWay+ system, including all NEC deliverables (i.e. equipment, and the MyWay+ portal and mobile app) and Transport Canberra “touch points” (i.e. website pages)’. This review, being undertaken by Get Skilled Access (GSA), was also considering ‘the end-to-end public transport experience for users across a broad range of physical, sensory and cognitive accessibility requirements’.³²¹

4.115. The initial focus of the review was on WACG compliance, and was to ‘result in iterative changes to the portal’ aimed at refinements to improve the availability and readability of text, enable keyboard-based navigation and support screen reader programs.³²²

4.116. Following this initial focus, the ACT Government told the Committee that:

GSA will evaluate the broader customer journey using MyWay+. This will involve engaging a diverse cohort, similar to the Community Based Testing program, of people with a disability who are able to provide a user-based assessment of MyWay+ and inform further, more nuanced improvements, to the system to support an accessible end-to-end experience. Transport Canberra will offer participation in this testing to members of the TCCS Accessibility Reference Group.³²³

4.117. The Minister for Transport told the Committee that the lack of accessibility compliance was, in his view, a ‘great disappointment’. He noted that it was one of the top three issues with the MyWay+ project, and that ‘more proactive measures’ taken prior to the public launch ‘would have potentially addressed that’.³²⁴

4.118. Officials noted that an opportunity had been missed to address the problems with accessibility via ‘stronger enforcement’ and ‘stronger contractual bounds’.³²⁵

Committee comment

4.119. The Committee notes that the ACT Government launched the service when it was not compliant with basic accessibility requirements, with features like onboard announcements still unavailable in some cases. Many Canberrans with a disability have found themselves struggling or unable to use the website, ticketing system and bus and navigation systems. Launching a service in this state and phasing in basic accessibility

³²⁰ ACT Government, *Submission 59.1*, Attachment A, p 1.

³²¹ ACT Government, *Submission 59.1*, Attachment A, pp 1-2.

³²² ACT Government, *Submission 59.1*, Attachment A, p 2.

³²³ ACT Government, *Submission 59.1*, Attachment A, p 2.

³²⁴ Chris Steel MLA, Minister for Transport, *Committee Hansard*, 3 July 2025, p 198.

³²⁵ Mark White, Executive Branch Manager, Transport Canberra and Business Services, City and Environment Directorate, *Committee Hansard*, 3 July 2025, p 192.

features over time does not meet the standards or needs of Canberrans. At the time of writing, the service still did not have the accessibility features Canberrans expect.

- 4.120. The Committee further notes that in April 2025, Thomas Emerson MLA referred the matter of MyWay+ compliance with anti-discrimination legislation to the ACT Human Rights Commission.³²⁶ Whether the system as launched constitutes a breach of the ACT Government's obligations under anti-discrimination legislation remains to be seen.

Seniors

- 4.121. Evidence to the Committee indicated that seniors—many of whom rely heavily on public transport—faced notable difficulties during the MyWay+ rollout. It was clear to the Committee that despite extensive consultation by the ACT Government, older citizens experienced accessibility issues, confusion, and stress, which placed additional pressure on the community organisations that support them.
- 4.122. Prior to the introduction of MyWay+, seniors used a dual-function card combining the MyWay travel 'smart card' and ACT Seniors 'flash card'. Under MyWay+, these functions were split, requiring two separate cards. While the 'flash card' remains valid for concession eligibility, the old MyWay card is no longer able to be used for travel. To access discounted fares under the new system, seniors must either:
- use a free MyWay+ concession card obtained by presenting of a valid concession at a retail agent proof (e.g. the existing 'flash card'); or
 - tap on/off with a Visa or Mastercard linked to a MyWay+ account with a current concession (e.g. ACT Seniors 70+, Pensioner Concession Card) registered to the account.³²⁷
- 4.123. To ease the transition to MyWay+ senior cardholders were able to continue using their 'flash card' for free travel during eligible periods—off-peak for those aged 60–69, and anytime for those 70 and over—until June 2025. After that, they were advised they would need to tap on and off using either a MyWay+ concession card or a Visa/Mastercard with a registered concession linked to a MyWay+ account.³²⁸
- 4.124. Transport Canberra undertook targeted consultation with seniors in addition to more general communications aimed at the wider community. This included engagement with the Office for Seniors and Veterans Affairs (OSVA) and Council on the Ageing ACT (COTA) including dedicated sessions with seniors at COTA offices³²⁹ and the preparation of tailored communication materials to disseminate through OSVA and COTA channels.³³⁰

³²⁶ Thomas Emerson MLA, Media release - *MyWay+ knowingly launched without addressing accessibility issues*, 20 May 2025, <https://www.thomasemerson.com/250520mr>, accessed 22 October 2025.

³²⁷ ACT Government, *Submission 059*, p 17.

³²⁸ ACT Government, *Submission 059*, p 17.

³²⁹ ACT Government, *Submission 059*, p 17.

³³⁰ ACT Government, *Submission 059*, Attachment A, p 11.

- 4.125. COTA told the Committee that ‘despite our long-standing and genuine engagement in the consultation process, COTA ACT is deeply concerned about the significant challenges and confusion older Canberrans have faced during the MyWay+ transition.’³³¹
- 4.126. COTA described considerable consultation prior to the MyWay+ rollout including a meeting at the end of 2023 to discuss aspects of the new system that might be challenging for seniors, and how information might need to be tailored for seniors.³³² The evidence provided by COTA suggests that despite working closely with Transport Canberra in the lead up to the launch of MyWay+ the organisation’s concerns and suggestions were not always heard or actioned.
- 4.127. COTA noted that Transport Canberra underestimated the demand for physical cards which meant there was a shortage when the system went live.³³³ As a result, many seniors were forced to travel significant distances only to find that cards were not available.³³⁴
- 4.128. One of COTA’s main concerns was the increased burden the rollout placed on their staff and resources, particularly the increased call volume from seniors who were either not aware they should contact, or were unable to contact, Transport Canberra:

Over an initial ten-day period, COTA ACT fielded over 450 calls about MyWay+, a tenfold increase in our usual call volume. This has diverted more than 40 staff hours, at a significant cost to our organisation as well as disrupting our other vital programs. Many of these calls stemmed from seniors being unable to reach Transport Canberra, waiting at length on hold (for example being told they are 58th or later in a queue) or receiving inconsistent information.³³⁵

- 4.129. By 1 May 2025, the number of calls fielded by COTA was approaching 6,000.³³⁶ The queries being dealt with were in many cases not complex, and included simple questions such as whether seniors were required to get a MyWay+ card, where to get them, how to transfer the balance of legacy cards, and what to do with Seniors Cards.³³⁷
- 4.130. COTA offered to host an ACT Government staff member to ‘hear firsthand the issues that seniors were raising’ but the ACT Government did not provide this, and so COTA had to provide these information services for Government unfunded.³³⁸
- 4.131. According to COTA, while this information was available online many older Canberrans do not have access to computers. COTA was critical of the fact it had to produce hard copy information targeted at seniors, despite not being funded to do so.³³⁹
- 4.132. A further issue was the confusing or inconsistent advice received by seniors. COTA found that, in some cases, the advice received by seniors was not being applied consistently on

³³¹ Jennifer Mobbs, Chief Executive Officer, Council on the Ageing ACT, *Submission 109*, p 2.

³³² Jennifer Mobbs, Chief Executive Officer, Council on the Ageing ACT, *Committee Hansard*, 1 May 2025, pp 145-146.

³³³ Council on the Ageing ACT (COTA), *Submission 109*, p 4.

³³⁴ COTA, *Submission 109*, p 4.

³³⁵ Jennifer Mobbs, Chief Executive Officer, COTA, *Submission 109*, p 3.

³³⁶ Jennifer Mobbs, COTA, *Committee Hansard*, 1 May 2025, p 148.

³³⁷ Jennifer Mobbs, COTA, *Committee Hansard*, 1 May 2025, p 148.

³³⁸ Jennifer Mobbs, COTA, *Committee Hansard*, 1 May 2025, pp 147-148.

³³⁹ COTA, *Submission 109*, p 4.

public transport. For example, some drivers asked passengers to tap on or obtain new Seniors Cards,³⁴⁰ leading some to throw their Seniors Cards away only to find they had to apply for new ones (which still did not work on public transport).³⁴¹

- 4.133. Overall, COTA felt that the ‘burden of this transition’ had ‘disproportionately fallen on us and, more critically, on the vulnerable seniors who rely on public transport’.³⁴²

- 4.134. PTCBR felt that it too lacked information to assist seniors:

We ourselves often did not feel equipped to provide definitive guidance to people who approached us for help on this issue, and we felt confused by information provided to us by Transport Canberra when we raised this issue with them.³⁴³

- 4.135. The Committee also heard directly from older Canberrans about their experiences with MyWay+. Ilona Crabb and Myra Judge both noted that the communications around seniors access was confusing.³⁴⁴ Another older Canberran was unaware that he needed to arrange a new card for himself until February 2025.³⁴⁵ Australian Multicultural Action Network (AMAN) told the Committee that the perceived lack of inclusive communication strategies for seniors from multicultural communities need to be improved.³⁴⁶

- 4.136. Another issue for seniors was the removal of a dual card and the necessity to carry two cards under the new system.³⁴⁷ The Inner South Canberra Community Council questioned the need for this:

The justification for requiring Over 70s to carry a separate MyWay+ card is apparently the Government’s desire to collect statistics on their travel. This could surely be achieved through rough sample surveys, as in other areas where the Government requires data for planning, rather than requiring all Over 70s to carry two cards.³⁴⁸

- 4.137. John Dow characterised this move as ‘reprehensible, short sighted and inconvenient’.³⁴⁹

- 4.138. The Minister for Transport explained the steps the ACT Government has taken in response to these issues:

We have announced an extension of time for the period in which seniors can use their seniors card as a flash card to access public transport to give the seniors community time to pick up a MyWay+ concession card. Tens of thousands have done that, but there are still some who have not. We have stepped up

³⁴⁰ COTA, *Submission 109*, p 5.

³⁴¹ Jennifer Mobbs, COTA, *Committee Hansard*, 1 May 2025, p 145, p 148.

³⁴² COTA, *Submission 109*, p 6.

³⁴³ Public Transport Association of Canberra, *Submission 104*, p 11.

³⁴⁴ Ilona Sigrid Crabb, *Submission 27*, p 2; Myra Judge, *Submission 16*, p 2.

³⁴⁵ Name withheld webform responses, *Submission 42*, p 38.

³⁴⁶ Australian Multicultural Action Network, *Submission 4*, p 3.

³⁴⁷ See for example, Christine Butterfield, *Submission 24*, p 2; Graham Anderson, *Submission 81*, p 3

³⁴⁸ Inner South Canberra Community Council, *Submission 3*, p 3.

³⁴⁹ John Dow, *Submission 06*, p 2.

communications, talking with COTA for these next three months until September, when they have to make the final transition, to make sure that they are ready.³⁵⁰

Finding 13

The Committee notes that despite clear feedback from stakeholders and members of the public, the ACT Government failed to provide services and information that met the needs of senior Canberrans.

Validators

- 4.139. Disruption and confusion occurred across the bus and light rail network on MyWay+ launch day with many users finding that validators (machines you tap your card against) were not installed on all buses³⁵¹ or did not work,³⁵² meaning users couldn't tap on or off.
- 4.140. As noted above, the installation schedule for the bus fleet experienced increasing delays as the 27 November 2024 launch approached.
- 4.141. Transport Canberra acknowledged this issue. It told the Committee that on launch day, only 41 of 71 light rail validators were operational due to a system misconfiguration causing validators to connect to the old CMET system instead of MyWay+.³⁵³ This issue was communicated to Transport Canberra immediately prior to launch. NEC was able to implement a solution progressively restoring functionality over a 48-hour period and the issue was fully resolved by 29 November 2024.³⁵⁴
- 4.142. Furthermore, according to Transport Canberra, on-bus validators were not activating because they were set to 'auto-activate' when buses were moving under 10 km/h and within a stop's geofence.³⁵⁵ On 28 November 2024 the geofence was extended by 45 metres, which improved activation rates, though some problems continued at large interchanges. Further system updates and driver training helped to reduce persisting issues.³⁵⁶ The Minister for Transport admitted that the geofencing issue was a significant, persistent issue and expressed his disappointment.³⁵⁷
- 4.143. Transport Canberra also advised the Committee of an associated problem involving validators deactivating during shift transitions and dead running which it advised was addressed by a route coding fix on 8 December 2024, and a further system update in February 2025 which reduced occurrences to acceptable levels.³⁵⁸

³⁵⁰ Chris Steel, Minister for Transport, *Committee Hansard*, 3 July 2025, p 186.

³⁵¹ See for example, Sarah Miller, *Submission 79*, p 2; Name withheld webform responses, *Submission 42*, p 20, p 46; Public Transport Association of Canberra, *Submission 104*, p 15.

³⁵² See for example, Name withheld webform responses, *Submission 42*, p 52, p 11; Sarah Miller, *Submission 79*, p 2; Mary McDonald, *Submission 29*, p 2; Alison Windsor, *Submission 68*, p 2.

