

HUON VALLEY COUNCIL SUBMISSION

TASMANIA'S SMALL BUSINESS STRATEGY 2036 – CONSULTATION DRAFT

1. Introduction

Huon Valley Council (Council) welcomes the opportunity to comment on the Consultation Draft of Tasmania's Small Business Strategy 2036.

Council supports the Strategy's themes and its recognition that success looks different for every business. Council's submission is directed at the practical settings that determine whether a small business in the Huon Valley can start, change or grow, and at who carries the cost of administering those settings.

Section 2 sets out Council's overarching comments. Section 3 responds to each theme and objective.

2. Overarching comments

1. The Strategy describes what government will provide. The bigger opportunity is what government will stop requiring.

The Strategy says government's role is to create the conditions for business success. Council agrees. But almost every Enabling Action in the draft adds something — a forum, a support service, a tool, a guide. Very little is directed at removing an existing requirement.

For most small businesses in the Huon Valley the binding constraint is not a lack of advice. It is the time, cost and uncertainty of getting permission to trade. Creating the conditions for success means removing or substantially simplifying compliance with conditions.

2. Councils administer most of the regulation small business encounters. Councils do not make it.

The regulation a Huon Valley business meets is entirely State-made:

- land use and development — *Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993* and the Tasmanian Planning Scheme;
- building and plumbing — *Building Act 2016* and the National Construction Code;
- food premises — *Food Act 2003*;
- public health and environmental health — *Public Health Act 1997*;
- environmental nuisance and Level 1 activities — *Environmental Management and Pollution Control Act 1994*; and
- heritage places — *Historic Cultural Heritage Act 1995*.

Council's discretion under each is narrow. The standards, thresholds, triggers and timeframes are set by the State. Council is the shopfront and enforcer for regulation it did not write and cannot change.

The consequence is that the business owner's frustration lands on Council, and any reform conversation happens somewhere else.

Council submits that the Strategy name local government as an implementation partner alongside the TCCI and the TSBC. Councils see how these instruments fail before anyone else does.

3. A strategy the State does not fund is a strategy the State has not committed to.

Many of the Strategy's Enabling Actions can only be delivered at the local level.

Convening business networks, prioritising local suppliers, advocating for digital infrastructure, building climate resilience, providing clear pathways for business and reducing red tape all require local delivery.

The Strategy names the TCCI and the TSBC as partners. Both are funded membership bodies whose role is to represent business. Local government is not named as a partner, yet local government administers most of the regulation the Strategy is concerned with and will be expected to deliver much of what the Implementation Plan contains with no appropriate funding attached.

Local government has one substantive revenue source - Rates, which are a property tax. They do not grow with economic activity, and they cannot be raised to fund State policy without a direct cost to the same households and businesses this Strategy is meant to help.

Where the State prescribes a fee for a service councils administer on its behalf and that fee does not recover the cost, the shortfall is met from rates. That is a transfer from ratepayers to the State's regulatory program.

Council submits that the Implementation Plan must state, for every action:

- is it really necessary;
- who delivers it;
- what it costs to deliver; and
- who funds it.

No action should be attributed to local government without funding agreed with the sector in advance. Responsibility shifting and cost shifting are not implementation.

The parking code illustrates the problem precisely. Clause C2.5.1 A1 of the State Planning Provisions offers two ways out of the standard parking rates: a parking plan for the area adopted by council, or a parking precinct plan under clause C2.7. Both require Council to fund traffic studies, strategic planning work and, for a precinct plan, an amendment to the Local Provisions Schedule. The requirement was made by the State yet the significant cost of resolving it is left for Council and ratepayers.

4. Red tape reduction to date has been at the edges.

Council acknowledges the work done through the Coordinator-General's red tape reduction program, the reporting portal and the publication of permit processing timeframes. As at the 2023-24 report, government had responded to 86 per cent of the 198 red tape issues identified. Recent reforms to liquor licensing, event permits and tax administration are genuine improvements.

But these are process improvements around a regulatory core that has not moved.

The two instruments that generate the most cost and delay for small business — the Tasmanian Planning Scheme and the Building Act 2016 — remain substantially untouched. A ninety-day approval made online is still a ninety-day approval.

Council submits that the Strategy commit to reform of the source instruments, and to a measurable target: publish a baseline of how many separate approvals a new hospitality or retail business currently requires, and a target for reducing it.

