OK, guys, we're slightly behind time, but I've consulted with the fearless leader, which is also from the cartoons of the '60s which shaped my total mind, as you can tell. So we've eliminated the summing-up. Just for the debaters in the room, we're going to have three speakers for the affirmative, three speakers for the negative, and the winners will be judged by the clap-o-meter, which is my arm responding to your clapping. I'm still promising to finish early for afternoon tea. I'm assuming I've got lots of debaters - Wayne, you're the second speaker but if you want to get into position, you're most welcome. Our other debaters, I'll bring you up from the floor - don't worry.

I think wait till it's his time to speak, Wayne, if that's OK...

No, because you're the second speaker. Would you give Wayne a seat, please, Teresa? If you don't mind waiting there, I'll call you up when it's your turn to speak. For our other speakers, I'll bring you up one at a time, I think. Then you can stare at your opposition. So ladies and gentlemen, let me lead you into the debate. The topic: Driverless vehicles are an excellent part of the connected future. I will repeat that. Thank you. Driverless vehicles are an essential part of the connected future. That was an ageing eyeball malfunctioning. Driverless vehicles are an essential part of the connected future. Each person will go for seven minutes. There will be a six and a cacophony at seven. We have three speakers for, three against. First speaker for the proposition is Dean Economou from Telstra. Dean, can you come forward?

DEAN ECONOMOU: Where do I sit?

JULIE McCROSSIN: It is a debate, I thought you might speak.

DEAN ECONOMOU: I was going to dance.

JULIE McCROSSIN: Honey, we welcome interpretive dance.

DEAN ECONOMOU: I won't take seven minutes, I want to give the opposition more time because they'll need it.

(LAUGHTER)

First of all, it is my pleasure to be here, thank you for inviting me. The first thing is slightly refine the topic. Driverless vehicles are not driverless. They are driven by software and sensors. They are an essential part of the world, not connected. The future, it is already happening, we don't need that either. That's setting the scene. I would say the case for this is compelling. We will talk about compelling tech in a little while. The main arguments are around safety which I will cover but my esteemed colleagues will cover the environmental, social and other benefits in some depth. One day humans will drive for recreation where they can't kill each other.

Fundamentals. Okay. So, virtually every road death is caused by human error. Look up the stats. Doesn't matter if it is here, the United States, the country side, or the cities, it is human error. Humans are very good at some things, very bad at others. Software and machines are very good at others, some bad. Software and machine can remove human errors. In Australia, unfortunately, about 1,200 people a year die on our roads. In the US it is 40,000. Globally it is millions. In developing countries where they don't have our safety standards, the carnage is just horrible. Okay?

In addition to the 1,200 people who get killed, there is about 35,000 people around them who get badly affected. If you care about money, it is about $27 billion a year and going up. Software, AI, sensors. Let's see what they don't do well. They are very bad at drinking, falling asleep, taking their sensors off the road, they don't get tired, don't get angry, sad. They only break the rules if they are told to by another set of rules. They are good at some things, bad at others. Humans are good at poetry, believing we understand ethics....

(LAUGHTER)

We are very good at framing new problems which is something AI is very bad at. What else? We have eyes and ears, we don't have sensors that can see in the dark. Our eyes and ears fade with time, which is a bit of a worry for an ageing crowd.

(LAUGHTER)

So do our reflexes and our spatial perception. It is not good news for the humans, alright.

Why do we think - as if I haven't convinced you already - why do we think autonomous vehicles or automated vehicles or self-driving vehicles are a great leap forward in safety? There is already compelling evidence. I am sure the opposition will bring up the Tesla, it is still twice as safe as humans. The Teslas have auto-pilot enabled barely have a crash compared to the one where is the humans are in control. Just so you know. National highways traffic safety authority in the US did some study on what electronic stability control has been doing for safety. Who knows what electronic stability control is? It is what called a level zero autonomous component in the car. If you are going around a corner and the car is detecting that where you're steering is not where the car is going and you are slipping around the corner, the computer in the car will take control of the brakes and acceleration and try to get you around that corner safely. Basically, it stops people sliding off the road and keeps them controlled. It is one step beyond ABS braking which takes over if you start skidding. They think 35% of accidents have been avoided since that technology came into the US. 10,000 lives a year already saved with one tiny component of autonomy. This is just one thing that computers are doing. What's going to happen when we get the full thing? We already have some evidence from Tesla.