³⁵³ ACT Government, *Submission 059*, Attachment B, p 1.

³⁵⁴ ACT Government, *Submission 59*, Attachment B, p 1.

³⁵⁵ ACT Government, *Submission 59*, Attachment B, p 3.

³⁵⁶ ACT Government, *Submission 59*, Attachment B, p 3.

³⁵⁷ Chris Steel MLA, Minister for Transport, *Committee Hansard*, 3 July 2025, p 198.

³⁵⁸ ACT Government, *Submission 059*, Attachment B, p 3-4.

- 4.144. Other validator related problems reported include long queues and delays in tapping off light rail at the city station³⁵⁹ and validators ceasing to work during a journey resulting in passengers being charged a higher default fare and having to claim a refund from Transport Canberra.³⁶⁰
- 4.145. While Transport Canberra officials acknowledged their awareness of inconsistent validator performance prior to launch, they noted that internal testings showed higher activation rates and the problem was not considered sufficiently critical to delay launch.³⁶¹ Since launch, daily monitoring and system updates have improved performance, with current automatic activation rates above 90 percent.³⁶²
- 4.146. It would appear that the installation schedule continued to perform poorly against projections after public launch, given that in March 2025 95 per cent of the bus installations had been completed.³⁶³ 100 per cent installation was not achieved until July 2025. This did not include older buses due to be replaced.³⁶⁴ According to the Minister, all active buses are expected to have MyWay+ technology installed by the end of 2025, 13 months after the service was launched.³⁶⁵
- 4.147. A number of contributors to the inquiry also raised concerns about the user friendliness of the MyWay+ validators, their design and functionality. A big concern was the lack of audio and visual cues on validators to assist passengers, including those with impairments. Submitters highlighted the lack of audible and visual confirmation of a successful or unsuccessful tap,³⁶⁶ and lack of visual cues for how and where to scan a QR code³⁶⁷ or tap a card.³⁶⁸
- 4.148. One submitter noted that the validator screens at some light rail stops could not be seen at certain time of the day due to excessive glare.³⁶⁹ Other submitters would have liked the validators to have additional functionality such as displaying an account balance and low balance warning.³⁷⁰
- 4.149. In its submission, the ACT Government noted that some improvements had been implemented to improve the overall accessibility and individual user experience including

³⁵⁹ Victor Kalkman, *Submission 31*, p 2; Name withheld webform responses, *Submission 42*, p 43.

³⁶⁰ For example, Alison Windsor, *Submission 68*, p 2.

³⁶¹ Ben McHugh, Deputy Director General, Transport Canberra and Business Services, City and Environment Directorate, *Committee Hansard*, 27 March 2025, p 119.

³⁶² Ben McHugh, Transport Canberra and Business Services, City and Environment Directorate, *Committee Hansard*, 27 March 2025, p 119.

³⁶³ ACT Government, *Submission 59*, Attachment B, p 6.

³⁶⁴ Transport Canberra website: <https://www.transport.act.gov.au/news/news-and-events-items/july-2025/myway-update#:~:text=We%20would%20like%20to%20thank,118%2C300%20MyWay%2B%20cards%20in%20circulation>, accessed 11 October 2025.

³⁶⁵ Chris Steel MLA, Minister for Transport, *answer to QON 51, 4 July 2025 (received 14 July 2025)*.

³⁶⁶ Andrew Donnellan, *Submission 105*, p 9; Anna Orlova, *Committee Hansard*, 27 March 2025, p 91; Australian Multicultural Action Network, *Submission 4*, p 2; Name withheld, *Submission 12*, p 2.

³⁶⁷ Andrew Donnellan, *Submission 105*, p 6; Name withheld, *Submission 1*, p 2.

³⁶⁸ Name withheld, *Submission 1*, p 2.

³⁶⁹ Bill Gemmel, *Submission 57*, p 4.

³⁷⁰ See for example, Andrew Wadey, *Submission 22*, p 3; Evan Slayter, *Submission 19*, p 3; Nicholas Hickey, *Submission 73*, p 3; Name withheld, *Submission 12*, p 2.

an increase in the volume of the audio confirmation noise for a successful tap on/tap off on validators.³⁷¹

- 4.150. In July 2025, the Minister for Transport told the Committee that the issues with validators on buses not activating at stops had been resolved and ‘people are very successfully using the system across the board’. However he noted his ‘particular disappointment’ over the issue, which he referred to as a ‘fundamental problem’ that ‘did persist for a period of time’.³⁷²

Customer support

- 4.151. Transport Canberra described the customer support mechanisms it put in place following the MyWay+ Go-Live.³⁷³ These included deployment of Transport Canberra and Canberra Metro Operations (CMET) staff at city kiosks, light rail platforms and bus interchanges; and an expanded Customer Experience team to handle enquiries and provide phone and one-on-one support.³⁷⁴
- 4.152. In addition, multiple communication channels, including staff, website, newsletters, and social media, continued to be used for updates. An internal IT service team managed service and change requests, with over 1,800 feedback items received in the first month, resulting in around 300 service requests.³⁷⁵
- 4.153. Nonetheless, many public transport users raised concerns about the level and consistency of support staff knowledge across the different support channels.³⁷⁶ Andrew Hutt stated that he experienced ‘various levels of staff knowledge on each call’.³⁷⁷ Jonathan Campton reported:

I have called for support and not once has the issue been resolved during the call. The poor operators have no real access to the system and everything seems to be referred to the blackhole of the IT vendor.³⁷⁸

- 4.154. While frontline staff were described as ‘courteous,’³⁷⁹ ‘polite’ and ‘professional’³⁸⁰, some appeared to lack the depth of knowledge required to deal with some of the more technical customer queries referring customers to the MyWay+ team or Access Canberra.³⁸¹
- 4.155. Madeleine Harwood noted that support was only available during business hours, and this combined with long wait times presented a barrier to full-time workers receiving

³⁷¹ ACT Government, *Submission 59*, Attachment B, p 5.

³⁷² Chris Steel MLA, Minister for Transport, *Committee Hansard*, 3 July 2025, p 198.

³⁷³ ACT Government, *Submission 59*, p 16.

³⁷⁴ ACT Government, *Submission 59*, p 16.

³⁷⁵ ACT Government, *Submission 59*, p 16.

³⁷⁶ Kaab Qureshi, *Submission 25*, p 2; Andrew Hutt, *Submission 20*, p 2.

³⁷⁷ Andrew Hutt, *Submission 20*, p 2.

³⁷⁸ Jonathan Campton, *Submission 36*, p 3.

³⁷⁹ David Archbold, *Submission 48*, pp 2-3.

³⁸⁰ Name withheld webform responses, *Submission 42*, pp 13-14.

³⁸¹ David Archbold, *Submission 48*, pp 2-3; Cameron Gosley, *Submission 21*, p 3.

assistance.³⁸² This led one user to suggest that increased support should have been made available during the launch period.³⁸³

4.156. Some submitters also pointed to deficiencies in the online advice provided by Transport Canberra with one describing it as ‘overly simplistic and not helpful in troubleshooting the issues.’³⁸⁴

4.157. One submitter who tried to link his debit card to his MyWay+ account commented that the online video tutorials did not show all the necessary steps in the process.³⁸⁵ Another submitter felt the online help tools on the website that came online a few weeks after the launch were helpful but had come too late.³⁸⁶

4.158. Some public transport users looked to bus drivers for guidance on how to use the new system. However, several submitters commented that some drivers did not appear to have been well trained or know how to operate the system and therefore were of no assistance.³⁸⁷

4.159. Andrew Gruber stated:

A lot of drivers didn’t know how to operate the system; as they are the face of public transport, they should been system experts. Clearly they were not trained properly.³⁸⁸

4.160. In contrast to this view, another submitter believed it was not bus drivers’ job to assist passengers with the new system and empathised with them having to deal with frustrated passengers.³⁸⁹ Several submitters spoke in defence of bus drivers and acknowledged their patience and professionalism, one stating:

Please give the poor unfortunate bus drivers who have had to cop so much abuse a big bouquet and my deepest gratitude.³⁹⁰

Finding 14

The Committee finds that the rollout of MyWay+ had a significant impact on bus drivers, and thanks them for their service.

Real-time passenger information

4.161. PTCBR told the Committee that the NXTBUS real-time passenger information (RTPI) system introduced in 2013 marked a significant improvement to Canberra’s public transport

³⁸² Ms Harwood, *Committee Hansard*, 26 March 2025, pp 69-70.

³⁸³ Name withheld webform responses, *Submission 42*, p 44.

³⁸⁴ Joshua Osborne-Goldsborough, *Submission 84*, p 2.

³⁸⁵ Name withheld webform responses, *Submission 42*, pp 17-18.

³⁸⁶ Name withheld webform responses, *Submission 42*, p 47.

³⁸⁷ Name withheld webform responses, *Submission 42*, p 47, p 52; Andrew Gruber, *Submission 17*, p 2; *Submission 19*, Evan Slayter, p 3.

³⁸⁸ Andrew Gruber, *Submission 17*, p 2.

³⁸⁹ Name withheld webform responses, *Submission 42*, p 47.

³⁹⁰ Pat Tandy, *Submission 93*, p 3.

system.³⁹¹ It provided passengers with information such as live updates on bus locations, wheelchair accessibility and availability of bike racks. On board passenger information displays (PIDs) provided information about upcoming stops and arrival times and was integrated with third party travel apps.³⁹²

4.162. As discussed above, RTPI was not available at launch. Submitters told the Committee that the initial absence of real time bus tracking was ‘inexcusable’³⁹³ and ‘unacceptable,’³⁹⁴ and they missed the easy access to RTPI information available under the previous NextBus system.³⁹⁵

4.163. Jennifer Manson conveyed the real-world implications of having no RTPI:

All information on bus movements across Canberra were available via NextBus. Now there’s nothing. No transparency, no flexibility, no user friendliness, no customer focused public transport services at all. This is particularly problematic when there are hours between buses at night and on weekends, long gaps between bus stops, bad weather, or when you are loaded with shopping, kids and many activities to move between in limited time frames.³⁹⁶

4.164. According to Transport Canberra, RTPI ‘started to become available through the mobile app and online journey planner in December 2024’.³⁹⁷

4.165. Nonetheless, when it became available, the MyWay+ RTPI was missing some of the key functionality passengers expected. PTCBR summarised this as follows:

- The suggested journey times on the MyWay+ app and on-board PIDs are inaccurate and inconsistent.
- The real-time location of buses refreshes only every 30 seconds. This is twice as slow as the 15 second standard identified in the contract.
- It does not provide relevant information about wheelchair accessibility or the availability of bike racks.
- PIDs at interchanges and major bus stops remain inactive.
- Real-time data is not yet available to third party travel and map apps.³⁹⁸

4.166. Transport Canberra noted that, by late February 2025, 95 per cent of ‘the intended bus fleet has MyWay+ installed and is displaying RTPI, and that some inaccuracies in the real-time information displayed in the app was being addressed through an app update.’³⁹⁹

4.167. However, the availability of RTPI via third-party apps was subject to delays. In late February 2025, Transport Canberra was projecting that RTPI data would be available to third-party apps in the first quarter of 2025.⁴⁰⁰ By April 2025, Transport Canberra acknowledged a

³⁹¹ Public Transport Association of Canberra (PTCBR), *Submission 104*, p 3.

³⁹² PTCBR, *Submission 104*, p 3.

³⁹³ Name withheld responses, *Submission 42*, p 41.

³⁹⁴ Name withheld responses, *Submission 42*, p 18.

³⁹⁵ Jennifer Cohen, *Submission 103*, pp 2-3; Jennifer Manson, *Submission 60*, p 1.

³⁹⁶ Jennifer Manson, *Submission 60*, p 1.

³⁹⁷ ACT Government, *Submission 59*, Attachment B, p 6.

³⁹⁸ Public Transport Association of Canberra, *Submission 104*, p 3.

³⁹⁹ ACT Government, *Submission 59*, Attachment B, p 6.

⁴⁰⁰ ACT Government, *Submission 59*, Attachment B, p 6.

delay until the end of May 2025.⁴⁰¹ RTPI data finally became available to third parties in June 2025.⁴⁰²

- 4.168. There is no expected timeline for PIDs at key bus interchanges. According to the Minister for Transport, these were not a specification in the MyWay+ contract, and ‘will be provided once Transport Canberra has carried out an assessment of requirements and funding has been identified’.⁴⁰³
- 4.169. Transport Canberra officials explained these delays, stating that:

That data is, again, significantly more complex than the previous MyWay data. The MyWay data purely provided static timetable information, and the app developers would consume that. With real time, there is a level of complexity as you would expect. It is constantly changing, and it requires different technical connections, et cetera.

- 4.170. While officials noted that the MyWay+ app was reporting RTPI from January 2025, it apologised that it took so long to become available to third party app providers, particularly in light of the use of these apps by people with a disability.⁴⁰⁴

Committee comment

- 4.171. The Committee notes it was a poor project management choice to provide a worse real-time passenger information than was previously available. Real-time passenger information should also have been available on launch day rather than eight months later.