5. The test should be whether the requirement changes the outcome.

The Parking and Sustainable Transport Code (C2.0) applies to all use and development, and clause C2.4.1 states there are no exemptions to the code.

Worked example. A 100m² shopfront in a Huon Valley Village becomes a café. No building work. No change to floor area. No land available for parking, as is the case for most main-street tenancies.

Under Table C2.1, General Retail and Hire requires one space per 30m², being four spaces. Food Services (restaurant) requires one space per 15m², being seven spaces. Under clause C2.5.1 A1(d)(ii) the requirement is calculated as $N = A + (C - B)$. With no existing on-site parking, the change of use requires three new car parking spaces. Clause C2.5.2 adds two bicycle spaces.

Three car spaces cannot be built. The proposal fails the Acceptable Solution and must be assessed against Performance Criteria P1.1. That means an application fee, usually a traffic engineer's report, public advertising, the statutory clock and an appeal window.

The application is almost always approved. No parking is built. Nothing about the site changes. The requirement adds cost, delay and risk, and changes no outcome.

The State has already fixed this — in the wrong zones. Clause C2.5.5 provides that within existing non-residential buildings in the General Residential Zone and Inner Residential Zone, no on-site car parking is required for Food Services up to 100m² floor area or 30 seats, or General Retail and Hire up to 100m², subject to the hours of operation for the zone. Its stated objective is to facilitate the reuse of existing non-residential buildings.

The identical café, in the identical former shop, requires no parking in a residential zone and three spaces in a Village Zone. The zones where Tasmania actually wants commercial activity are the zones that get no relief.

Council's submission. Extend clause C2.5.5 to existing buildings in the Village Zone, Local Business Zone, General Business Zone, Central Business Zone and Urban Mixed Use Zone.

This is not a new policy. The drafting exists, it is in force, and its objective is already the reuse of existing buildings. Council's suggestion is a relatively simple Zone application amendment in line with existing policy.

Council notes that clause C2.5.1 A1 already carries a bespoke deduction for container refund scheme space, inserted by a targeted amendment to the State Planning Provisions. The State can amend this clause quickly when it chooses to.

6. **Red tape reduction must include a de-regulation agenda with measurable targets for elimination.**

A process improvement target and a de-regulation target are different things. A target to shorten a permit timeframe is a commitment to administer the same rule faster. A target to remove the permit is a commitment to stop administering it and remove the time delay altogether – making the process more efficient for business. Only the second reduces the number of things a small business must do.

Council submits the Strategy adopt an explicit de-regulation agenda, with targets expressed as elimination and reported publicly. Measurable targets should be set for:

- the number of Acts and statutory rules imposing business-affecting obligations;
- the number of separate approvals, registrations, notifications and licences a small business must hold; and
- the number of agencies a business must deal with to obtain them.

Council offers two target areas as examples.

Codify consumer protection. Tasmania has no consolidated State consumer law. Consumer protection obligations are instead distributed across numerous separate Acts and statutory rules, each with its own definitions, administering body and compliance requirements. The consequence for a small business is that there is no single place to find out what applies to it, and no cheap way for an adviser to tell it. Council submits Tasmania codify its consumer protection provisions into a single instrument and repeal the scattered provisions as it does so. The measurable target is the number of instruments removed, not the time taken to answer an enquiry about them.

The Parking and Sustainable Transport Code. The amendment proposed at overarching comment 5 is a de-regulation target, not a process improvement. Extending clause C2.5.5 removes a permit requirement entirely for a defined class of small business. It does not make the permit faster, cheaper or better explained. It removes it. Council submits that is the form a red tape target should take.

7. **Regulation should be proportionate to the risk, and made with the people who will carry it.**

Council supports regulation that is proportionate to actual risk and administers a good deal of it. The concern is not that Tasmania regulates. It is that obligations are increasingly set without reference to the scale of the businesses subject to them and settled before the people who will carry them are meaningfully engaged.

Two consequences follow, and both are costs the State chooses to incur.

First, confidence in a stable regulatory environment is damaged. An operator who is surprised once concludes that the next change will also arrive without warning, and prices that risk into every investment decision.

Second, businesses spend time and money resisting regulation rather than contributing to its design and intent. That is the worst available outcome. The regulation is no better and the business is poorer.