Okay. So. So... The fact is it's not the future, it's already here. If you go - you can already buy a Tesla that does this. Volvo has autonomous vehicles on the road being tested. Ford has, Chrysler, Audi and Hyundai, when Hyundai announces a $20,000 I - whatever it is it will be that's autonomous, the future is already here. This is all happening. It is not just cars. Okay? The other thing is that the trucks are coming. I was in the US recently, we thought there were about three autonomous truck companies. There are about 30. You can't hear me? Can you hear me before?

JULIE McCROSSIN: It is much better if you do that. The reproduction of sound is on the top. You are speaking into the side, if you do that we'll hear you better. Lick it like an ice-cream.

DEAN ECONOMOU: No, no, it's been used. Sorry.

(LAUGHTER)

Anyway, ice cream is fattening!

Anyway, there are dozens of people automating trucks in the US. There are road trains going across highways in Nevada autonomously. They have a human keeping an eye on it. It is a very good safety message because humans are very bad at being bored and fall asleep on long, straight roads. Computers and software do not.

The other thing that was surprising is it is happening in public transport. There is a shuttle in NSW, there is one in Perth. The company building that will automate buses and do on-demand transport.

The last bit, which is compelling, are we up to five minutes?

JULIE McCROSSIN: You have 54 seconds.

DEAN ECONOMOU: I have had a bit to do with compelling technologies. Mobile phones, remember they said they'd never spread because of the radiation? Wi-fi, I used to run the lab that did wi-fi. The lady who was part of allocating spectrum said it will never catch on because it will interfere with the satellites. I said, "Carol, there were 6 billion people on earth who want to use wi-fi, they will want it." People will say it is illegal. When something is compelling, it will happen. If the opposition wins, it will be on a legal technicality which is missing the point and be a footnote in history!

(LAUGHTER)

JULIE McCROSSIN: Thank you so much, Dean.

(APPLAUSE)

Our first speaker for the negative is Brendan Coady, Sydney partner in charge and sector leader of technology for Maddocks Lawyers. Please make him welcome. Feel free to use the microphone or the lectern.

(APPLAUSE)

BRENDAN COADY: Thanks for having me. It is a great honour to be here to speak to you.

So the topic is driverless vehicles are an essential part of a connected future. There's a superficial attraction, as we can see from what Dean has had to say, to the idea of driverless cars. It's easy for us to conjure a vision of a Utopian future, Jetson-style future where transport is clean, safe and relaxing. However, like most Utopian visions, the reality is likely to be far different to what we imagine.

The practical difficulties of a transition to such a future are formidable and I think may ultimately prove to be insurmountable. As the negative team will show, there are a range of legal, practical and ethical issues that mean such a future may well evolve into more of a dystopian nightmare. Here I was going to talk about Utopian technology visions turning into dystopian nightmares and make a joke about the nbn but, since I note nbn are a sponsor of the event, I thought I'd better not make that joke!

(LAUGHTER)

The other speakers will talk about the privacy, security and ethical issues. I want to talk about some of the regulatory issues likely to impact any move towards driverless vehicles as well as some of the problems of any transition to a driverless vehicle future.

There have been a number of recent papers and studies into automated vehicles, including an inquiry by the House of Representatives Standing Committee on Industry, Innovation, Science and Resources. A policy paper on regulatory reform produced by the National Transport Commission. One of the things these highlight is something like 716 laws, rules and regulations that would require amendment or repeal and replacement to facilitate the transition to driverless vehicles.