Account balance information

- 4.172. Under the previous MyWay system, a user’s account balance was displayed when the MyWay card was tapped on the card reader. With the MyWay+ system, the account balance is accessed through the MyWay+ app or via the web portal and is no longer displayed on card reader screens.

- 4.173. The Minister for Transport explained the change:

A MyWay+ user can see their account balance from the app or via the website accurately once all transactions are finalised with the customers banking provider, typically this occurs overnight each day. With the old MyWay system, which was card based and not account based, the only way to read your balance was via tapping the card on a reader.⁴⁰⁵

- 4.174. A significant number of public transport users criticised the removal of account balance visibility on card readers and called for it to be reinstated.⁴⁰⁶ The feedback received by the

⁴⁰¹ ACT Government, *Submission 59.1*, p 2.

⁴⁰² Mark White, Executive Branch Manager, Transport Canberra and Business Services, City and Environment Directorate, *Committee Hansard*, 3 July 2025, p 188.

⁴⁰³ Chris Steel MLA, Minister for Transport, *answer to QON 38, 13 May 2025, (received 20 May 2025)*, p 1.

⁴⁰⁴ Mark White, Transport Canberra and Business Services, City and Environment Directorate, and Chris Steel MLA, Minister for Transport, *Committee Hansard*, 3 July 2025, p 188.

⁴⁰⁵ Chris Steel MLA, Minister for Transport, *answer to QON 35, 13 May 2025 (received 20 May 2025)*, p 2.

⁴⁰⁶ See for example, Name withheld webform responses, *Submission 42*, p 2, p 12, p 20, p 29, p 47, p 49, p 50, p 60, p 62, p 68, pp 70-71; Bruce Pittard, *Submission 49*, p 3; Evan Slayter, *Submission 19*, p 4; Nathan Rickerby, *Submission 26*, p 2.

Committee suggested this was widely regarded as a valued and practical functionality that supported users in managing their travel budget and ensuring sufficient funds were available for journeys.⁴⁰⁷

- 4.175. Users reported that the lack of real-time feedback at tap-on and tap-off points had introduced uncertainty and inconvenience into their public transport experience.⁴⁰⁸ One submitter stated that not knowing her balance was ‘stressful in case it affects my journey.’⁴⁰⁹ Another stated ‘...now you use your card in ignorance and then suddenly without warning run out of credit. This is a great hassle.’⁴¹⁰
- 4.176. Nicole Brown found that over half of her attempts to log in were refused, and with validators no longer displaying the balance she was ‘unable to accurately keep track’ of her MyWay+ balance.⁴¹¹ One submitter reported unknowingly travelling with insufficient funds, resulting in their card going into debt before being blocked from travel:

My MyWay+ card has gone into debt nearly \$8 before preventing me from travel. The debt amount was never this large from the old system. Because I don’t know how much is on the card, I cannot rectify this ahead of time before travel.⁴¹²

- 4.177. Some submitters suggested that a ‘low balance’ message would be helpful:⁴¹³

It’d be really nice if there was some feedback, even if it was just a message saying "low balance, top up soon". This could be supplemented with an email, for people who have an account.⁴¹⁴

- 4.178. Lachlan Butler from the Belconnen Community Council pointed out that public transport users don’t want to have to worry about their account balance. In his view easy access to account balance information contributes to the convenience of public transport:

The thing with public transport is that it will rarely be the quickest option, but it needs to be made much more convenient. You cannot have to think really hard about how you are going to pay for it and have always in the back of your mind whether or not you have money in your account. It just needs to work.⁴¹⁵

- 4.179. Andrew Wadey was of the view that not having the account balance integrated into the app was evidence of ‘poor implementation’ and showed little thought for the usability of the app.⁴¹⁶

⁴⁰⁷ See for example, Name withheld webform responses, *Submission 42*, p 20, pp 43-45, p 49.

⁴⁰⁸ See for example, Name withheld webform responses, *Submission 42*, p 44, p 60.

⁴⁰⁹ Name withheld webform responses, *Submission 42*, p 60.

⁴¹⁰ Angie Murray, *Submission 67*, p 2.

⁴¹¹ Nicole Brown, *Submission 88*, p 1.

⁴¹² Name withheld webform responses, *Submission 42*, p 44.

⁴¹³ Name withheld webform responses, *Submission 42*, pp 43-44; Evan Slayter, *Submission 19*, p 3.

⁴¹⁴ Evan Slayter, *Submission 19*, p 3.

⁴¹⁵ Lachlan Butler, Chair, Belconnen Community Council, *Committee Hansard*, 27 March 2025, p 100.

⁴¹⁶ Andrew Wadey, *Submission 22*, p 3-4.

It seems to have been designed around what information was easiest to implement in an app, not what information users are most likely to use or need.⁴¹⁷

- 4.180. In response to the feedback from the community the Minister for Transport advised that Transport Canberra is working with its delivery partner NEC to explore options for reinstating account balance visibility on validator screens.⁴¹⁸

Committee comment

- 4.181. The ACT Government should provide account balance information that is easy for customers to use, and the Committee notes that this functionality is being considered for inclusion in a future system update.

Recommendation 1

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government continue its investigations and ensure that account balance information is available on validator screens as soon as possible.

Readiness for launch

- 4.182. The issues outlined above led to a perception within the community that MyWay+ was not ready for launch on 27 November 2024. Lack of readiness was a recurring theme in the evidence, with many arguing that the launch should have been delayed until more issues had been resolved.⁴¹⁹
- 4.183. Alex Vickery thought that the system was not ready,⁴²⁰ others said it had not been adequately tested,⁴²¹ and that the launch was rushed.⁴²²
- 4.184. Tony Hill was of the opinion that the ‘systems ranging from the physical readers to the software applications all appeared to be still in a test phase when released to the public.’⁴²³
- 4.185. John Storey told the Committee:

⁴¹⁷ Andrew Wadey, *Submission 22*, p 3-4.

⁴¹⁸ Chris Steel MLA, Minister for Transport, *response to QON 35, 13 May 2025, (received 20 May 2025)*, p 2.

⁴¹⁹ See for example, Heather Fitzpatrick, *Submission 97*, p 2; Name withheld webform responses, *Submission 42*, p 23; Ilona Sigrid Crabb, *Submission 27*, p 2; Name withheld webform responses, *Submission 42*, p 67; John Storey, *Submission 85*, p 2; Alex Vickery, *Submission 15*, p 2; Judith Elizabeth Dodd, *Submission 102*, p 2; Andrew Bleeze, *Submission 15*, p 2; Andrew Gruber, *Submission 17*, p 2; Andrew Hutt, *Submission 20*, p 2; Bernadette Fabbo, *Submission 52*, p 2; Karen Murnain, *Submission 95*, p 2.

⁴²⁰ Alex Vickery, *Submission 15*, p 2.

⁴²¹ See for example: John Storey, *Submission 85*, p 2; Anne Rowlands, *Submission 32*, p 2; Tony Hill, *Submission 101*, p 3.

⁴²² Judith Elizabeth Dodd, *Submission 102*, p 2; Evan Slayter, *Submission 19*, p 2; Alexandra Vickery, *Committee Hansard 27 March 2025*, p 82.

⁴²³ Tony Hill, *Submission 101*, p 2.

The system went live without adequate testing and was (and still is) full of bugs. Any new system should be thoroughly tested on a broad range of users, and refined to make sure it is fit for purpose.⁴²⁴

- 4.186. Judith Dodd agreed that more time to trial the system was obviously necessary given the ‘significant number of problems once launched.’⁴²⁵
- 4.187. The ACT Council of Parents and Citizens Association felt that not having all the key features of the system fully functional at launch ‘caused significant frustration and practical challenges for users, undermining confidence in the system.’⁴²⁶
- 4.188. One submitter was of the view that free travel should have been available until the system was fully functional.⁴²⁷
- 4.189. The Belconnen Community Council criticised the decision to proceed with a ‘hard launch’ rather than a more phased or ‘soft’ rollout.⁴²⁸ Anne Rowlands agreed a soft launch would have been preferable to allow for problems to be ‘ironed out’.⁴²⁹
- 4.190. The Minister for Transport argued that regardless of which approach was taken to the launch of the system, there would be an adjustment period for users:

This was quite a significant change for the community, and others regardless of how the transition was done—whether there was a hard switchover or not—it always would have required the community to take action in order to, at some point, transition to a new ticketing system, and the new payment options that would become available to people to use would need to be understood.⁴³⁰

- 4.191. Some questioned whether the timeline for the system’s launch caused it to be rushed.⁴³¹ Alexandra Vickery stated it was as if the system ‘was brought out too early to keep to a promised timeline rather than giving the product the oversight it deserves’.⁴³² Another submitter, Tony Hill, echoed this sentiment:

It seems that deadlines were being met regardless of the quality of the system being imposed on the customers⁴³³

- 4.192. Ben Jones commented that the rollout and free fare period seemed to be ‘aligned with the ACT Election period.’⁴³⁴ Judith Dodd also felt it was ‘rushed to fit election timing.’⁴³⁵

⁴²⁴ John Storey, *Submission 85*, p 2.

⁴²⁵ Judith Elizabeth Dodd, *Submission 102*, p 2.

⁴²⁶ ACT Council of Parents and Citizens Association, *Submission 13*, p 3.

⁴²⁷ Sarah Miller, *Submission 79*, p 2.

⁴²⁸ Lachlan Butler, Chair Belconnen Community Council, *Committee Hansard 27 March 2025*, p 97.

⁴²⁹ Anne Rowlands, *Submission 32*, p 2.

⁴³⁰ Chris Steel, Minister for Transport, *Committee Hansard*, 27 March 2025, pp 120-121.

⁴³¹ Alexandra Vickery, *Committee Hansard*, 27 March 2025, p 82; Ben Jones, *Submission 99*, p 2; Judith Elizabeth Dodd, *Submission 102*, p 2.

⁴³² Alexandra Vickery, *Committee Hansard*, 27 March 2025, p 82.

⁴³³ Tony Hill, *Submission 101*, p 3.

⁴³⁴ Ben Jones, *Submission 99*, p 2.

⁴³⁵ Judith Elizabeth Dodd, *Submission 102*, p 2.

4.193. The Minister for Transport strongly denied that the timing of the MyWay+ system was politically motivated or influenced by the election cycle. Rather, he explained, it was primarily driven by the project needing to be delivered before the 3G shutdown upon which the old MyWay system relied, which ‘just happened to occur at about the same time as the caretaker mode and the ACT election.’⁴³⁶

4.194. PTCBR questioned whether it was necessary for the system to have ‘all the bells and whistles’ the Government wanted at the very beginning.⁴³⁷ He noted that all the messaging around MyWay+ was that it would be a simple way to plan and pay however this was not people’s experience from day one.⁴³⁸ He continued that what public transport users were looking for was to the ability to pay with a debit or credit card and ‘anything else was extra’:⁴³⁹

The idea to make this bigger than Ben Hur and develop whole mobility as a service approach was not something we would have recommended to Transport Canberra, if they had come to us and asked what our members thought the new MyWay+ ticketing system should look like on day one.⁴⁴⁰

4.195. Belconnen Community Council echoed PTCBR’s view that the system was over engineered:

The MyWay+ product is quite all-encompassing. It has been put forward as this big solution to transport, but is it solving the problems that people actually have?One question was: “What were the features that you were most keen for?” Really, there were just three: pay by card and, by extension, by phone; instantaneous top-ups; and live tracking. That is really what people wanted.⁴⁴¹

Committee comment

4.196. The Committee notes that MyWay+ was not ready for launch on launch day and this had a negative impact on bus users and the confidence of Canberrans in our public transport system.

Post-launch communication

4.197. Public transport users highlighted serious concerns about the communication strategy employed by Transport Canberra and the ACT Government during the launch of the MyWay+ system. A recurring theme was that both downplayed the problems that passengers were experiencing with the new system as ‘teething problems’ and failed to take responsibility for them.⁴⁴²

⁴³⁶ Chris Steel, Minister for Transport, *Committee Hansard*, 27 March 2025, p 128.

⁴³⁷ Ryan Hemsley, Public Transport Association of Canberra (PTCBR), *Committee Hansard*, 26 March 2025, p 6.

⁴³⁸ Ryan Hemsley, PTCBR, *Committee Hansard*, 26 March 2025, p 3.

⁴³⁹ Ryan Hemsley, PTCBR, *Committee Hansard*, 26 March 2025, p 3.

⁴⁴⁰ Ryan Hemsley, PTCBR, *Committee Hansard*, 26 March 2025, p 3.

⁴⁴¹ Lachlan Butler, *Committee Hansard*, 27 March 2025, p 94.

⁴⁴² See for example, Lachlan Fisk, *Submission 9*, p 2; Public Transport Association of Canberra, *Submission 104*, p 12; Andrew Donnellan, *Submission 105*, p 4.

