

Questions answered during webinar # 21 27 April 2023	Votes	Response
Is there any update on an Operations focused webinar? Possible started with answering some FAQs.	4	The department will host a series of operational RVSA webinars on select topics and is currently seeking feedback from peak industry representative bodies on what topics to prioritise. In the meantime, if there are any operational queries you have, please fill out the form on our Contact us webpage at: www.infrastructure.gov.au/infrastructure-transport-vehicles/vehicles/rvs/contact-us
What is the Status of 2.55 m wide ADAS equipped vehicles? Situation becoming urgent!!! Certainty is required to equip vehicles with lifesaving technology as most sensors fit outside the restrictive 2.50 m - Urgent action is required.	2	The department is currently finalising the Impact Analysis for Safer Freight Vehicles. This includes additional analysis of the road safety problem caused by blind spots around trucks. This analysis was requested by industry following discussions of requirements to enhance indirect vision for drivers. Once this issue is resolved, a brief will be provided to the Minister for consideration.
When the Department develop a Triage system for applications? - 60 days to update an RVD to add a compliant variant has serious downstream effects.	4	The department's standard practice is to work through applications in the order in which they are received. This is to ensure fairness to all applicants, and to assist ensuring decisions are made within legislative timeframes. The large majority of applications are currently being decided well within legislated timeframes. The department rarely provides special priority to RVS applications, however, where unforeseen or extenuating circumstances exist, certain applications may be prioritised at the department's discretion. There is a guidance note on the department's website regarding requesting priority assessment of an RVS application. This guidance note outlines in what circumstances requests for priority assessment might be considered and can be accessed at: www.infrastructure.gov.au/department/media/publications/guidance-note-requesting-priority-assessment-rvs-application
RVSA is lacking the details MVSA had. We need clear and detailed guidelines with consistent and timely decisions. Broader communication channels and more transparency, funnelling enquiries through a portal is not always appropriate, particularly for questions relating to policies and procedures.	3	The department continues to produce and update a large amount of guidance material, and welcomes feedback on how this can be improved and/or if there is a need to address any gaps. From experience, the department has found that using a single point of contact is the most effective and efficient way to ensure that queries are sent to the relevant subject matter experts for response in a timely manner.
When we will be able to do a bulk upload of our facility ID's when submitting a new approval?	2	This has been included on the department's backlog for consideration when prioritising future additional functionality for ROVER. We are unable to provide a timeframe at this stage.

<p>Are ROVER technical assessors trained in specific sections - cars, trucks, bikes, trailers etc? We received an RFI recently where the assessor stated that they were 'unaware of what constitutes a standard dimensional trailer'. Seemingly assessing an application they don't have the knowledge required</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>This particular example highlights the importance of providing appropriate evidence (including through making declarations) that the vehicle type in question complies with legislative requirements. The statement "Trailer is supplied as a Standard Model" was considered ambiguous and not satisfactory to demonstrate compliance, in part because "Standard Model" is not a term defined in legislation. "This vehicle fully complies with the dimensional requirements of this ADR" would be a more appropriate response as the applicant is declaring they comply with the legislated requirements.</p>
<p>ROVER performance after Release 8b is significantly down, pages are again taking over 1-2 minutes to load, most notably when saving sections such as Extent of Compliance, the RVD and 'further information', etc. Is the Department aware of this and can we expect improvements prior to the next Release?</p>	<p>5</p>	<p>The department is aware of a performance issue caused by some of its servers going down shortly after 8B was deployed, although this was not caused by the deployment itself (it affected multiple department systems). Monitoring of the system since has not indicated any ongoing degradation in performance. The department is considering further performance enhancements as part of future ROVER builds.</p>
<p>With SSM applications for GVM upgrades, is each fitting location to be added as a manufacturing facility? If the RAV entry and QMS control point is central can it be assumed that is the manufacturing location to prevent 200+ manufacturing locations being entered?</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>If it's a facility doing the modifications, then they should be listed as a manufacturing facility as part of an application.</p>
<p>It is increasingly difficult to get ADR interpretations, as standard response is that "cannot assess outside of a VTA" however surely this is part of the departments role as the author of the ADR's. We need some mechanism to get these answers through Standards or elsewhere.</p>	<p>9</p>	<p>In almost all cases where the department receives requests for ADR interpretations, these are sought in relation to particular vehicle types, systems or components. These requests must be assessed as part of the vehicle type or component type application process to align with the cost recovery framework the department works under. However, where broader and/or industry-wide interpretations are deemed necessary, please bring this to the attention of the department and any resulting interpretations included in guidance materials will be made available to all stakeholders. The department is currently reviewing how ADRs and ADR-specific content is published on its website. The intention is to move ADR supporting material, such as that currently contained in ADR-specific Administrator's Circulars, into equivalent ADR-specific guidance notes. Any broadly applicable ADR interpretations resulting from the process described above would be added to these guidance notes. The department will also be reviewing this issue during the Post Implementation Review of the legislation.</p>
<p>Not a question- the CI evidence by variant change is great thank you</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>Thank you.</p>