Dean talked a lot about what proof there is of the increased safety of autonomous vehicles but, in fact, a lot of this is based on quite limited test samples because major transition towards autonomous vehicles is actually very difficult because of the current regulatory regime. Motor vehicle regulation, as you can probably imagine, is very complex matrix involving harmonisation of international standards, national vehicle standards in Australia, Australian road rules, range of State-based legislation and local government rules and regulation in relation to roads and transport.

So even to facilitate trials of automated vehicles requires a range of permits or exemptions from these regulations and the National Transport Commission has produced some guidelines on the conduct of trials which really highlights the difficulties of even conducting trials for these vehicles.

One of the big problems, of course, is that our current transport regulatory regime is entirely structured around drivers having control of and responsibility for their vehicles. The driver of a car is civilly liable and potentially criminally liable for actions that they take on the road, so as a driver, if I'm responsible for a motor vehicle accident, I'm liable for damaging or my insurer would be and also subject, potentially, to criminal prosecution.

Imagine as we transition to more automated vehicles, the line between responsibility of the driver and responsibility of the manufacturer of the vehicle becomes increasingly blurred and what we are likely to see is increased blame-shifting between manufacturers and individuals as to who is responsible for a particular accident. We have already seen this sort of thing with - you might remember a case in the last year or so with a certain VW vehicles where they suffered a sudden loss of power and there were a number of accidents and disputes about whether, in fact, it was a problem with the vehicle controls or driver error that resulted in those problems. As an individual driver, you can imagine the difficulty of having a dispute with the manufacturer about who it is who is responsible for an error that led to an accident.

Also as we are moving towards more autonomous vehicles, there's obviously - manufacturers are going to make decisions about what safety features they are going to put into these autonomous vehicles are going to be based on a cost-benefit analysis. Is it worth fixing this safety feature based on the number of accidents that are going to be caused? Do we real - are we really happy with that decision being made purely on a cost-benefit analysis? It is quite a different situation to the individual driver who has got individual liability and is potentially going to jail if they do the wrong thing, whereas you can imagine it's very unlikely that, in the event, even if an accident is found to be the responsibility of the manufacturer, I don't think the executives of the manufacturer are going to end up going to jail. There might be a big payout but it is quite a different thing.

We can't just immediately turn a switch and have driverless vehicles on our roads. Cars currently have an average age of about 10 years vehicles on the road so there is going to be a long transition period where you have conventional vehicles and increasingly autonomous or driverless vehicles on the road. While softwares and computers are very good at doing logical things and participating what other driverless vehicles might be do, probably less good at what humans will do, humans being unpredictable in their behaviour, both as drivers and in general. We will see a difficult period of transition if we go down this route where you have driverless vehicles interacting both with conventionally-driven cars and also other road users, pedestrians and cyclists and so on, whereas I think, once you start down this path, there is going to be a drive to move totally to a driverless future and I think there is a risk that driven cars and other road users like cyclists are going to be increasingly forced off the road in the interests of having uniform driverless future. I think, before we, as Dean would have us...

(BELL RUNG)

..it is important to thing about the role of driving in terms of independence and a sense of achievement and freedom for humans which would be lost if we moved to a purely driverless vehicle future. Thank you.

JULIE McCROSSIN: This is utterly compelling. Powerful arguments on both sides. Second speaker for the affirmative Wayne Hawkins from ACCAN. We have made a decision not to have the sum-up speeches at the end but you will be basing your decision on the three speakers on each side. As Wayne Hawkins takes position, we hear a second speaker for the affirmative. Driverless vehicles are an essential part of the connected future. Would you please applaud?

(APPLAUSE)

WAYNE HAWKINS: Thank you, everybody. I am very excited to be here speaking about driverless vehicles. I have this very Utopian view of what driverless vehicles are going to do for all of us. I don't have that sadly dystopian view that Brendan just talked about. You know that fear of litigation, that almost gleeful satisfaction of seeing us shackled to the steering wheel and the brake for the rest of time. That's not what I look forward to when I think of the future.