4.198. PTCBR commented that initially, senior Transport Canberra representatives appeared to deflect responsibility, attributing problems to passengers or drivers.⁴⁴³ This was met with ‘disappointment by passengers who were doing their best to adjust to a new system which had been launched prematurely’.⁴⁴⁴ One submitter described the campaign as ‘awful’, making users feel at fault and suggesting they simply needed to ‘learn’ the system.⁴⁴⁵

4.199. Andrew Donnellan remarked that the tone of Transport Canberra’s communication in the first few weeks of the rollout was ‘entirely wrong and missed the mark’. He said:

Where TCCS needed to be seen as sincerely apologetic, it instead claimed that everything was more or less fine and the issues were minor. The public does not buy this, because the public had eyes and ears of their own.⁴⁴⁶

4.200. According to PTCBR the tone and quality of communication from Transport Canberra shifted only after system inadequacies became undeniable.⁴⁴⁷ Following this, Transport Canberra’s communications improved markedly becoming ‘clear and informative’ and ‘delivered to a standard that should have been in place months earlier’.⁴⁴⁸

4.201. The Minister for Transport acknowledged that communication could have better framed the launch as a transition, rather than delivering a fully functional system from day one:⁴⁴⁹

Communicating about it being a minimum viable product rather than delivering every single thing that people expected of a new ticketing system all at once would have been a better approach, and that work would need to be done on some of the elements of the system, going back to the on-the-day issues that played out as a result of some of the issues around not doing enough user testing and the like.⁴⁵⁰

Committee comment

4.202. The Committee notes community concerns about how Transport Canberra and the ACT Government responded to the many flaws and faults in MyWay+.

Finding 15

The Committee finds that the ACT Government should have taken a more proactive and genuine approach in acknowledging the many flaws and faults in this project.

⁴⁴³ Public Transport Association of Canberra (PTCBR), *Submission 104*, p 12.

⁴⁴⁴ PTCBR, *Submission 104*, p 12.

⁴⁴⁵ Name withheld webform responses, *Submission 42*, p, 47.

⁴⁴⁶ Andrew Donnellan, *Submission 105*, p 4.

⁴⁴⁷ PTCBR, *Submission 104*, p 12.

⁴⁴⁸ PTCBR, *Submission 104*, p 12.

⁴⁴⁹ Chris Steel MLA, Minister for Transport, *Committee Hansard*, 3 July 2025, p 198.

⁴⁵⁰ Chris Steel MLA, Minister for Transport, *Committee Hansard*, 3 July 2025, p 198.

Public confidence

- 4.203. Some witnesses raised concerns about the impact of MyWay+ on confidence in the public transport system.
- 4.204. One user thought the ‘poor design’ of MyWay+ suggested that the leadership in Transport Canberra ‘is out of touch’ and demonstrated ‘a fundamental lack of understanding of the needs of Canberra’s bus users’. The extent of the issues at launch led this user to question whether the project team responsible even uses public transport’.⁴⁵¹
- 4.205. Similarly, Andrew Donnellan noted the importance of ‘first-hand experience with the limitations and faults of a system’ in providing ‘a strong motivator to address issues that may not otherwise be prioritised’. As a result Mr Donnellan recommended that Transport Canberra and contractors ensure that as many staff as possible be ‘encouraged to use public transport as their primary mode of transport’.⁴⁵²
- 4.206. One submitter considered MyWay+ to be a ‘lost opportunity to improve the ACT public transport system’. According to this submitter, the way MyWay+ was implemented showed little competence in ‘project and program management, communication and change management’.⁴⁵³
- 4.207. Another witness noted that the lack of real-time information raised questions about the reliability of Transport Canberra more generally to the extent they were unable to rely on buses even arriving.⁴⁵⁴ Some had stopped using public transport,⁴⁵⁵ parents felt uncertain about their children’s travel to and from school,⁴⁵⁶ and one submitter expressed their sympathy for the Transport Canberra staff who faced abuse from a ‘bungled rollout’.⁴⁵⁷
- 4.208. COTA told the Committee that some seniors stopped using public transport after the system repeatedly failed them. According to COTA, despite some bus drivers ‘being kind’ and waving seniors onto the bus when they were unable to tap on, ‘there is a bus full of people behind them’ and ‘the embarrassment level is really high’. This caused anxiety about what an attempt to use public transport would lead to, in turn resulting in some to simply not using it at all.⁴⁵⁸
- 4.209. Aside from the confidence in the public transport system, some submitters reflected on how the MyWay+ project had affected their confidence in the ACT Government more generally.⁴⁵⁹ Andrew Hutt noted that, when considered alongside the HRIMS project, there appears to be an inability to learn from mistakes, a lack of capacity, or a lack of care.⁴⁶⁰

⁴⁵¹ Name withheld, *Submission 12*, p 8.

⁴⁵² Andrew Donnellan, *Submission 105*, pp 1-2.

⁴⁵³ Name withheld, *Submission 66*, p 3.

⁴⁵⁴ Ben Langley, *Committee Hansard*, 26 March 2025, p 77.

⁴⁵⁵ See for example, Andrew Bleeze, *Submission 15*, p 3; Michael Gregg, *Submission 51*, p 2; David Archbold, *Submission 48*, p 2; Heather Fitzpatrick and Madeleine Harwood, *Committee Hansard*, 26 March 2025, p 77.

⁴⁵⁶ See for example, Jonathan Campton, *Submission 36*, p 3; Bernadette Fabbo, *Submission 52*, p 2.

⁴⁵⁷ Cameron Gosley, *Submission 21*, p 3.

⁴⁵⁸ Jenny Mobbs, Chief Executive Officer, Council on the Ageing ACT, *Committee Hansard*, 1 May 2025, p 146.

⁴⁵⁹ Name withheld webform responses, *Submission 42*, p 1, pp 46-47, p 58; Name withheld, *Submission 66*, p 3; Andrew Bleeze, *Submission 15*, p 2.

⁴⁶⁰ Andrew Hutt, *Submission 20*, p 3.

4.210. Andrew Donnellan compared the ACT with other jurisdictions, stating that:

The ACT Government needs to hold itself to higher standards and develop more capacity for managing complex technology projects, like the NSW Government has been doing with great success. But it also needs more people who are able to see the obvious and confidently intervene when things are clearly not going to plan.⁴⁶¹

4.211. The negative effect on public confidence was so great that it even led to collateral damage. COTA told the Committee that ‘an unfortunate side effect of the poor implementation’ of MyWay+ caused it reputational harm to COTA. Specifically, COTA stated that:

When seniors call us, they are used to their query being answered quickly and fully. Unfortunately, with MyWay+, there were instances in the evolving saga where COTA ACT simply did not have the information yet were blamed by seniors for the problems they were experiencing. It is a very unfortunate and disappointing result for COTA ACT, when this is a Transport Canberra issue that we have inadvertently become embroiled in.⁴⁶²

⁴⁶¹ Andrew Donnellan, *Submission 105*, p 8.

⁴⁶² COTA, *Submission 109*, p 4.

5. Committee comment, findings and recommendations

- 5.1. In reflecting on the process from the finalisation of the procurement process to the public launch of MyWay+, it is difficult to identify any single point at which the process went wrong and ultimately led to the poor public experience of the new ticketing system. The evidence outlined above lists many decision points at which poor choices were made.
- 5.2. However, a few particular aspects stand out, for example the decision to shift to a single-phase transition. The risks it sought to mitigate, including reducing confusion through avoiding the concurrent operation of two ticketing systems, were instead replaced with confusion caused by the lack of functionality available under MyWay+, by the chaotic experience of passengers on go live day and subsequent days, by the card shortages and QR code ticketing problems, and the problems with validators on buses.
- 5.3. This in turn has damaged public confidence in the public transport system, as evidenced by the extensive evidence provided by its users. Many submitters to this inquiry have also expressed their reduced confidence in the ACT Government's ability to deliver large changes such as MyWay+ effectively. As the Minister for Transport has recognised, the public communication of the transitional nature of the public launch and go live of MyWay+ would have helped ensure that public expectations of the functionality offered at launch were in line with what Transport Canberra was in a position to provide.
- 5.4. While this would have helped to mitigate the reputational damage incurred as a result of MyWay+, it would not have prevented it. While other large digital projects have been subjected to sustained public scrutiny and critique, MyWay+ appears unique in its direct impact on the public. The problems with MyWay+ occurred in full public sight, with the users of public transport being the primary victims of its various failures. It may take some time for public confidence in the delivery of large-scale digital projects to fully recover.
- 5.5. The changes in scope and delivery timelines, partially because of the shift to a single-phase transition, appear to have placed consideration pressure on the project teams within NEC and Transport Canberra. The timelines for delivery of various scope items were consistently not met, and the projections were repeatedly pushed out in response. This demonstrates the impact of the significant schedule pressure raised by Projects Assured and raises questions about the amount of the staff and resources allocated to the project by the ACT Government.
- 5.6. Choosing to launch MyWay+ with minimum product viability at all was a bold call. Choosing to launch it in the face of clear feedback and testing that showed it was not performing the basic functions expected by Canberrans was an extremely poor decision.
- 5.7. Given the finding by Projects Assured that the schedule pressures resulted in key project documentation not being available or of sufficient quality, this also raises questions about the ability of the project teams to effectively document and mitigate risk, and to ensure that the ACT Government and its vendor were working as closely together as should be

expected in the project of this scale. This is especially the case in the lead up to the launch date, the point at which this shared understanding becomes most important.

Recommendation 2

The Committee recommends that the ACT Auditor-General consider examination of the MyWay+ project team's project documentation, as highlighted in the Projects Assured report.

- 5.8. While it is never possible to account for, and mitigate, every risk in a large, complex project such as MyWay+, in this specific case the Committee has been provided – and in some cases published - project documents. These documents demonstrate a disconnect between the efforts to address risks and the outcomes of these efforts. Something has clearly gone wrong in the risk management process.
- 5.9. For example, many of the risks that were realised at launch were raised in the Projects Assured report, and according to Transport Canberra addressed or resolved to the extent that they could recommend that the public launch go ahead in late November 2024 as planned. Many of the aspects that are highlighted in the evidence on user experience are at odds with the pre-launch assurances that MyWay+ was a functional product, ready to go live on 27 November 2024.

Finding 16

The Committee finds that the MyWay+ project demonstrates a significant lack of appropriate risk management practices within Transport Canberra.

- 5.10. In making recommendations the Committee seeks to focus on future actions and improvements. As such, a process within the City and Environment Directorate which examines the assessment and mitigation of risk in the MyWay+ project, the extent to which it contributed to the outcomes outlined in the evidence to this inquiry and this report, and steps that can be taken to improve risk management in large digital projects would be far more useful than any exercise that results in the retrospective laying of blame.

Recommendation 3

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government conduct an internal review of risk management within the MyWay+ project, with a view to identifying and implementing specific process changes in how risks are managed and mitigated in large digital procurements. Further, that the Minister for Transport report to the Legislative Assembly on the process changes identified and how they are being implemented and that this report be updated in the Assembly once every six months until the end of the term.

- 5.11. In terms of project management, despite the evident experience in delivering projects on this scale both within Transport Canberra and NEC, MyWay+ was delivered poorly and failed in many aspects. Similarly, the finding by Projects Assured that the Transport Canberra project team established in mid-2023 was of sufficient size and possessed the required skills to deliver the project now seems less certain.
- 5.12. The timing of the changes to the transition plan, commencing with the establishment of the new project team in mid-2023, appears significant. This was the point at which the risks of a multi-phase transition proposed by a vendor with experience in managing this type of project were reconsidered, and an entirely new single-phase transition was requested by the ACT Government.
- 5.13. The evidence to this inquiry shows that, following the establishment of the new project schedule through to launch in November 2024, the MyWay+ project fell further and further behind in schedule. It is evident that the changes in the transition plan and resultant adjustments to the project milestones were poorly managed, and that system readiness projections were frequently inaccurate.
- 5.14. The comment made by Projects Assured about 'just in time' delivery contributing to a highly compressed delivery schedule is certainly borne out by subsequent events. This period of increased activity, and the concerns expressed by Projects Assured about the lack of shared understanding of what constitutes a minimum viable product, raises concerns about how the project was managed, and the public service resources devoted to managing it.
- 5.15. The Committee is deeply concerned that the lack of shared understanding of a minimum viable product extends even to issues like compliance with accessibility requirements. Transport Canberra does not appear to have asked direct questions of NEC about accessibility until after the launch, and neither did NEC see a need to include accessibility in the information it provided to Transport Canberra. This shows the extent of the disconnect between the two parties to the contract. Transport Canberra did not even arrange a clearly documented understanding of what a minimum viable project was.
- 5.16. The final phases of the MyWay+ program in the leadup to the go-live date on 27 November 2024 represents a period of increased activity for both NEC and Transport Canberra. The evidence outlined above presents a clear picture of an accelerating hardware installation process which was consistently unable to meet the expected targets.
- 5.17. If, as Projects Assured noted, project staff were so busy ensuring that MyWay+ was in a position to provide a minimum viable product at some point in November 2024 that they were unable to complete project documentation to a reasonable standard, again, something has gone very wrong. End-loading a project schedule to the degree evident in the MyWay+ project significantly increases the pressure on the project teams and leaves little room to respond to unexpected delays such as the issues associated with installing hardware on the bus fleet and the late delivery of ticket vending machines.