Horticulture produce regulation illustrates the problem. The national Primary Production and Processing Standards for berries, leafy vegetables and melons took effect in February 2025, and Tasmania is implementing them through the Primary Produce Safety (Horticulture Produce) Regulations. Council does not dispute the food safety objective.

The national standard leaves implementation to each State, and States have implemented it differently. New South Wales set a scale threshold: growers at or above two hectares require a licence, and those

below two hectares notify at no cost. Victoria discounted fees through the transition. Tasmania's draft Regulations, as consulted, require accreditation and an audited food safety program without an equivalent small-producer threshold.

The Strategy states that small businesses make up around 97 per cent of Tasmanian businesses. Tasmania has nonetheless chosen the least proportionate of the available implementations.

Council notes that two rounds of public consultation were held. Growers report that the decisions which mattered most — whether a scale threshold would apply, and whether accreditation or notification was required — were settled before consultation opened. Consultation on the drafting of a decision already made is not engagement on the decision. Council submits a scale-based threshold be included before the Regulations are made.

Small-scale meat processing shows what proportionate regulation could deliver. Regulatory requirements for small-scale, mobile and service-kill abattoirs are not proportionate to the scale of those operations or to what consumers expect of them. The result is that Tasmania has effectively no service-kill capacity. A producer who wants an animal processed and returned for direct sale cannot readily have it done in this State.

The cost of that gap is now visible. In August 2026 Woolworths confirmed it will stop selling Tasmanian beef from 2027, ending its arrangement with the Longford abattoir and citing production and freight costs across Bass Strait. Coles does not buy Tasmanian beef. Cattle raised and slaughtered in Tasmania have been shipped to the mainland for processing and shipped back. Butchers have responded by encouraging Tasmanians to buy local, but producers cannot readily reach those customers directly, because the processing capacity that would let them do so does not exist.

Proportionate regulation of small-scale and mobile abattoirs would be a competitive advantage for Tasmania. It would give small producers a route to market that does not cross Bass Strait, shorten supply chains, improve local food security, retain processing jobs in the State and take pressure off the cost of living. It sits squarely within the State's control, under the *Primary Produce Safety Act 2011* and the meat safety scheme made under it. Council submits the Strategy identify small-scale meat processing as a priority for proportionality review.

Dynamic support. When a business strikes a problem that sits across several agencies, there is currently no one whose job it is to solve it. Each agency answers for its own instrument. None is accountable for the outcome, and the business carries the time and cost of the gap between them.

Council submits the Implementation Plan establish a regulatory resolution function: a small unit with the standing to convene the relevant agencies and councils, work a problem through to a decision, and publish the instruments that caused it. The cases it resolves become the de-regulation list at overarching comment 6. The function pays for itself twice — once for the business it helps, and again for every business that never meets the problem after it is fixed.

Council submits the Strategy commit to:

- a proportionality test for all business-affecting regulation, assessing the obligation against the scale and actual risk profile of the businesses subject to it, with a distinct assessment for micro and small operators;
- engagement with affected businesses, and with the councils that will administer the regulation, before the design decisions are settled rather than after; and
- a regulatory resolution function with the standing to resolve cross-agency problems and to report on their causes.

8. Electrification capacity is infrastructure, and it is as urgent as telecommunications.

The Strategy treats digital connectivity as core enabling infrastructure and gives it an objective of its own. Electrical capacity receives no equivalent treatment. It should.

The Strategy presents Tasmania's 100 per cent renewable electricity as a competitive advantage. Generation is not the constraint. Delivery is. What determines whether a small business can electrify is the capacity of the local distribution network at its premises — feeder capacity, transformer ratings and the availability of three-phase supply.

A business that wants to electrify a commercial kitchen, install refrigeration or cool storage, run a small processing line, add customer vehicle charging, or host computer and data workloads needs delivered capacity at the door. Where that capacity does not exist, the cost of augmenting it falls on whichever business asks first.

Businesses that want to add EV Chargers (now seen as essential for Tourism) are being told that there is insufficient capacity in the network. The roll out of EV Chargers to regional centres must be a priority for the State.

The result is that the State's headline advantage is least available to the businesses best placed to demonstrate it. A producer asked to decarbonise cannot get the connection to do it. An operator quoted six figures for a transformer upgrade keeps the diesel or the LPG. The emissions stay, the cost stays, and the competitive advantage of 100% renewable energy remains unrealised.