I see a lot of benefits. In fact, it actually reminded me of you know those old ships where they had hundreds of people down below rowing, rowing, rowing to get anywhere!

(LAUGHTER)

That's what it reminded me of, the idea of us being shackled to the steering wheels and the brake pedal and all of that horrible, manual stuff that has to happen when you're driving a vehicle.

My idea is much more exciting. I think that's what the future holds. I see huge benefits, particularly for people like myself with disabilities. The benefits that driverless vehicles are going to provide for me are great opportunities of independence, self-reliance. As Greg spoke to yesterday in the IoT session, provide self-esteem. No more waiting for the family, the friends, the carers to find time to take me where I'd like to go. No more waiting for the taxi that never showed up. The accessible taxi that didn't show up or showed up and took off when it saw the guide dog and the wheelchair. No more waiting at the bus stop and the rain for the accessible bus that never comes to get on with the wheelchair. The future for people with a disability in a driverless car environment is completely different from what we have today and completely - provides complete autonomy for us. It's just going to be fantastic!

Then, you know, unlike Brendan and those opposite who want to see the elderly stuck at home forever because they can't get a driver's licence any longer, I see the opportunity for the old people getting out and about. Let the frail out and about, I say. Let them drive! Let them go out in their car and pick up the kids from soccer. Let them go to the balls - the golf club. In fact, give them a golf cart. Just like President Trump! They could drive around in a driverless golf cart. Fantastic!

(LAUGHTER)

The future is really exciting in the driverless car world if you ask me. There is the other option - the environmental benefits of less congestion, less pollution, better use of public spaces.

Then there's the other - not so important but very interesting benefits. Who needs to be the designated driver? No-one! We can all drink to excess and who cares! We can all get home safely! No more hoons drag racing up and down outside your house late at night. It's fantastic!

I say to those on the opposite, I say to them - they are over here?

(LAUGHTER)

Take my hand, I say, take my hand as you lay down your Luddite-like fear of ones and zeros. Take my hand as you let go of your unfounded fear of litigation. Volvo is going to pay for everything, they've already said, by 2020. They are going to take care of it. We don't have to worry. We are not the driver by definition. Driverless cars. Volvo will take over the responsibility. Take my hand, I say as you step away, as your forebears did stepping away from their horse-drawn carriages!

(LAUGHTER)

Step away from the unsafe, the unpredictable, the enslaving 20th century transportation relics that you would have us drive and drive and drive! Take my hand, I say, and come with me as we ride into a bright, safe, efficient, fully-connected future in our driverless car!

(LAUGHTER)

Come with me! I have a dream!

(LAUGHTER)

It is like this.

SINGS:

# At the age of 37

# He realised he'd never drive through Paris in a sports car

# With the warm wind in his car. #

Come with me. Live the dream. I may not be Luci Jordan and obviously I'm not 37 - yet! - but I will ride through Paris in a sports car and I will feel the warm wind in my hair and you too can join me in this dream in the driverless car! Thank you.

(APPLAUSE)

JULIE McCROSSIN: Thank you very, very, very much. That was absolutely marvellous. Our second speaker for the negative is Kayleen Manwaring, lecturer from the school of business law at UNSW. Place make Kayleen welcome.

KAYLEEN MANWARING: Firstly, thank you so much for the dream. It's a beautiful dream. It's a gorgeous dream. I now want to go to Paris. However, I just want to remind you of something that a very wise person said back in 1971. "Technology is a queer thing. It brings you great gifts with one hand, we can take your hand and will give us great gifts but what have you got in your other hand? Because technology brings you great gifts with one hand but stabs you in the back with the other."