Finding 17

The Committee finds that the MyWay+ project constitutes a significant failure to effectively manage a complex digital project and comes in the context of a series of digital projects that have been poorly managed and delivered by the ACT Government.

Finding 18

The Committee finds that there was insufficient transparency regarding the costs of the MyWay+ project which hindered its ability to determine whether the project was delivered within budget, and the financial implications of lost revenue.

- 5.18. In light of other complex digital projects with similar results, the Committee sees a need for urgent reform to project management within the ACT Government.

Recommendation 4

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government commence a cross-directorate structured program of internal project management reform, and that a report on this program outlining the specific steps to be taken, as well as the timing of these steps, be presented to the Legislative Assembly within 12 months; and that the Assembly be updated once every 12 months on the implementation of this reform.

- 5.19. Any program of project management reform, if it is to increase public confidence in the ability of government to delivery complex projects, must include some form of publicly available, measurable metrics of success.

Recommendation 5

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government require that future annual reports of large ACT Government agencies include a section on project management, which highlights the extent to which project deliverables have been achieved on time and within budget, quantifies and explains any delays incurred, and provides sufficient detail to support effective scrutiny by Legislative Assembly committees.

- 5.20. The Committee is seriously concerned that upon launch, the MyWay+ system was non-compliant with legislated accessibility requirements. By still being in the delivery phase after the system's public launch, it allowed for a situation where parts of the promised new system were not functional and remained in-development after the public launch.
- 5.21. It is astonishing that Transport Canberra and the ACT Government chose to go ahead with a system in which public transport users with vision impairments or mobility devices were negatively impacted and in some cases unable to use the service at all. This is further

compounded by the fact that these users are generally more reliant on public transport. It appears that little effort was made to effectively communicate this to these users, with some details only emerging during the conduct of this inquiry. We may never know the full impact this had on public transport users.

- 5.22. In the Committee's view, blame cannot be placed on NEC alone. Given the contract had not entered the operations and maintenance phase, and that meeting accessibility standards was considered a deliverable during the delivery phase of the contract, NEC could understandably have considered itself compliant with the requirements of the contract.
- 5.23. Rather, the fault lies with poor contract management that took no care to provide basic accessibility features to Canberrans. Noting the six months that elapsed between the ACT and NEC representatives signing the December 2023 contract variation, it appears that the problems with project documentation extended to key contract documents and were a feature of the MyWay+ project well before the stages leading up to launch.
- 5.24. Additionally, in contract variations, regard should have been given to ensuring that key accessibility requirements formed part of the concept of minimum viable product. If legislated accessibility requirements could not be met at launch, then MyWay+ was not ready to launch.

Finding 19

The Committee finds that MyWay+'s non-compliance with accessibility requirements has failed the ACT community, in particular people living with disabilities.

- 5.25. Furthermore, links can be drawn to the lack of project documentation and poor project management discussed above. Given the lack of project documentation and a shared understanding of minimum viable product between NEC and Transport Canberra, it is uncertain whether compliance with accessibility requirements would have been effectively shared between the parties to the MyWay+ contract.

Recommendation 6

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government require the cross-directorate structured program of internal project management reform, as per Recommendation 4, include a focus on ensuring compliance with accessibility requirements and standards, particularly in relation to projects that are subject to major contract variations that result in changes to delivery schedules.

- 5.26. The community testing for MyWay+ appears rushed and haphazard. Undertaking community testing concurrent with the accelerated hardware installation resulted in gaps in the testing. Transport Canberra's contention that not all community testing feedback could be actioned, and identified sufficient problems that their addressing had to be prioritised to fit with the go live date indicates that the process was not sufficiently robust to ensure that as many issues as possible could be addressed prior to the public launch.

This also speaks to the nature of the project schedule, particularly in the final stages before the public launch.

- 5.27. Additionally, the feedback received from community testers does not inspire confidence in the community testing process. The characterisation in the ministerial brief of 25 November 2024 of the pre-launch testing undertaken is not realistic. The Committee is unable to see how the community testing outlined in evidence, with its confusing, vague instructions and lack of any systematic attempt to survey testers, can in any way be referred to as considerable testing, let alone provide any assurance that the system would be functional once launched.

Finding 20

The Committee finds that the MyWay+ project testing process was flawed and unable to contribute useful information that would have effectively informed the project team about the readiness of the system.

- 5.28. Again, as with risk and project management, the haphazard, unstructured approach to community testing of the MyWay+ system shows poor project management and a pressing need for reform.
- 5.29. Community testing of a vital, public-facing digital infrastructure project appears to be an afterthought. There was no systematic attempt to ensure community testers had the information they needed to conduct the testing, know what they were testing, or to collate and disseminate the results of the testing. The Committee cannot see how user feedback was integrated and informed the rollout of the project or changed any decisions or implementation. These issues must all be addressed to ensure that the MyWay+ community testing is not repeated in future projects of this scale and prominence.

Recommendation 7

The Committee recommends that the ACT Government produce a manual for best-practice community testing programs for complex projects with important public-facing aspects or functions and that the ACT Government apply these procedures to test all major complex projects.

- 5.30. One key question that the Committee has not been able to adequately answer in this inquiry is why a public launch in November 2024 was considered so critical. As outlined above, the Minister for Transport once delayed the public launch due to delays in the installation of card readers on buses. However when further installation delays occurred, Transport Canberra nonetheless proposed a public launch on 27 November due to that being the day that had previously been announced. There was no technical reason at this stage why the launch had to go ahead. The 3G network was not about to finish. The Committee can see no legitimate reason why ACT Government chose to launch an essential service that was clearly not ready for launch.

- 5.31. In hindsight, it is easy to see that the reputational damage incurred by launching on 27 November 2024 outweighs the reputational damage of a further delay to the launch. This appears not to have been evident prior to launch.
- 5.32. In essence, the only information in front of the Committee that supports the decision to launch on 27 November 2024 is that the ACT Government had announced this date previously, and that Transport Canberra and NEC both believed the system was ready.
- 5.33. This report outlines a series of major problems within the project occurring concurrently in October and November 2024. Compounding delays in hardware installation, an inability to complete project documentation, an inability to coordinate community testing, an inability to collate and action the feedback from the community testing, a lack of a shared understanding between NEC and Transport Canberra of what constitutes a minimum viable product one month before launch, taken together surely would have led to a conclusion that a further delay to the public launch was necessary.
- 5.34. The evidence also indicates that the Minister and project team were aware of the problems. The hardware installation delays were communicated internally and to the Minister. Projects Assured raised major issues around the implementation and documentation of the project milestones necessary for the intended functionality at launch. Community testers provided feedback that was clearly at odds with the internal testing undertaken. Community groups provided unsolicited feedback to both Transport Canberra and the Minister's office.
- 5.35. That all these factors were not put together by any individual or group within the project and only came to light once the system went live, is unclear. In the Committee's view, this leads to the conclusion that oversight of the MyWay+ project as a whole was lacking. The various forums that constituted the project's governing structure were unable to put all of the pieces together and form a view that further delays in the public launch were the best way forward. It appears that no individual or group had a sufficiently broad view of the project's implementation to be able to effectively see the many issues that emerged in October and November 2024 and advise the Minister for Transport that further delays were necessary. There was a serious failure of management for this project and that is why it delivered such poor outcomes for Canberrans.

Finding 21

The Committee finds that there was a failure of management over the MyWay+ project and that its delivery structure was not sufficient to provide internal oversight and identify key concerns in relation to the delivery schedule.

- 5.36. The Committee also notes that, in the two ministerial briefings on the public launch from 8 and 25 November 2024, the apparent key considerations put forward for determining the launch date have heavy political undertones.
- 5.37. Specifically, in asking the Minister to consider two potential launch dates in the 8 November briefing, the key issue that was put forward was the public announcement of

fare free Fridays, its proximity to the first sittings of the 11th Assembly and the possible prioritisation of other public announcements. For the 25 November briefing, the reputational cost of not adhering to previous announcements is listed as the critical reason on the front page of the brief.

- 5.38. The Committee questions these considerations from which to make a key decision about whether to launch. The Committee does not know the cause, but notes that they do not indicate a culture of providing frank and fearless advice or delivering competent management to deliver an essential service.

6. Data security

- 6.1. The security of users' data emerged early in this inquiry as a highly concerning area. This section sets out a timeline of events that developed during the Committee's examination of the MyWay+ system.
- 6.2. According to the ACT Government, the contract with NEC Australia contained clauses aimed at ensuring the integrity of the system. These clauses included a requirement that NEC 'adhere to various ACT Government standards regarding data sovereignty', that 'certain types of data' be stored locally, that NEC notify the ACT Government if data is to be stored offshore, and restrictions on the use of ACT data in developing systems offshore.⁴⁶³
- 6.3. NEC stated that it 'designed the MyWay+ system in line with best practices for security in IT intensive systems', in addition to ensuring compliance with ACT Government requirements. NEC and the ACT Government also 'independently and jointly developed contingencies' for managing cybersecurity threats and defined 'appropriate escalation and notification paths'.⁴⁶⁴
- 6.4. The ACT Government told the Committee about efforts taken to manage potential cybersecurity threats to MyWay+:

For example, in the event of a proven breach, MyWay+ will be shut down and all data connections to the ACT Government system severed, including the ACT Digital Account.⁴⁶⁵

- 6.5. Primary responsibility for monitoring attempts to breach MyWay+ rests with NEC, which is required to notify the ACT Government of any attempted breaches 'determined by the level of threat presented'. According to the ACT Government, when it made its submission, there had 'been no recorded data breaches of the MyWay+ system'.⁴⁶⁶
- 6.6. This assurance notwithstanding, on 27 February 2025, the Director-General of Transport Canberra and City Services Directorate, David Pryce, wrote to the Committee noting that:

The MyWay+ Project and its vendor NEC have been working closely with the Transport Canberra and City Services (TCCS) Chief Information Officer and the ACT Chief Information Security Officer (ACT CISO) to resolve a number of cyber security vulnerabilities that were identified during the launch of MyWay+.⁴⁶⁷

- 6.7. Mr Pryce noted that 'there is a strong likelihood the Committee's inquiry has received public submissions which include or refer to such vulnerabilities'.⁴⁶⁸ While Mr Pryce stated

⁴⁶³ ACT Government, *Submission 59*, p 14.

⁴⁶⁴ NEC, *Submission 63*, p 4.

⁴⁶⁵ ACT Government, *Submission 59*, p 14.

⁴⁶⁶ ACT Government, *Submission 59*, p 14.

⁴⁶⁷ David Pryce, Director-General, Transport Canberra and City Services Directorate, *Submission 53*, p. 1.

⁴⁶⁸ David Pryce, Transport Canberra and City Services Directorate, *Submission 53*, p. 1.

that as at 13 February 2025, ‘all high severity vulnerabilities have been resolved’, NEC was still working to address ‘many lower priority vulnerabilities’.⁴⁶⁹

- 6.8. The ACT Government discussed the steps taken to address cybersecurity risks. Its submission stated that CyberCX was engaged to conduct a Cybersecurity Threat Risk Assessment. This assessment identified one risk that was ‘above tolerance level’. According to the ACT Government, ‘treatments were applied to the identified and other risks, resulting in the final review determining all risks being considered below the ACT Government’s accepted tolerance level’.⁴⁷⁰
- 6.9. Further testing was undertaken internally by NEC. Officials told the Committee that this involved at least three instances of penetration testing both before and after the public launch.⁴⁷¹
- 6.10. Ongoing risks to user data was accounted for via the development of a Security Risk Treatment Schedule, which is tracked by a group involving representatives from NEC, Transport Canberra and the Chief Information Security Officer.⁴⁷²
- 6.11. These efforts notwithstanding, DDTS advised that the task of maintaining the security of digital systems ‘is not exhaustive’. No software will be free of defect, and the ACT Government does ‘as comprehensive testing as [it] can feasibly run’.⁴⁷³ Even so, Transport Canberra noted that ‘you can conduct multiple testings, perform the same testing with different vendors... and end up with different results’.⁴⁷⁴
- 6.12. As foreshadowed by Mr Pryce, the Committee received two early submissions that raised two specific vulnerabilities in the MyWay+ system from two computer science students – Patrick Reid and Shaun Fulham.⁴⁷⁵ As noted by Andrew Donnellan, the ‘nature of the vulnerabilities’ Mr Reid and Mr Fulham identified showed that the security audit that was undertaken was ‘not properly scoped’ or not undertaken by the right people, and further that ‘there is something wrong in NEC’.⁴⁷⁶

The “Free Money Glitch”

- 6.13. Mr Reid and Mr Fulham noted that on 27 November 2024, the ‘balance transfer mechanism was missing critical (server side) checks’. These missing checks meant that anyone with sufficient technical skill ‘could ask MyWay+ for as much free money as you want’ – the “free money glitch”.⁴⁷⁷

⁴⁶⁹ David Pryce, Director-General, Transport Canberra and City Services Directorate, *Submission 53*, p. 1.