Demand is about to rise sharply. Data centres and artificial intelligence compute are high-load uses, and Tasmania is actively marketing itself to them. If that demand is connected into existing regional headroom, it will consume the capacity small business needs, and small business will not know it has happened until it applies for a connection and is told the cost.

Council submits:

- the Strategy treat electrical distribution capacity as core enabling infrastructure, on the same footing as digital connectivity, with its own objective or Enabling Action;
- the Implementation Plan include a program of distribution network uplift in regional and rural areas — feeder capacity, transformer ratings and three-phase availability — planned ahead of demand rather than in response to individual connection applications;
- connection and augmentation charging be reviewed, so that the first business to seek capacity in an area does not carry the full cost of infrastructure that later connections will share; and
- high-load uses including data centres be planned for explicitly, with capacity added rather than absorbed, and with regional headroom protected for small business.

9. Demographic change should be a foundation of the whole Strategy. The draft treats it as a workforce footnote.

The Strategy runs to 2036. Over that period the most predictable change in Tasmania's operating environment is demographic. Tasmania has the oldest median age of any state, and young people continue to leave regional communities for study and work, many without returning. The State's own consultation draft of the Economic Diversification and Investment Strategy projects natural population decline from the early 2030s.

The draft Small Business Strategy mentions an ageing workforce, skills shortages and a growing reliance on interstate and overseas workers, and then moves on. Demography appears as a constraint

on labour supply and nowhere else. The draft does not refer to the Tasmanian Population Policy or to Treasury's population projections, and no objective, priority or measure addresses population change.

For small business the effects reach well beyond recruitment. An ageing population changes who the customers are and what they buy. It increases the number of owners approaching retirement without a successor. In regional communities it thins the customer base that main-street businesses depend on, while lifting demand for health and care services that are already hard to staff.

Council notes a similar gap in the consultation draft of the Economic Diversification and Investment Strategy, which names population as a driver of growth but builds no goal, priority or indicator around it. Two ten-year economic strategies sharing the same omission points to a gap in how the State connects its economic planning to its population planning, rather than an oversight in a single document.

Council submits:

- the Strategy include a demographic outlook alongside its economic overview, drawing on the Tasmanian Population Policy and Treasury's population projections, including regional variation;
- the retention and return of young people and families be named as a priority under Theme one, Objective 3;
- business succession be recognised as a demographic issue in its own right, with support for pathways that transfer existing businesses to younger owners; and
- the Implementation Plan report its measures by age cohort and region where the data allows, so that progress can be tested against demographic change.

SUBJECT	COUNCIL COMMENT AND SUBMISSION
Theme one: People and connections	
Objective 1: Networking and collaboration	Supported. Council notes that in regional Councils the convening role is already performed by councils, business associations and community organisations. Council submits that the Enabling Action be delivered through existing local networks rather than new State-run structures, and that where government participates it does so as a participant rather than a host.
Objective 2: Local purchasing	Supported, but the objective is drafted as though councils need encouragement to buy locally. Council already does. Council's Code for Tenders and Contracts (GOV-CORP-013) requires officers to actively support local business participation, to prefer a local business where its quote is within 5 per cent of an external alternative at the same standard, and to prefer a local business where tenders are equally ranked. The constraints are elsewhere. The local preference margin is policy, not law. Council's 5 per cent margin sits beneath a statutory value-for-money and open-competition framework under section 333B of the Local Government Act 1993 and regulations 24 to 30 of the Local Government (General) Regulations 2025. A council applying it carries the probity and audit risk alone, and councils without the capacity to defend the position simply do not adopt one. Council submits the State provide a model local benefit provision, validated in the Regulations, so that every Tasmanian council can apply a local preference with confidence. The threshold is where the real constraint sits. Above the Prescribed Amount of \$250,000 a public tender is mandatory and local preference reduces to a tie-breaker between equally ranked tenders. Most contracts large enough to materially grow a Huon Valley business sit above that line. Council submits the State examine whether local benefit can be weighted within the tender framework above the Prescribed Amount, rather than only applied as a tie-breaker.