(LAUGHTER)

As my colleague Brendan has pointed out, and the affirmative, the idea of driverless vehicles is very seductive but he has already talked to you about the regulatory difficulties, the thicket of regulations we are going to have to untangle before we get to any sort of idea of a connected future. He has talked about the difficulties of the transition time. We are not going to have a magic wand and it is going to be all beautiful. There is going to be a long and difficult and dangerous road ahead if this is where we want to go. After me, Nigel is going to talk more about that long and difficult road, particularly about the significant privacy issues associated with automated vehicles and he is also going to talk about what the word "essential" really means.

I am here to talk to you about two issues. The challenge of keeping driverless or automated vehicles secure and the ethics of handing over control of a lethal machine to a piece of software. A week ago, a former director of US international intelligence wrote, "How difficult is it to turn a driverless car into a driverless car bomb? The inevitable growth of planes, trains, buses, ships and unmanned ships will offer nefarious actors myriad opportunities to... To cause a mass casualty event without having anyone present at the scene of the attack. Imagine a worst-case scenario in which we experience a 9/11-type attack but without any actual hijackers?"

This isn't just excessive paranoid on behalf of the US security services. Both low-attackers have been identified. People use masking tapes on stop signs to confuse driverless cars. A researcher used a laser pointer to con fuse the scanning systems on the cars. In the last few years, search researchers have managed to hack into Jeep, Chrysler, General Motors vehicles to take controls of locks and steering as well as tracking their location. I have noticed some of the car manufacturers are representing it won't be a problem. These systems are designed to have access from the very outside. I'm very sorry, but I call trust deficit on that one. There is a lot of security researchers who say otherwise about driverless cars including the researchers who successfully hacked into a Jeep Cherokee, not via the control system but via a remote export of its entertainment system. As we heard a number of times yesterday, we have to remember that it is an essential part of the driverless car model, that driverless vehicles are connected in all sorts of different ways to GPS satellites, traffic services, to map services, entertainment services, to consumers themselves or users of the road, to our own personal devices and to the manufacturer.

Sometimes it's actually not the malicious actors we have to worry about. It's the manufacturer and other third parties access that we need to worry about. Nigel will talk about the privacy issues but it is also to remember that currently over 2 million vehicles in the US already have starter-interrupter devices installed which currently allow lenders to remotely disable vehicles when borrowers have allegedly missed a payment.

There is going to be considerable pressure by every service provider, the big list I gave you, for a driverless car to have a remote disablement capacity and for them to access it, just to ensure they get their bills paid.

This is not a remedy without victims. Stories have now emerged of people having their vehicles disabled while on a freeway or attempting to take their children to the doctor. In the future, of course, even state actors might be wanting to get into bed with the service providers so maybe your automated car might take you to a police station when your vehicle outs there is an outstanding warrant out on you!

Lastly, I'd like to talk very briefly about ethical decision making. Of course, we have got the very obvious ethical dilemma of the driverless car industry putting a whole lot of people out of work - taxi drivers, bus and truck drivers, parking officers - okay, we might not have an ethical problem getting rid of parking officers but let's just keep going. These are not people you can transfer and pick up into a software engineering job in a car manufacturer in Detroit. I also want to finish on what it means as a human being to give away control over life-and-death decisions to a piece of software. Consider this scenario - a self-driving car identifies a group of children runing into the road. There is no time to stop. To swerve around them would drive the car into a speeding truck on one side or a large concrete barrier on the other, putting sudden death to anybody inside the car. When this scenario involves an automated vehicle, the moral dilemma would have already been decided but not by the person in the car at the time but by the marketing director of a car manufacturer five years ago before the accident and thousands of kilometres away. This situation isn't merely hypothetical. In October last year, Mercedes Benz manager of driver assistance systems says all level four and five automated cars would prioritise the occupants in the car in those types of situations. It is not just the car manufacturers that we can blame. When researchers asked normal consumers what sort of ethic settings they would like in the cars they said, "Of course we'd like to prioritise the result that saves the most people." Then they asked, "What sort of car would you buy?" "The one that saved the driver." I wonder, as a species, are we ready for the moral ramifications for these sorts of decisions to be done at a mass market level? Or have we ended up at a place where, as Albert Einstein allegedly said, it has become appallingly clear that our technology has exceeded our humanity. Thank you.