⁴⁷⁰ ACT Government, *Submission 59*, p 15.

⁴⁷¹ Ben McHugh, Deputy Director General, Transport Canberra and Business Services, City and Environment Directorate, *Committee Hansard*, 27 March 2025, p 127.

⁴⁷² ACT Government, *Submission 59*, p 15.

⁴⁷³ Julian Valtas, Chief Information Security Officer, Cyber Security Centre, Digital Data and Technology Solutions, Chief Minister Treasury and Economic Development Directorate, *Committee Hansard*, 27 March 2025, p 127.

⁴⁷⁴ Ben McHugh, Transport Canberra and Business Services, City and Environment Directorate, *Committee Hansard*, 27 March 2025, p 127.

⁴⁷⁵ Patrick Reid, *Submission 56*, and Shaun Fulham, *Submission 78*.

⁴⁷⁶ Andrew Donnellan, *Committee Hansard*, 26 March 2025, p 54.

⁴⁷⁷ Patrick Reid, *Submission 56*, p 1.

6.14. According to Mr Reid, this was reported to the Australian Signals Directorate (ASD) within hours and the system was suspended temporarily.⁴⁷⁸

6.15. Similarly, officials told the Committee that:

The “endless loop” is actually technically better described as an SQL injection, which is where you would establish a database and have that database set on automatic and start feeding in a piece of information and get that information to respond out of the system. That vulnerability was identified very early.⁴⁷⁹

6.16. Specifically, this vulnerability was identified on 14 November 2024 – prior to go-live – via a responsible disclosure and remediated out of the system on 16 November 2024.⁴⁸⁰

Personal data

6.17. The second vulnerability was more serious and involved the personal data of MyWay+ users. Mr Reid told the Committee that personal details, including full names, phone numbers, email addresses, full MyWay+ card numbers, and the first six and last four credit/debit card numbers were ‘leaked on a public, unauthenticated endpoint’.⁴⁸¹

6.18. Mr Reid elaborated on this vulnerability:

Not only were all of these details on the public internet, with no authentication, they were also very easy to index. All account numbers are serial (with small gaps). This means that within the range [600, 800], there is at least 30 users information. Scraping this is very easy. Just ask for user 1, followed by user 2, and so on until you have every registered user.⁴⁸²

6.19. Mr Fulham stated that this issue was also notified to ASD and the ACT Government on 6 December 2024, and again on 12 December 2024. The issues identified by Mr Fulham were mostly patched by 15 December 2024, and when notified that Mr Fulham intended to publish the identified vulnerabilities on 11 January 2025, the ACT Government requested that this be delayed. Mr Fulham ultimately published the details on 21 February 2025.⁴⁸³

6.20. Officials noted that, when notified of this issue, TCCS found that ‘you could take some information out’ of the MyWay+ system ‘using pretty rudimentary technology tools’. However, ‘if you were making an inquiry of the system, using these tools, it would then pass back your credentials’.⁴⁸⁴

⁴⁷⁸ Patrick Reid, *Submission 56*, p 1.

⁴⁷⁹ Mark White, Executive Branch Manager, Transport Canberra and Business Services, City and Environment Directorate, *Committee Hansard*, 13 March 2025, p 3.

⁴⁸⁰ Mark White, Transport Canberra and Business Services, City and Environment Directorate, *Committee Hansard*, 13 March 2025, p 3.

⁴⁸¹ Patrick Reid, *Submission 56*, p 1.

⁴⁸² Patrick Reid, *Submission 56*, p 1.

⁴⁸³ Shaun Fulham, *Submission 78*, p 1.

⁴⁸⁴ Mark White, Transport Canberra and Business Services, City and Environment Directorate, *Committee Hansard*, 13 March 2025, p 4.

6.21. TCCS had tested the proposition put by Mr Reid relating to the ability to extract other users' data. It found that changing the numbers in the request 'did not get any other information', and as a result the vulnerability's risk rating was downgraded as 'not being a critical one'. This was due to it being assessed as not capable of 'passing out information' or 'extract large volumes of personal identifying data'.⁴⁸⁵

6.22. Mr Reid characterised this vulnerability as a notifiable data breach.⁴⁸⁶ On 27 March 2025, the Minister for Transport disagreed, noting advice from Transport Canberra to that effect.⁴⁸⁷ In elaborating on this characterisation, the Minister told the Committee that:

It is important to note the distinction between a 'Data Breach' and a 'System Vulnerability', as the terms are not interchangeable. The ACT Cyber Security Centre defines a data breach as happening "when personal information is accessed or disclosed inappropriately, or without authorisation, or is lost"; whereas, a system vulnerability, can be defined as "a weakness in a system's security requirements, design, implementation or operation that could be accidentally triggered or intentionally exploited and result in a violation of the system's security policy".⁴⁸⁸

6.23. At the public hearing on 27 March 2025, officials stated that once TCCS received notification of the security vulnerabilities, 'NEC were actively and immediately engaged'. Officials re-stated the essence of the 13 March evidence: that a researcher examining the MyWay+ system 'may well have discovered their own [personal identifying information] and may have theorised that they would be able to access more', however Transport Canberra had 'not seen any evidence' that other users' data could be extracted from the system.⁴⁸⁹

6.24. However, Mr Fulham contested this view:

It was stated that I only accessed my own data; this is not true. In order to thoroughly check that it was not just a mere coincidence or anything, I did check surrounding user IDs—the first couple, like zero and one. However, I did not save any data outside of my own, and a very, very small amount of Mr Reid's data with his consent. I did not save any other Canberrans' information.⁴⁹⁰

6.25. Similarly, Mr Reid recounted his own investigations into the vulnerability identified by Mr Fulham. He told the Committee that:

I made 10,000 requests to the server for a "fare media" end point. This was to see, "Does the server respond to a large number of requests, and does it detect that this is suspicious? If you use a suspicious IP from a VPN, does it block it?" The

⁴⁸⁵ Mark White, Executive Branch Manager, Transport Canberra and Business Services, City and Environment Directorate, *Committee Hansard*, 13 March 2025, pp 3-4.

⁴⁸⁶ Patrick Reid, *Submission 56*, p 2.

⁴⁸⁷ Chris Steel MLA, Minister for Transport, *Committee Hansard*, 27 March 2025, pp 122-123.

⁴⁸⁸ Chris Steel MLA, Minister for Transport, *answer to QTON 7, 27 March 2025 (received 8 April 2025)*, p 2.

⁴⁸⁹ Mark White, Transport Canberra and Business Services, City and Environment Directorate, *Committee Hansard*, 27 March 2025, pp 121-122.

⁴⁹⁰ Shaun Fulham, private capacity, *Committee Hansard*, 26 March 2025, p 29.

answer to all of these questions is, roughly, “no”. I have since deleted all of the data that came from that.⁴⁹¹

- 6.26. Furthermore, Mr Reid formed the impression ‘that the government does not know what data has been accessed’.⁴⁹² This concern was reflected in evidence received from the ACT Government. Officials told the Committee that the ‘back-end controls... identified all points of access’, and that Transport Canberra had no evidence of unauthorised access to users’ personal data.⁴⁹³
- 6.27. Mr Reid subsequently disputed this evidence in a supplementary submission. This supplementary submission included an attachment, which contained personal data belonging to Andrew Donnellan (a friend of Mr Reid, and submitter to this inquiry, who agreed to his data being shared with the Committee).⁴⁹⁴
- 6.28. This attachment contained Mr Donnellan’s MyWay+ account number and had been extracted using the methods described by Mr Reid and confirmed by TCCS as only returning the individual user’s data. Using this method, Mr Reid was able to extract, and prove that he had extracted, part of Mr Donnellan’s bank card number and expiry date, as well as his mobile phone number.⁴⁹⁵
- 6.29. A copy of this submission was provided to the Minister for Transport on 9 April 2025, and on 10 April 2025 the Minister told the Assembly of ‘two incidents of minor data breaches’ of the MyWay+ system that had been identified as a result.⁴⁹⁶
- 6.30. Specifically, the Minister informed the Assembly that:
- My office was informed yesterday that NEC has found that personal information relating to around 61 MyWay+ accounts has potentially been seen through the course of the responsible disclosure, which occurred on 5, 6, 9 and 10 December 2024. Early indications are that this is also a minor incident with a mixture of details collected, such as first name, surname, postal address and MyWay+ account number, though the matter is continuing to be investigated.⁴⁹⁷
- 6.31. Minister Steel stated that this vulnerability had been addressed on 13 December 2024, and that there was ‘no evidence that data has been accessed in a malicious manner’ or that any other attempts had been made to exploit the vulnerability.⁴⁹⁸
- 6.32. NEC told the Committee that when these data breaches occurred in December 2024, it was ‘initially not aware’. According to NEC:

⁴⁹¹ Patrick Reid, private capacity, *Committee Hansard*, 26 March 2025, p 29.

⁴⁹² Mr Patrick Reid, private capacity, *Committee Hansard*, 26 March 2025, p 29.

⁴⁹³ Mr Mark White, Executive Branch Manager, Transport Canberra and Business Services, City and Environment Directorate, *Committee Hansard*, 27 March 2025, pp 122-123.

⁴⁹⁴ Patrick Reid, *Submission 56.1*, p 1.

⁴⁹⁵ Patrick Reid, *Submission 56.1*, p 1.

⁴⁹⁶ Chris Steel MLA, Minister for Transport, *Assembly Debates*, 10 April 2025, p 1146.

⁴⁹⁷ Chris Steel MLA, Minister for Transport, *Assembly Debates*, 10 April 2025, p 1146.

⁴⁹⁸ Chris Steel MLA, Minister for Transport, *Assembly Debates*, 10 April 2025, p 1146.

It was only through further investigations as a result of the inquiry, as we have noted in our responses on notice, that we became aware of an issue and, immediately becoming aware of it, reported it to the government.⁴⁹⁹

- 6.33. Additionally, a second incident was disclosed in Minister Steel's statement. This incident involved the release of personal information, including a mix of first names, email addresses, concession types and truncated credit or debit card numbers, of 297 MyWay+ account holders. This information was sent to a single email address, and according to Minister Steel did not compromise the accounts or require further action by account holders.⁵⁰⁰
- 6.34. NEC discussed the March 2025 incident, stating that they 'became aware of it on the day and notified the customer immediately' and provided further details as they emerged.⁵⁰¹ It also noted that this incident did not constitute a security breach, as it related to a person making 'an error in performing a maintenance task with data'. As such, the March 2025 incident is more accurately considered 'an accidental outcome rather than a breach'.⁵⁰²
- 6.35. NEC elaborated on the nature of this incident, stating that:

One of our staff was tasked with updating an individual account holder's email address. An error was made in the process of them doing that and that email address was applied to multiple accounts rather than a singular account. As a consequence, for other MyWay+ account holders who were performing their normal use of the system, who would have received emails giving them notification or confirmation of their own actions in MyWay+, the emails that were generated for those individuals went to that singular one email address instead of going to their own personal email address.⁵⁰³

End-of-life software and encryption

- 6.36. One of the findings of the cybersecurity assessment by CyberCX was that the ACT Government's encryption standard was not in alignment with the Commonwealth Government's information security standards, and that aspects of the MyWay+ software were reliant on end-of-life software.⁵⁰⁴
- 6.37. Officials told the Committee that the encryption standards issue was not specific to MyWay+ itself, but was 'independent of the system' and related to 'the whole-of-government standard' that defines how encryption is undertaken in the ACT. As a result, this standard had 'been flagged for update' and was on the 'critical path for policy update'.⁵⁰⁵

⁴⁹⁹ Mark Messenger, Head of Smart Transport ANZ, NEC, *Committee Hansard*, 1 May 2025, p 137.

⁵⁰⁰ Chris Steel MLA, Minister for Transport, *Assembly Debates*, 10 April 2025, p 1146.

⁵⁰¹ Mark Messenger, NEC, *Committee Hansard*, 1 May 2025, p 137.

⁵⁰² Kylie Gorham, Senior Product Manager, NEC, *Committee Hansard*, 1 May 2025, p 137.

⁵⁰³ Kylie Gorham, NEC, *Committee Hansard*, 1 May 2025, p 138.

⁵⁰⁴ *Committee Hansard*, 1 May 2025, p 157.

⁵⁰⁵ Julian Valtas, Chief Information Security Officer, Cyber Security Centre, Digital Data and Technology Solutions, Chief Minister Treasury and Economic Development Directorate, *Committee Hansard*, 1 May 2025, p 158.