<p>Like other importers of campers, the factories are still trying to get their WMI and VIN structures approved in country, which is looking to be around July for ours. So can we get more clarification around using already issued VINs from the department through the VIA process after the 1st July.</p>	2	<p>VINs were issued by the department under transitional arrangements via the VIS system. If these vehicles are to be provided under the RVS legislation, they must be covered by an approval and meet the RVS conditions of the approval. The VINs can be used but do not comply fully with the requirements of ADR 61/03 - the WMI element does not identify the manufacturing location or manufacturer. You should apply for an approval for minor and inconsequential non-compliance.</p>
<p>Can you please share the documentation used for assessment process so we make sure all the points are present?</p>	11	<p>The department is not able to share its internal procedure documents. The assessment process is based on the RVS legislation, and the provisions in the RVS Rules in particular, which is available for the public to access at: www.legislation.gov.au/Details/F2022C00421 The department has also published guidance documents for all the application types and these can be accessed via the department's website.</p>
<p>Should fees be being charged to add an ADR capability to a TFA? There is no assessment carried out, but it attracts a charge?</p>	3	<p>Section 252 of the Road Vehicle Standards Rules 2019 states that a fee must be paid where the variation would change the scope of the approval, except where the variation would only reduce the scope of the approval. As adding an ADR capability to a testing approval is a change (increase) in scope, it does attract an application fee.</p>
<p>How can industry recover costs from the Departments mistakes?</p>	0	<p>If you believe the department has made an error in the application/assessment process and are eligible for a refund, please contact us and provide specific information on your circumstances.</p>
<p>"Opted in" models for a SSM manufacturer are not coming across to RVSA as a SSM vehicle and this cannot be changed when varying an application. Can the Department change this section so we can edit the application to a SSM vehicle.</p>	1	<p>As this affects a finite number of approvals, rather than use ROVER development time on this issue, the department is changing approvals that were opted in and should be marked as SSM approvals. If you are aware of an approval that has not yet been updated, please contact the department.</p>
<p>Under the 'Vehicle type details -> 'Manage compliance information' field, can we please have a select all button added to this page? A number of approvals have hundreds of documents that all relate to the one Road Vehicle Variant. Having to select these manually adds significant unnecessary time.</p>	3	<p>You can bulk select ADRs for variants from the Vehicle type details page by clicking on the Manage compliance information button next to each variant. You can add new variants from the Vehicle type details page, on a new application or when varying an approval. For more information, see the What's new? What's different? ROVER Release 8B guide for industry at www.infrastructure.gov.au/department/media/publications/whats-new-whats-different-rover-release-8b</p>

<p>Can the required engineer to certify the design of the Model Report standards (i.e. standards for left-hand to right-hand drive) be any other professional engineer than a Chartered Professional? It is difficult to find a CPEng willing to accept liability unless the department will provide one.</p>	<p>5</p>	<p>The requirement to have a CPEng sign off on the conversion design is a key part of the legislation that ensures an appropriate level of safety for this inherently risky activity. The department is not considering any changes. CPEngs can be found on the Engineers Australia website.</p>
<p>There have been Model Reports approved using "Motor Vehicle Standards (Approval to Place Used Import Plates) guidelines 2006 (No. 1)", what compliance documents are allowed to be used to show compliance for model reports</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>The Road Vehicle Standards (Model Reports - Compliance with Standards) Determination 2021 made under subsection 89(2) of the RVS Rules details the concessions available under the MVSA. Please refer to that document for the compliance information required - it can be accessed at www.legislation.gov.au/Details/F2021L00838</p>