(APPLAUSE)

JULIE McCROSSIN: Ladies and gentlemen, I ask you: Is there anything more glorious than a debate? The answer is, "No, this is fantastic." Third speaker for the affirmative Mark Harvey-Sutton, National Farmers' Federation. Please welcome him back to the stage.

MARK HARVEY-SUTTON: Ladies and gentlemen, esteemed guests, I'm here today to tell you that driverless vehicles are part of our future. Now, I was really excited, the reason I'm using the lectern is I can pretend to have some notes but I don't need them. I was really excited to be invited to be part of this debate. I was so pleased to be on the affirmative side, simply because history is going to be on our side. As simple as that. When I stand up here today, I'm asking you to embrace the future.

The other reason I took on this debate is, when we all got together, Teresa briefed us and said, "This is supposed to be a light-hearted finish to the conference." So I just wanted to ask the negative team - you heard that message, didn't you?

(LAUGHTER)

Did I really heard the words "dystopian nightmare"? I'm sure you are very lovely people - I haven't met these people in person before - I want to point that out, because you are such lovely people, I thought wouldn't it be great if I had a barbecue, we had a party but I'm questioning that invite now! The reason is I can picture it now. The music is too loud, someone will burst an eardrum! What will the neighbours think? Are they going to call the police, you'll get an infringement? "Do you have a food-handling certificate for overcooking those 'gor-met' snags?" One of the things front of my mind at the moment is risk. We have generated an industry out of risk. The reason we have generated that industry is because risk is manageable. Much like the barbecue context - all the things the negative team have mentioned today are surmountable and, quite frankly, just like the barbecue context, sucks the fun out of the whole thing. Now, I'm going to use an example about why driverless vehicles are so important in the rural context. It goes a little bit off the back of Wayne's - this is in all seriousness - I've been lucky enough to get around and talk to farmers, and often ask them, you know, "What's the biggest social impact that's been on your community?" You know what? This is fair dinkum. The number one answer I get is, "Drink-driving laws." The reason is - if you're out on your farm by yourself and you have limited opportunity for social interaction, it's so important to be able to get into town. I heard a great story at lunch about someone getting pulled over in a country town by the policeman, and the policeman said, "Oh, alright, mate, just follow my tail-lights, I'll get you home." But it's so important - not only that - a lot of our farmers run businesses that are quite far apart. The rural death toll from car accidents is actually quite astonishing, because people travel tired and, I guess, they do travel under the influence. I actually think driverless vehicles can provide a real boon for rural Australia. I mean, there'll obviously be that social benefit, but there's going to be a huge benefit to the building industry as all these multistorey car parks get built outside outback pubs.

(LAUGHTER)

I think it really is the future. The other example - and this one's a little bit more serious - is freight. The ability to move freight. At the moment, the Australian Government is developing a national freight strategy. One of the arguments we've been putting forward is - there's actually a few quite simple, practical solutions that can actually improve our efficiency. One of those is dynamic scheduling. Whereby you don't have a train sitting in a, you know, a few hundred kilometres away from port, waiting to get the call-up to go in. Imagine this world where everything's kind of run, I guess, in an autonomous manner doing things that machines are very good at, as my first speaker quite correctly pointed out, and all of a sudden we gain these efficiencies? Like yesterday, when I was talking about the potential gain that connectivity represents to the agricultural sector, so does efficiency in freight movements. It's quite significant. So I see huge benefit in what driverless vehicles can do. But most of all, the safety and the social aspects are just so fundamental. I'd just like to close my argument - I found it quite interesting that the second speaker for the negative raised technology as a "queer" thing. How timely! I'm going to stand here quite proudly and say - I'm voting "yes" for queer things...

(LAUGHTER)

..and I'd ask that you all do today as well.