- 6.38. In terms of end-of-life software, Transport Canberra officials noted that the MyWay+ system is ‘made up of multiple pieces of software’ and given the lifecycle stages of all types of software ‘there will always be some that are nearing that end-of-life stage’. However, for MyWay+, ‘none at go-live were end of life’.⁵⁰⁶ NEC told the Committee that the software identified as being end-of-life was rather in ‘maintenance mode’.⁵⁰⁷
- 6.39. Furthermore, according to NEC:
- ...the system is basically offered as a SaaS service, and there is no end-of-life software that forms part of the solution. Obviously, software is being updated and modified continuously and we will continue to update and modify the software in the system as new versions become available.⁵⁰⁸
- 6.40. Mr Reid disputed this characterisation of the software. He believed that relating the claim to the SaaS service was ‘intended to mean that no NEC software components are end of life’, whereas ‘that ignores third-party components (dependencies) that are close to or are already at end of life’.⁵⁰⁹
- 6.41. Mr Reid identified ten dependencies which he characterised as end-of-life, and eight where he could identify the version in use as not being the latest version available. According to Mr Reid, this information was not based on a complete audit of the software, and was limited to a subset of dependencies used as part of the front end of the customer portal.⁵¹⁰

Committee comment

- 6.42. The Committee is deeply concerned that the December 2024 data breaches in the MyWay+ system were not able to be found until Transport Canberra was provided with copies of a submission made to an inquiry being conducted by an Assembly committee.
- 6.43. Of further concern is that these data breaches were notified to Transport Canberra, via the appropriate channels, at multiple points by the very same individuals who provided these submissions to the Committee’s inquiry.
- 6.44. A parliamentary committee with no particular technical skill should not be better able to recognise the seriousness of the security concerns and breaches being reported than the Government agency delivering a complex digital project. This represents a serious failure of technical expertise and judgment at senior levels.
- 6.45. Furthermore, when questioned about these matters in hearings, officials provided responses to the effect that the system penetration achieved by university students could not be replicated by the project team. Indeed, it would appear that this was the position held within Transport Canberra until the Committee provided evidence for the successful penetration of the MyWay+ and the extraction of user data.

⁵⁰⁶ Mr Mark White, Executive Branch Manager, Transport Canberra and Business Services, City and Environment Directorate, *Committee Hansard*, 1 May 2025, p 158.

⁵⁰⁷ Mark Messenger, Head of Smart Transport ANZ, NEC, *Committee Hansard*, 1 May 2025, p 132.

⁵⁰⁸ Mark Messenger, NEC, *Committee Hansard*, 1 May 2025, p 132.

⁵⁰⁹ Patrick Reid, *Submission 56.2*, p 1.

⁵¹⁰ Patrick Reid, *Submission 56.2*, p 1.

- 6.46. At various points, officials told the Committee that:
- The vulnerability identified by Mr Reid and Mr Fulham ‘could not be exploited’,⁵¹¹ and that Mr Reid and Mr Fulham ‘could only return their own record’.⁵¹²
 - Transport Canberra had ‘not seen any evidence’ that other users’ data could be extracted from the system.⁵¹³
 - The ‘back-end controls’ on accessing user data ‘identified all points of access’ and that Transport Canberra had ‘not seen any evidence’ of unauthorised access to personal identifying information.⁵¹⁴
- 6.47. Responsible citizens like Mr Reid and Mr Fulham are to be applauded for their efforts, and for ensuring the results of their efforts are used in the interests of the public. In the case of MyWay+, the data breach identified may never have been publicly notified were it not for the initial attempts to penetrate the system by Mr Fulham, and Mr Reid watching this inquiry closely and making his response to the evidence he heard from Transport Canberra.
- 6.48. Additionally, the Committee is aware that other potential vulnerabilities within the MyWay+ system have been identified by members of the public, and notified via the appropriate channels for remediation or mitigation. While it is never possible to make any system that functions online fully safe, and the struggle between those seeking to penetrate systems and those seeking to keep them secure is never ending, it is nonetheless concerning that in the case of MyWay+, multiple issues have emerged so quickly following the launch. The Committee remains concerned that the officials in charge of data security who were unable to recognise the problem in the first place, despite being repeatedly told about it, remain in place to manage data security going forwards.
- 6.49. The Committee is not in a position to draw clear conclusions about whether or not the nature of the software used in building MyWay+ is responsible for the security vulnerabilities identified, or whether this relates to aspects of the software being at end-of-life. However, the process outlined above in relation to the December 2024 data breach does raise serious concerns about the capacity to effectively act on responsible disclosures made to the ACT Government by individuals like Mr Fulham and Mr Reid.

Finding 22

The Committee finds that Transport Canberra officials failed to take the security vulnerabilities and data breaches reported by members of the public seriously, and repeatedly told the Committee that there was no basis for these concerns despite clear evidence to the contrary.

⁵¹¹ Mark White, Executive Branch Manager, Transport Canberra and Business Services, City and Environment Directorate, *Committee Hansard*, 13 March 2025, p 4.

⁵¹² Mark White, Transport Canberra and Business Services, City and Environment Directorate, *Committee Hansard*, 13 March 2025, p 8.

⁵¹³ Mark White, Transport Canberra and Business Services, City and Environment Directorate, *Committee Hansard*, 27 March 2025, pp 121-122.

⁵¹⁴ Mark White, Transport Canberra and Business Services, City and Environment Directorate, *Committee Hansard*, 27 March 2025, pp 122-123.

7. Conclusion

- 7.1. This inquiry was extraordinary.
- 7.2. While other scrutiny processes have examined large digital projects that have not gone to plan, MyWay+ is unique in that the aspects that did not go to plan took place in full public view, as they happened. The level of community engagement, and the almost unanimously negative feedback, received by the Committee is a clear sign of the deep public impact that MyWay+ had in the ACT.
- 7.3. At each set of public hearings, the Committee heard of new problems and issues with the MyWay+ system. Indeed, it would have been possible to continue the inquiry until the delivery phase of MyWay+ had been completed and the system was fully functional. However, it seems unlikely that this would have altered the outcome of this report. Project management and service delivery failed at many key points and further inquiry is likely to lead to more findings of failure.
- 7.4. Similarly, it would have been possible for the Committee to forensically examine each of the issues raised in the evidence to this inquiry and make highly targeted recommendations on each specific matter. However, given the scale of the problems that have emerged, there seemed little value in making recommendations aimed at fixing each specific aspect of MyWay+, particularly in light of the fact that the project was still in the delivery phase.
- 7.5. Rather, in reporting on this inquiry the Committee sought to consider the many problems together, to seek to understand the systemic issues and, hopefully, make recommendations that address them. In making these recommendations, the focus has been on establishing processes that draw out the key lessons from MyWay+, apply these lessons to future large, complex digital projects, and to include public reporting on the steps to be taken as a result.
- 7.6. The Committee would like to express its thanks to all those who submitted to the inquiry or attended as a witness at the public hearing. In particular, the Committee thanks all the individuals who contributed to this inquiry.
- 7.7. The Committee has made 22 findings and 7 recommendations in the report.

Jo Clay MLA

Chair, Standing Committee on Planning and Environment

27 October 2025

Appendix A: Submissions and Exhibits

Submissions

No.	Submission by	Received	Published
1	Name withheld	16/01/2025	17/01/2025
2	Harry Morgan	20/12/2024	17/01/2025
3	Inner South Canberra Community Council (ISCCC)	12/01/2025	17/01/2025
4	Australian Multicultural Action Network (AMAN)	20/01/2025	30/01/2025
5	Greta Nielsen	29/01/2025	21/02/2025
6	John Dow	30/01/2025	21/02/2025
7	Leon Arundell	30/01/2025	21/02/2025
8	Dr Hugh Smith	4/02/2025	21/02/2025
9	Lachlan Fisk	7/02/2025	21/02/2025
10	Liana Harrington	8/02/2025	21/02/2025
11	Canaxess	9/02/2025	21/02/2025
12	Name withheld	11/02/2025	21/02/2025
13	ACT Council of Parents & Citizens Associations	12/02/2025	21/02/2025
14	Jon Lawrence	30/01/2025	21/02/2025
15	Andrew Bleeze	30/01/2025	21/02/2025
16	Myra Judge	31/01/2025	21/02/2025
17	Andrew Gruber	31/01/2025	21/02/2025
18	Nick Dowling	1/02/2025	21/02/2025
19	Evan Slayter	1/02/2025	21/02/2025
20	Andrew Hutt	3/02/2025	21/02/2025
21	Cameron Gosley	5/02/2025	21/02/2025
22	Andrew Wadey	6/02/2025	21/02/2025
23	Roy William Lupton	6/02/2025	21/02/2025
24	Christine Butterfield	7/02/2025	21/02/2025
25	Kaab Qureshi	7/02/2025	21/02/2025
26	Nathan Rickerby	7/02/2025	21/02/2025
27	Ilona Sigrid Crabb	8/02/2025	21/02/2025
28	Andrew Kristoffersen	8/02/2025	21/02/2025
29	Mary McDonald	10/02/2025	21/02/2025
30	Ian Robertson	10/02/2025	21/02/2025

No.	Submission by	Received	Published
31	Victor Kalkman	10/02/2025	21/02/2025
32	Anne Rowlands	10/02/2025	21/02/2025
33	Lynsey Dodds	11/02/2025	21/02/2025
34	Edward Seychelles	11/02/2025	21/02/2025
35	Oliver Hockey	11/02/2025	21/02/2025
36	Jonathan Campton	11/02/2025	21/02/2025
37	Vanessa Lester	11/02/2025	21/02/2025
38	John Guilfoyle	12/02/2025	21/02/2025
39	Alex Vickery	12/02/2025	21/02/2025
40	James Manwaring	12/02/2025	21/02/2025
41	Omer Mohsin Mubarak	13/02/2025	21/02/2025
42	Name withheld webform responses	30/01/2025	21/02/2025
43	Sally Walker	15/02/2025	6/03/2025
44	Sarah Burns	15/02/2025	6/03/2025
45	Peter Enzerink	15/02/2025	6/03/2025
46	Gill Smile	19/02/2025	6/03/2025
47	Jason Barnes	19/02/2025	6/03/2025
48	David Archbold	21/02/2025	6/03/2025
49	Bruce Pittard	21/02/2025	6/03/2025
50	Oliver Hulin	21/02/2025	6/03/2025
51	Michael Gregg	23/02/2025	6/03/2025
52	Bernadette Fabbo	14/02/2025	14/03/2025
53	David Pryce, Director General TCCSD	25/02/2025	17/03/2025
54	Ivan Neville PSM	28/02/2025	14/03/2025
55	Brendan Halloran	28/02/2025	14/03/2025
56	Patrick Reid	28/02/2025	17/03/2025
56.1	Patrick Reid - Supplementary	28/02/2025	9/04/2025
56.2	Patrick Reid - Supplementary	28/02/2025	9/04/2025
57	Bill Gemmell	28/02/2025	14/03/2025
58	Name withheld	28/02/2025	14/03/2025
59	ACT Government	28/02/2025	14/03/2025
59.1	ACT Government - Supplementary	28/02/2025	14/03/2025
60	Jennifer Manson	28/02/2025	14/03/2025

No.	Submission by	Received	Published
61	Published as Submission 108	28/02/2025	N/A
62	Belconnen Community Council (BCC)	28/02/2025	14/03/2025
63	NEC Australia	28/02/2025	14/03/2025
64	Mark Dando	28/02/2025	14/03/2025
65	Name withheld	28/02/2025	14/03/2025
66	Name withheld	28/02/2025	14/03/2025
67	Angie Murray	21/02/2025	14/03/2025
68	Alison Windsor	25/02/2025	14/03/2025
69	Lily Platt	25/02/2025	14/03/2025
70	Geoffrey Scammell	25/02/2025	14/03/2025
71	Mark Huppert	25/02/2025	14/03/2025
72	Naveen Nathan	25/02/2025	14/03/2025
73	Nicolas Hickey	25/02/2025	14/03/2025
74	Richard Pratt	25/02/2025	14/03/2025
75	Tina Smith	25/02/2025	14/03/2025
76	Fred Pilcher	25/02/2025	14/03/2025
77	Peter Bridgewater	25/02/2025	14/03/2025
78	Shaun Fulham	24/02/2025	17/03/2025
79	Sarah Miller	25/02/2025	14/03/2025
80	Tim Javenson	25/02/2025	14/03/2025
81	Graham Anderson	25/02/2025	14/03/2025
82	Tangyao Zhang	25/02/2025	14/03/2025
83	Phoebe Williams	25/02/2025	14/03/2025
84	Joshua Osborne Goldsbrough	25/02/2025	14/03/2025
85	John Storey	25/02/2025	14/03/2025
86	Sebastian Stallard	25/02/2025	14/03/2025
87	Andrew McCahon	25/02/2025	17/03/2025
88	Nicole Brown	26/02/2025	14/03/2025
89	Kieran Vale	26/02/2025	14/03/2025
90	Pending	26/02/2025	N/A
91	Ian Reid	26/02/2025	14/03/2025
92	Milena Dunn	27/02/2025	14/03/2025
93	Pat Tandy	27/02/2025	14/03/2025

