

Ride Share Drivers' Association Australia

12th August 2016

Ms Emma Wood Committee Manager Committee on Transport and Infrastructure, Parliament of New South Wales <u>transportinfrastructure@parliament.nsw.gov.au</u>

Inquiry into Workplace Arrangement in the Point to Point Transport Industry

Dear Ms Wood,

Thank you for inviting me to speak on behalf of the Ride Share Drivers' Association of Australia last month in relation to the Inquiry into Workplace Arrangement in the Point to Point Transport Industry.

Since the Ride Share Drivers' Association of Australia is a young organisation we currently have limited resources to explore, in depth, the questions that were taken on notice. In saying that we are growing rapidly daily in all states and wish to have a greater presence in the near future.

The following is our response to the three questions taken on notice:

1. Chapter 6 of the Industrial Relations Act 1996 (transcript, p 30)

The section currently does not relate to ridesharing in particular as almost all cars are owned by the drivers themselves, however, taking a broad view of the situation, one could argue that the arrangement to use the technology that Uber (etc) provides, is very similar in nature and outcome to the arrangement with bailees to use a vehicle.

2. The Committee received evidence from Uber that upon deactivation the driver is notified in by phone call or email. Uber also indicated that the driver has the option of walking into a support centre. What is your response to this evidence?

Please see attached emails we received from four previous Uber "Partners" which were deactivated without notice and without right of reply. Two of these drivers **examples at a set of the set of the**

example is a little different. The received his email following a very expensive (high surge price) trip from Uber stating there had been a serious incident reported from a rider. While we do condone the suspension of a drivers account during an investigation of a serious matter the driver was not given a phone call or right of reply on the serious incident that allegedly occurred before being deactivated by email.

While **Constraints** email does not contain information from Uber it speaks volumes on the importance of a transparent process. The privacy wall that Uber hide behind is unacceptable and a transparent dispute resolution process or deactivation procedure needs to adapted to ensure fairness for both drivers and Uber.

As discussed on the day of the hearing, drivers do in fact have the right to walk into the support centres, though with these being staffed by a third party often the outcome is fruitless. To point out an example please see experience with being deactivated and being told <u>not</u> to approach an office in the email. In total contradiction of Uber's testimony. After ignoring these directions, he did go into a centre but was given no specific information behind his deactivation with "privacy" being their cover.

3. What advice does your organisation give to members in relation to Workers Compensation Insurance?

As a new association, we are still developing and have not moved into the areas of offering advice on such matters as workers' compensation insurance, however, hopefully this may become something we can offer in the near future.

On a side note, a plumber makes his money from his learned skillset and not the tools he hires, which is unlike Drivers solely relying on a properly registered vehicle for their income. A plumber can complete his trade using his knowledge, with little inexpensive tools, while a driver cannot drive without access to a licenced taxi.

Once again thank you for your time in allowing me to speak and we look forward to the outcome of the inquiry.

Kind regards,

Troy Lake Treasurer Ride Share Drivers' Association of Australia