(APPLAUSE)

JULIE McCROSSIN: Thank you so much. I'd now like to welcome the closing speaker for the negative case, Nigel Waters - committee member, Australian Privacy Foundation. Please make Nigel welcome.

(APPLAUSE)

NIGEL WATERS: Thank you, Julie. Hard act to follow. That's quite a compelling team that we're up against. But let's have a go...

Most of you would probably think that, as a privacy advocate, I'm a pretty natural fit for a negative case. Normally - really, on more or less any subject, you choose to think of. Normally, I'd try and disabuse you of that and emphasise all the positives that flow from taking privacy seriously. But in the case of autonomous vehicles, I actually think some negativity is warranted. My colleagues have already, I think, sown a few seeds for you to think about. Turning to the privacy issues - there are clear privacy issues arising from intelligent and connected vehicles. Not all intelligent vehicles will be driverless, but all driverless vehicles will, necessarily, be intelligent and connected. That means that, when it they're in use, there is information being generated about where they are, where they're going, and so in addition to any other information or personal information that's being collected, you've got that additional sensitivity of movements, of whereabouts. And I don't need to paint you the picture of all the reasons why somebody else - knowing where you're going, when you're going - is potentially adverse for individuals. Let's brush aside that - if I've got nothing to hide, I've got nothing to fear - argument. I'm sure all of you have heard enough privacy latches to know that we all have things that we don't want made public or shared, legitimately so. If, in the future, we move towards a different model of vehicle ownership as a result of driverless technology, and it stops being our personal car, it's still going to be personal information that's being generated - partly because somebody's going to have to pay for it, so they're going to know - through the billing systems - that its user's using it - and partly for liability reasons. The manufacturers are certainly going to want to know who's driving the car when it does have a prang. So there's no escaping from the fact that there is going to be vast amounts of personal information being generated by autonomous vehicle use. There will be limited - if any - opportunity to opt out, because that would necessarily interfere with the functionality of the driverless system. And you simply couldn't allow people to say "I don't want to be tracked" 'cause it would just negate the whole purpose of the driverless system. We can expect attempts to reassure us that, "Oh, don't worry, it's all covered by privacy laws - everything will be alright." The super-tiptop security/access, limitations on disclosures - the experience is, we all know those privacy laws are pretty weak and that the people that collect the personal information can pretty well do what they want, provided they get you to tick the box saying "I consent." That won't really be a choice in this case. We've already heard this morning from Cristina from the ACCC about the pressures that are going to arise from monetising the information. So it's not just about managing the driverless car - it's about - "Wow, we've got all this data! What can we use it for?" We've also got the inevitability of data and security breaches - not a question of "if", but "when", from all the experience over the last few years. De-identification of the information - at some stage, that might offer some reassurance. We should certainly work on the idea of getting rid of the personal information as soon as possible after it's been collected. But that's not a perfect solution, and it doesn't remove the privacy problems. I'd ask you to think seriously about those privacy implications on top of everything else you've heard from my friends. To conclude - I direct you to the notion - you're not being asked to agree or disagree with the proposition that driverless vehicles will be just a part of a connected future - we can all agree that they will be, to varying degrees, with many potential benefits as the affirmative team have set out. What you are being asked - if driverless vehicles are an essential part of that future. Accepting that proposition, I put to you, would be to slip into technological determinism - just because we can do something doesn't mean we have to. Given the many, many up resolved issues that our team has outlined, you must, surely, reject the notion. Thank you.

(APPLAUSE)

JULIE McCROSSIN: Ladies and gentlemen, before I go into the voting process, can I ask you to give a big round of applause to all our debaters? That was so great.

(APPLAUSE)

Richard has prepared a Jetsons for us. I'll just hold onto that. I think we'll have the vote first, then we might play the film for you, but leave you seated where you are, because you can watch it on the screen. Ladies and gentlemen, we're going into voting mode. I've now turned on the clap-o-meter. First of all, those of you who believe that the affirmative team has been convincing in arguing that driverless vehicles are an essential part of the connected future - if you want to support that, clap now.