No.	Submission by	Received	Published
94	Karen Mobbs	27/02/2025	14/03/2025
95	Karen Murnain	27/02/2025	14/03/2025
96	Pending	28/02/2025	N/A
97	Heather Fitzpatrick	28/02/2025	14/03/2025
98	Pending	10/02/2025	N/A
99	Ben Jones	28/02/2025	14/03/2025
100	Connor Storen	28/02/2025	14/03/2025
101	Tony Hill	28/02/2025	14/03/2025
102	Judith Elizabeth Dodd	28/02/2025	14/03/2025
103	Jennifer Cohen	28/02/2025	14/03/2025
104	Public Transport Association of Canberra	3/03/2025	14/03/2025
105	Andrew Donnellan	4/03/2025	17/03/2025
106	Confidential	22/02/2025	14/03/2025
107	Confidential	25/02/2025	14/03/2025
108	Name withheld	28/02/2025	14/03/2025
109	COTA ACT	24/02/2025	10/04/2025

Exhibits

No.	Exhibit by	Received	Published
1	Attachment 3: Risk Management Plan	DD/MM/YY	DD/MM/YY
2	Attachment 2 (Delivery) MyWay+ Risk Register extract (as at 11 September 2025)	DD/MM/YY	DD/MM/YY

Appendix B: Witnesses

Wednesday, 26 March 2025

Private capacity

- Mr Andrew Donnellan
- Ms Heather Fitzpatrick
- Mr Shaun Fulham
- Ms Madeleine Harwood
- Mr Ben Langley
- Mr Patrick Reid

Organisation

Australian Multicultural Action Network

- Ms Radha Ravi

CANAXESS

- Mr Ross Mullen, Director

NEC Australia

- Mr Mark Messenger, Head of Smart Transport ANZ
- Ms Kylie Gorham, Senior Product Manager

Public Transport Association of Canberra

- Mr Ryan Hemsley, Chair
- Dr Amy Jelacic, Deputy Chair, Public Transport Association of Canberra

Thursday, 27 March 2025

Private capacity

- Ms Anna Orlova, Private citizen
- Ms Alexandra Vickery, Private citizen

Organisation

Belconnen Community Council

- Mr Lachlan Butler, Chair, Belconnen Community Council

Inner South Canberra Community Council

- Mr Colin John Walters, Chair, Inner South Canberra Community Council

ACT Government

Mr Chris Steel MLA, Treasurer, Minister for Planning and Sustainable Development, Minister for Heritage and Minister for Transport

Transport Canberra and City Services Directorate

- Mr Ben McHugh, Deputy Director-General, Transport Canberra and Business Services
- Mr Mark White, Executive Branch Manager, Transport Canberra and Business Services
- Ms Judith Sturman, Executive Branch Manager, Transport Canberra

Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate

- Mr Julian Valtas, Chief Information Security Officer, Cyber Security Centre

Thursday, 1 May 2025

Organisation

Council on the Ageing ACT

- Ms Jennifer Mobbs, Chief Executive Officer
- Ms Raina Johnston, Manager, ACT Seniors Card and Discount Directory

NEC Australia

- Mr Mark Messenger, Head of Smart Transport ANZ
- Ms Kylie Gorham, Senior Product Manager

ACT Government

Mr Chris Steel MLA, Treasurer, Minister for Planning and Sustainable Development, Minister for Heritage and Minister for Transport

Transport Canberra and City Services Directorate

- Mr Ben McHugh, Deputy Director-General, Transport Canberra and Business Services

- Mr Mark White, Executive Branch Manager, Transport Canberra and Business Services

Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate

- Mr Julian Valtas, Chief Information Security Officer, Cyber Security Centre

Thursday, 3 July 2025

ACT Government

Mr Chris Steel MLA, Treasurer, Minister for Planning and Sustainable Development, Minister for Heritage and Minister for Transport

Transport Canberra and City Services Directorate

- Mr Ben McHugh, Deputy Director-General, Transport Canberra and Business Services – City and Environment Directorate
- Mr Mark White, Executive Branch Manager, Transport Canberra and Business Services – City and Environment Directorate
- Mr Geoff Virtue, Executive Branch Manager, Communications – City and Environment Directorate

Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate

- Mr Julian Valtas, Chief Information Security Officer, Cyber Security Centre

Appendix C: Private briefing attendees

Thursday, 13 March 2025

ACT Audit Office

- Mr Michael Harris, ACT Auditor-General
- Mr Brett Stanton, Assistant Auditor-General

Appendix D: Questions on Notice and Questions Taken on Notice

Questions on Notice

No.	Date	Asked of	Subject	Response received
1	31/03/2025	Minister for Transport	MyWay+ Functionality	09/04/2025
2	31/03/2025	Minister for Transport	MyWay+ Consultation	09/04/2025
3	31/03/2025	Minister for Transport	MyWay + Revenue and costs	09/04/2025
4	31/03/2025	Minister for Transport	MyWay+ Milestones and risk register	09/04/2025
5	31/03/2025	Minister for Transport	MyWay+ Scope	09/04/2025
6	30/03/2025	Minister for Transport	Milestone details	09/04/2025
7	31/03/2025	Minister for Transport	MyWay+ Scope and recommendations	09/04/2025
8	01/04/2025	Minister for Transport	MyWay+ Functionality	09/04/2025
9	02/04/2025	Minister for Transport	MyWay+ Branding	09/04/2025
10	02/04/2025	Minister for Transport	MyWay+ Community consultation and testing	09/04/2025
11	02/04/2025	Minister for the Public Service (redirection)	MyWay+ Cybersecurity	16/04/2025
12	02/04/2025	Minister for Transport	MyWay+ Family and group accounts	09/04/2025
13	02/04/2025	Minister for Transport	MyWay+ Integration with NSW	09/04/2025
14	02/04/2025	Minister for Transport	MyWay+ TCCS disability reference group	09/04/2025
15	02/04/2025	Minister for Transport	MyWay+ Payment methods	09/04/2025
16	02/04/2025	Minister for Transport	MyWay+ Accessibility legislative compliance	09/04/2025
17	02/04/2025	NEC Australia	MyWay+ Cybersecurity and contract compliance	03/04/2025

No.	Date	Asked of	Subject	Response received
18	02/04/2025	NEC Australia	MyWay+ Data tracking and security	09/04/2025
19	02/04/2025	Public Transport Association of Canberra	MyWay+ Unresolved issues	16/04/2025
20	03/04/2025	Minister for Transport	Risk register	09/04/2025
21	03/04/2025	Minister for Transport	Go-Live brief	27/03/2025
22	03/04/2025	Minister for Transport	FOI, Accessibility and user experience	09/04/2025
23	03/04/2025	Minister for Transport	Cyber CX certification	09/04/2025
24	03/04/2025	Minister for Transport	Software and systems in MyWay+	09/04/2025
25	03/04/2025	Minister for Transport	Evaluation Team Expertise	09/04/2025
26	03/04/2025	Minister for Transport	Data breaches and vulnerabilities	09/04/2025
27	07/05/2025	Minister for Transport	MyWay+ fare discount eligibility	23/05/2025
28	07/05/2025	Minister for Transport	Real-time passenger information	23/05/2025
29	08/05/2025	Minister for Transport	Data breaches and timing	23/05/2025
30	08/05/2025	Minister for Transport	Different evidence given at different times on data breaches	23/05/2025
31	08/05/2025	Minister for Transport	Data breaches, vulnerabilities, credit card, password details timings	23/05/2025
33	07/05/2025	Minister for Transport	MyWay+ Data breaches	27/05/2025
34	07/05/2025	Minister for Transport	MyWay+ User testing	23/05/2025
35	08/05/2025	Minister for Transport	Fare and balance information	23/05/2025
36	07/05/2025	Minister for Transport	MyWay+ Ministerial briefs – cybersecurity	23/05/2025
37	07/05/2025	Minister for Transport	MyWay+ Access	23/05/2025
38	08/05/2025	Minister for Transport	Passenger Information Displays	23/05/2025

No.	Date	Asked of	Subject	Response received
39	08/05/2025	Minister for Transport	Ticket vending machines	23/05/2025
40	07/05/2025	Minister for Transport	Accessibility – stakeholder feedback	23/05/2025
41	08/05/2025	Minister for Transport	Risk register and evidence given about risks	23/05/2025
42	08/05/2025	Minister for Transport	False or misleading evidence	23/05/2025
43	07/05/2025	Minister for Transport	MyWay+ Go-Live decision	23/05/2025
44	07/05/2025	NEC Australia	Deferral of system elements	
45	03/07/2025	Minister for Transport	Access to bike cages	11/07/2025
46	04/07/2025	Minister for Transport	Bus boardings	14/07/2025
47	04/07/2025	Minister for Transport	Lost revenue – MyWay+ patronage	14/07/2025
48	04/07/2025	Minister for Transport	MyWay+ Risk register	14/07/2025
49	04/07/2025	Minister for Transport	Interoperability with NSW	14/07/2025
50	04/07/2025	Minister for Transport	MyWay+ App payment options	14/07/2025
51	04/07/2025	Minister for Transport	MyWay+ Reader installation	14/07/2025
52	04/07/2025	Minister for Transport	MyWay+ App showing bike racks	14/07/2025
53	04/07/2025	Minister for Transport	MyWay+ Ticketing machines	14/07/2025
54	04/07/2025	Minister for Transport	Budget for MyWay+ transition	14/07/2025
55	04/07/2025	Minister for Transport	MyWay+ Risk register ratings	14/07/2025
56	04/07/2025	Minister for Transport	MyWay+ Reader installation	14/07/2025
57	09/07/2025	Minister for Transport	Access to Bike cages	17/07/2025

Questions Taken on Notice

No.	Date	Asked of	Subject	Response received
1	27/03/2025	Minister for Transport	DDA Compliance prior to Go-Live	08/04/2025
2	27/03/2025	Minister for Transport	Contract Delivery Phase	08/04/2025
3	27/03/2025	Minister for Transport	Testing Evaluation	08/04/2025
4	27/03/2025	Minister for Transport	Tracker Activation Dataset	08/04/2025
5	27/03/2025	Minister for Transport	Community Awareness Cost (Comms)	08/04/2025
6	27/03/2025	Minister for Transport	Community Awareness Campaign – Report (Comms)	08/04/2025
7	27/03/2025	Minister for Transport	Advice from PIC and GSO – data breach	08/04/2025
8	27/03/2025	Minister for Transport	Discouraged Users since MyWay+	08/04/2025
9	27/03/2025	Minister for Transport	Bus Usage Data	08/04/2025
10	01/05/2025	Minister for Transport	Undated Risk Register	13/05/2025
11	01/05/2025	Minister for Transport	Risk Register for Project Control Group	13/05/2025
12	01/05/2025	Minister for Transport	Confidential Answer - Milestones	13/05/2025
13	01/05/2025	Minister for Transport	Advice sent to Project Control	13/05/2025
14	01/05/2025	Minister for Transport	Bus Patronage	13/05/2025
15	01/05/2025	Minister for Transport	Patronage numbers for up until end of April	13/05/2025
16	01/05/2025	Minister for Transport	Record of Meetings and accompanying Brief	13/05/2025
17	01/05/2025	Minister for Transport	MyWay validators prior to Go-Live	13/05/2025
18	01/05/2025	Minister for Transport	List of conditions	13/05/2025
19	01/05/2025	Minister for Transport	NEC accessibility readiness	13/05/2025

No.	Date	Asked of	Subject	Response received
20	01/05/2025	Minister for Transport	Non-compliance with Disability Discrimination Act	13/05/2025
21	01/05/2025	Minister for Transport	Accessibility Risk Management	13/05/2025
22	01/05/2025	Minister for Transport	Accessibility Assessment	13/05/2025
23	01/05/2025	Minister for Transport	Non-Compliance Assessment of current system	13/05/2025
24	01/05/2025	Minister for Transport	NEC Contract Compliance	13/05/2025
25	01/05/2025	Minister for Transport	Cost of non-compliance	13/05/2025
26	03/07/2025	Minister for Transport	Incomplete elements of the MyWay+ contract (Public transport)	17/07/2025
27	03/07/2025	Minister for Transport	Treasury concerns about long fare free period (Public transport)	17/07/2025
28	03/07/2025	Minister for Transport	MyWay+ compliance with minimum legal standards (Public transport)	17/07/2025
29	03/07/2025	Minister for Transport	MyWay+ contract variations (Public transport)	17/07/2025
30	03/07/2025	Minister for Transport	Risks to people's personal information or money (Public transport)	17/07/2025
31	03/07/2025	Minister for Transport	Community updates on MyWay+ fixes (Public transport)	17/07/2025
32	03/07/2025	Minister for Transport	ACT Government contract compliance with all laws (Public transport)	17/07/2025
33	03/07/2025	Minister for Transport	Changes to improve and promote accessibility (Public transport)	17/07/2025
34	03/07/2025	Minister for Transport	Responses provided to the Committee in relation to risk management (Public transport)	17/07/2025
35	03/07/2025	Minister for Transport	Risks identified in the Projects Assured report (Public transport)	17/07/2025

Appendix E: Gender distribution of witnesses

Beginning in April 2023, in response to an audit by the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, Committees are collecting information on the gender of witnesses. The aim is to determine whether committee inquiries are meeting the needs, and allowing the participation of, a range of genders in the community. Participation is voluntary and there are no set responses.

Gender indication	Total
Female	5
Male	20
Non-binary	0
Gender neutral	0
No data	6