SUBJECT	COUNCIL COMMENT AND SUBMISSION
	Aggregated panels can work against local suppliers. Councils may contract through State and Federal agency arrangements, other councils and LGAT panels without tender. These are efficient and Council uses them. But a whole-of-government panel awarded to interstate suppliers removes the opportunity from local business entirely, and does so more completely than any tender would. Council submits that where the State encourages councils onto aggregated panels, those panels be required to include participation pathways for small and regional suppliers. Reciprocity. The objective asks councils to prioritise local suppliers. Council submits the same discipline apply to State agencies and to State-funded projects delivered in regional Councils, with local content reported publicly. Pipeline visibility. Supported without qualification. Forward publication of upcoming opportunities is the single cheapest thing government can do for small business, and it costs nothing.
Objective 3: Attracting and supporting people to live and work in Tasmania	Supported. In the Huon Valley the binding constraints on workforce are housing, childcare and transport, in that order. Council notes these constraints connect back to the planning and building system. Housing supply is limited by the same instruments that limit small business development. The Strategy should acknowledge that regulatory reform in planning and building is workforce policy as much as it is business policy. This objective is where the Strategy's demographic gap is most visible (see overarching comment 9). It speaks of attracting people but not of keeping them. For regional Tasmania, retaining young people and families, and giving those who leave for study or work a reason to return, matters at least as much as attracting new residents. Council submits that retention and return be named explicitly in the objective and its priorities. Council also submits the Implementation Plan look beyond recruitment to how work is organised. Flexible, part-time and shared work arrangements can widen participation among parents, carers and older workers, and can make regional living more attractive to younger people. Council submits the Implementation Plan support regional pilots of such arrangements, designed with small business so that they do not add to its administrative load.

SUBJECT	COUNCIL COMMENT AND SUBMISSION
Theme two: Place	
Objective 1: Tasmanian brand	Supported. Council submits that access to Brand Tasmania alignment support be tested for cost and administrative accessibility for micro and sole-trader businesses, which make up the majority of businesses in the Huon Valley.
Objective 2: Location, size and lifestyle	Supported. Council notes that uniform statewide standards carry a higher cost in regional areas. Freight, contractor availability, consultant availability and travel time all price differently outside Hobart. Council submits that regulatory impact assessment for business-affecting regulation include an explicit test of differential cost in regional and rural Councils. Council notes that the recent withdrawal of a major supermarket from Tasmanian beef, on the basis of production and freight costs across Bass Strait, is a live illustration of how location costs translate into lost market access. Council submits that where a location disadvantage cannot be removed, the State should at least remove the regulatory barriers that compound it. Small-scale meat processing capacity is the example. See overarching comment 7. Council notes that Tasmania's lifestyle attracts retirees and younger families alike, and the age profile of those who come matters to the small business economy. Council submits the Strategy position lifestyle, liveability and regional amenity as tools for attracting and retaining working-age residents, not only as brand attributes. See overarching comment 9.
Objective 3: Environment, climate and renewable energy	Supported in principle. Council administers environmental health, public health and Level 1 activity regulation on the State's behalf. The businesses subject to these controls in the Huon Valley are overwhelmingly micro-businesses with no compliance capacity.

SUBJECT	COUNCIL COMMENT AND SUBMISSION
	Council submits that new environmental or sustainability obligations be accompanied by State-funded compliance assistance and, where the burden is administered by councils, by funding for that administration. Council submits that the Strategy's treatment of renewable energy addresses generation but not delivery. Tasmania's renewable generation is only an advantage to a small business that can get the capacity to its premises. In much of the Huon Valley the local distribution network cannot deliver it, and the cost of augmentation falls on the first business to ask. Council submits that electrical distribution capacity be treated as core enabling infrastructure under this objective, and that the Implementation Plan include a program of regional network uplift planned ahead of demand rather than in response to individual connection applications. See overarching comment 8.

Theme three: Enabling business	
Objective 1: Business advice and support	Supported. Council submits the largest gap is not the volume of advice but the absence of a single authoritative answer. Business Tasmania cannot give binding advice on planning or building outcomes. Councils cannot advise on State instruments they do not administer. A business owner is routinely referred in a circle. Council submits the Strategy commit to a genuine single point of entry with the authority to give an answer a business can rely on. Council submits the Strategy go further than advice. Where a business strikes a problem spanning several agencies, it needs someone with the standing to resolve it, not another referral. Council submits the Implementation Plan establish a regulatory resolution function able to convene the relevant agencies and councils, work a problem through to a decision, and report on what caused it. See overarching comment 7. Council submits that succession planning deserves more weight than its place in a list of advice topics suggests. With an ageing population, many established regional businesses will change hands or close over the life of the Strategy, and each closure takes local services, jobs and accumulated knowledge with it. Council submits the Implementation Plan support succession-to-ownership pathways, including matching retiring owners with prospective younger buyers, and mentoring and finance support for first-time owners. See overarching comment 9.
Objective 2: Operating environment	Supported. Council submits that regulatory churn is itself a source of uncertainty. Amendments to the Building Act 2016, the National Construction Code, the planning scheme and subordinate instruments arrive on no predictable cycle, and each requires businesses and councils to relearn the rules.