(APPLAUSE)

Thank you very much. And if you'd like to support the negative team, clap now...

(APPLAUSE)

It's not as... ..it's great. It's very close, would you agree? That's very nice. But I am going to declare the winners to be the affirmative team by a dog's hair.

(APPLAUSE)

If you want to stay on stage - we'll just close up the conference. First of all - Wayne, can we have the last production from the wonderful Richard of The Jetsons?

(VIDEO)

AUDIO DESCRIPTION:

Cartoon space…

Earth materialises...

Out come shapes, dancing shadow, a flying car zooms across a futuristic city skyline…

The title reads, 'The Jetsons'…

Meet George Jetson...

George hands a lunch box to a boy…

They're in a transport capsule…

They're going to school…

Back in the car - Judy hugs George. Off to Orbit High School…

George offers money to Jane, she takes the whole wallet - and off to the mall...

A real, black-and-white, single-person flying vehicle takes off from the ground...

It hovers on four rotors...

It flies around past trees...

Up, into the evening sky...

It ascends high above the city...

Green and red lights fly above the city...

It makes a slow, swooping descent...

JULIE McCROSSIN: Wow...!

(APPLAUSE)

Help me get the name right - that's simultaneous audio description? Thank you so much, Richard, for that extra effort. A big round of applause, please, for that, from Richard.

(APPLAUSE)

Ladies and gentlemen, to close our conference, I welcome our CEO, Teresa Corbin, for our very final segment. Thank you.

(APPLAUSE)

TERESA CORBIN: I'm just going to invite - I'm going to invite Sandra to come up. Sandra's from ACCAN's board. I also would like Johanna Plante and Nigel Waters to come forward. While they're doing that, thank you to everybody for all the work with the conference. Thank you to our sponsors for supporting it. One of them is on the stage. Actually, two of them are on the stage - Telstra and Maddocks. So, without them, the conference doesn't happen. And thank you to all of you for coming along. I hope you got something out of the event. I know there's definitely been some new information for me, which is always a good test for a good conference. So, before I go on, what I want to do is thank Johanna and Nigel, who are actually finishing up on ACCAN's board after our AGM. I just want to say that both of them have been on the board for some time - many years - and even before that have made enormous contributions to both the establishment and creation of ACCAN, but also to the representation of consumers in telecommunications over many, many years. I hope they're not going to be strangers, although they won't be on our governance body anymore, and I just want to hand over to Sandra to say a few words.

SANDRA MILLIGAN: Thank you very much. Board members at ACCAN actually don't like this part of the conference because, every year, a couple of our members go off as part of the constitutional rotation system. So we have say goodbye to a couple of people who we've lived with and worked with over the last few years. I did a straw poll of some of our members to see - what would they say about these two who are going off? These are two of the most longstanding activists in the industry, and the ACCAN board is going to be really denuded by their going. But the funny thing is, when I talk to your peers, what did they reflect on? I think that what they reflected on was the fact that the quality of a board is much more than the sum of the experience and knowledge on it. And that what you guys brought was, really, the sort of thing that gives the board such power. Johanna, the things I think - your sense of fun - really good. It makes very tricky debates just absolutely a joy to take part of. Also, your political acumen and her tough-mindedness is just really valuable in a board meeting. Nigel - when I first met Nigel, I thought he was this calm, quiet, civil person. And for the first couple of meetings, I thought, "This man adds a tone to the board that every board needs." What I subsequently discovered was that the quietness comes from deep authority and the civility hides a passionate heart, and his calmness belies the sort of dogged determination he has for a good fight when it's in the interests of consumers. So, guys, I think they're the things that we're going to miss about you. But, as Teresa said, don't be a stranger.

(APPLAUSE)

Safe travels, everybody, and thank you very much, Julie, for such a great conference.

(APPLAUSE)