	Council submits: • business-affecting regulatory change commence on fixed dates, no more than twice a year; • a minimum lead time between a change being made and it commencing; and consolidated plain-language notification of what has changed, issued to councils and businesses together. Council submits that certainty also depends on how regulation is made. Where obligations are settled before the businesses and councils that carry them are engaged, the loss is not only the quality of the regulation but the confidence of every business watching. See overarching comment 7. Council submits that demographic change is itself part of the operating environment and should be named as such. It shapes customer demand, labour availability and the viability of services in smaller communities. Businesses can plan for it if they can see it. Council submits the State publish regional population data and projections in a form small businesses can use. See overarching comment 9.
Objective 3: Red Tape Reduction	Supported. Council submits this objective should be the Strategy's priority. The Enabling Action should be strengthened. "Take a holistic approach" is not measurable. Council submits the Strategy publish a baseline of how many separate approvals are currently required to establish a small business, and a target for reducing it. Council submits the following priority reforms be identified in the Implementation Plan. 1. Parking. Extend clause C2.5.5 of the State Planning Provisions to existing buildings in the Village, Local Business, General Business, Central Business and Urban Mixed Use Zones. This is a discrete, already-drafted amendment that could be made through the State Planning Provisions review now underway. See overarching comment 5. 2. Change of use. Broaden exemptions for change of use within an existing commercial building where hours of operation, floor area and emissions are unchanged.

	3. Building Act. Review the building work categories and the notifiable work regime as they apply to small commercial fitouts. The current thresholds capture low-risk work at disproportionate cost. 4. Consolidated approvals. Deliver, end to end, the single application for planning, building, plumbing, food, environmental and heritage approvals that has been committed to since 2019. PlanBuild has not made approval easier. 5. Proportionate inspection. Move inspection frequencies under every Act to a risk-based model. 6. No new burden without funding. Every red tape reduction action should be tested for whether it removes a requirement or merely relocates the administration of it. Digitising a process, consolidating a portal or shortening a timeframe are worth doing, but where they transfer effort to councils they are not red tape reduction. They are red tape redistribution. See overarching comment 3. 7. Codify consumer protection. Consolidate Tasmania's scattered consumer protection provisions into a single instrument and repeal the provisions it replaces. See overarching comment 6. 8. Small-scale meat processing. Review the regulation of small-scale, mobile and service-kill abattoirs against the scale and actual risk of those operations. See overarching comment 7. A regulator-side test. Council submits that every new business-affecting regulatory proposal be accompanied by a statement of who will administer it, what administration will cost, and whether that cost is funded. Sunsetting. Business-affecting subordinate legislation should have a review date. Targets should be expressed as elimination. Council submits that each priority reform above carry a measurable target for removal, and that progress be reported against the number of requirements eliminated rather than the time taken to administer those that remain. See overarching comment 6.
--	---

	Proportionality. Council submits that every priority reform be tested against the scale and actual risk profile of the businesses subject to it, with a distinct assessment for micro and small operators. See overarching comment 7.
Theme four: Technology	
Objective 1: Digital connectivity	Strongly supported. Mobile black spots and network outages are a live commercial risk in much of the Huon Valley, affecting payments, bookings and personal safety for sole operators. Council submits that where government mandates digital lodgement, digital reporting or digital record-keeping, it accepts an obligation to deliver the network that makes compliance possible, and to maintain non-digital pathways until it has. Council submits the same argument applies to electricity. Digital infrastructure does not run without power, and the parts of the Huon Valley with the worst mobile coverage generally have the least electrical network capacity as well. Council submits the Strategy address electrical distribution capacity alongside digital connectivity, and treat the two as a single infrastructure problem. See overarching comment 8.
Objective 2: Global markets and diversification	Supported. No further comment.
Objective 3: Digital capability	Supported. Council submits that the pace at which government adds digital compliance obligations should be calibrated to the capacity of micro-businesses to absorb them. Cyber safety support in particular should be practical and free at the point of use.