

Questions Answered During Webinar #23 Thursday 29 June 2023	Votes	Responses
Will the Model Reports – compliance with standards determination legislative instrument be updated in line with the introduction of new ADRs for VTAs?	1	The legislative instrument will only need to be updated where a concession to the standard is necessary and appropriate. Otherwise, the requirements of the ADR are to be met.
When will the updated CRIS be available?	2	Activity-based modelling for the Cost Recovery Implementation Statement (CRIS) is being finalised. The department will then consult with industry.
Assessment times have improved greatly, RFI's are being answered in a timelier manor. Great improvements. Well done, Team!	0	Thank you for providing the feedback.
Now that the Department has engaged with some ROVER users to get an understanding of the user experience from industry side, can you please provide a report on the Department's findings from that engagement and the potential improvements to ROVER (including schedule) which may result.	4	The department conducted observations sessions with a small number of participants in June 2023 focussing on submitting vehicle type approval applications. Of particular note was the inconsistency of load times across participants. We are waiting for advice from IT around technical matters in order to design a development schedule for the next ROVER release.
When will the 'Make' and 'Actuator brand' drop-downs be updated in ROVER?	1	You can request a specific make or brand to be added by completing an online enquiry form on the department's website. We will then make a decision on whether to add it.
Is there a plan to allow SPV's such as on-road cranes to use Model Reports, thus avoiding the need for every ADR to be filled out for each application/batch of vehicles?	1	No, the Model Reports provisions of the RVS Rules do not allow for a Model Report for an SPV. Another option is to consider applying for a vehicle type approval.
Are there ADR compliance report templates/examples available to demonstrate the level of information/detail expected when submitting an approval request? Further to that, are there templates/examples for other items such as model reports?	2	Applicants must address the requirements in the compliance information forms, and only use the 'information supporting a declaration' option when no other options are more suitable for the information you hold. Given the range of information that could be provided, it is not feasible to provide a template of sample.  There is a sample template for Model Report for a SEVs vehicle available at <a href="https://www.infrastructure.gov.au/department/media/publications/model-report-template-specialist-and-enthusiast-vehicles">https://www.infrastructure.gov.au/department/media/publications/model-report-template-specialist-and-enthusiast-vehicles</a>
Does the image need to accurately represent the variant. Some VTAs have the same image across all variants.	4	Different manufacturers batch their variants in different ways, however, each RVD must have a photograph that is representative of the variant. For example 2 door, 4 door, sedan and wagon vehicles should use separate images to match the Road Vehicle Descriptor (RVD) body style.
When conducting a variation, we are noticing a lot of additional duplicate VINs that have just been added. We hope the Department may be able to provide an update. We believe this issue has already been raised (and demonstrated) by other FCAI members.	0	Can you please provide more information on this issue so the department can investigate further. For example, what application type were you varying? When referring to duplicate VINs, are these the typical VIN in a Road Vehicle Descriptor (RVD)?
Can you please go over the Attachment A again, we have opted in MVSA approval that was standard, from the explanation you are saying this is non-standard?	1	MVSA 10A(1) or 10A(2) opted-in approvals would be identified as being 'Standard' and/or minor and inconsequential (M&I) non-compliance. A 14A approval is a 'non-standard' approval.
Section 19 is standard pathway?	2	Section 19 of the Road Vehicle Standards Rules covers all vehicle type approval decisions.
How will we handle applications that include both variants that have a noncompliance and variants that do not have a noncompliance? Will we need to split these applications into two applications, one including the variant without a noncompliance and another for the variants with a noncompliance?	3	A type approval will be granted based on the lowest extent of compliance, if a variant is substantially compliant and otherwise suitable, then all vehicles need to be entered on the RAV as 'Type approval—non-standard'. 'Standard' and 'Non-standard' vehicles cannot be on the same approval.

<p>We have a few queries concerning the appropriate vehicle importation pathway which we have sent via ROVER info emails, RVSA inquiry forms, etc but have little correspondence regarding this. Can we please get in touch with the Department directly that can take this offline with us?</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Yes, the department is happy to discuss your queries offline. Please reach out via the Contact us page with your specific queries.</p>
<p>For SSM, is the compliance requirement of 'all vehicles date' applicable regardless of the FSA activity? Eg: The OEM either has the ADR compliance now, or it will have it before the 'all vehicles date', is it correct that SSM will not have to show compliance to the ADR until the all vehicles date?</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>When applying a particular ADR, the vehicle model is not considered a 'new model' if the base vehicle is not a new model. The SSM vehicle can continue to comply with the standard against which the OEM's base vehicle complied with until the 'all vehicles' date applies.</p>
<p>If a vehicle has 2 versions of the vehicle under different approval numbers, can one vehicle be tested and covered under variant applicability if it can be shown it is applicable as per traditional applicability rules? Ie brake testing</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>Where the ADR allows the testing to cover the worst-case or the testing requirements are identical, the same test could be used or supplemented by partial testing.</p>
<p>Some clarification please on the Type Approval item. Assume cab chassis variant (has M&amp;I for wheel guards, rear lamps, etc) is type approval-standard? Also second stage manufacturers with non-standard approval (eg over-dimensional EWP), is type approval - SSM and not type approval- non-standard?</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Section 6 of the Road Vehicle Standards (Information on the Register of Approved Vehicles) Determination 2021 groups fully compliant vehicles and M&amp;I vehicles into 'Type approval—standard'. 'Type approval—second stage of manufacture' does not identify the extent of compliance.</p>
<p>Just wanted to clarify the RAV entry issue related to entry pathway for M&amp;I vehicles. The guidance says an M&amp;I approved vehicle should be entered as type approval standard. Which is what we have been doing. Does this now mean all VIN's (a huge qty) submitted in this way are now considered in error?</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>That is the correct option - no error.</p>
<p>With the new UN approval document change mentioned at the start. If the document is requested, will this be requested as an RFI? If so will it also require a withdraw and replace?</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>If required, an assessor will request a copy of the UN approval document via a request for further information (RFI). You should respond to that RFI and you do not need to withdraw your application to provide the document.</p>
<p>Are manufacturing facilities for SSM required to get an approval number as per RVCS eg: C12345? The pathway is still functional but the number is not required in the application</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>No, manufacturing facilities are entered as part of the type approval application.</p>
<p>Is there any consideration for an ADR regarding placement of indicator stalks on vehicles? I believe EU vehicle manufacturers should be required to install indicator stalks on the right side of the steering wheel, considering vehicles drive on the left side of the road in Australia, unlike the EU..</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>In Australia, the national road vehicles standards are mostly performance-based for vehicle safety, emissions control and anti-theft protection. They are being increasingly harmonised with international vehicle regulations adopted by the United Nations (UN), which is important because there is a high proportion of vehicles sold here of an overseas design. Neither Australia nor the UN has a regulation for the layout of indicator controls. There would be a considerable cost involved for manufacturers to produce modified vehicles for the small Australian market. Additionally, any proposal to regulate a new standard would have to be assessed with considerable emphasis on the need for evidence of effectiveness of the proposal. In this case it is not likely that a substantial case could be made for the proposal.</p>
<p>Having duplicate models across different VCC is creating issues in RAV, will this be fixed?</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>The department is looking at options to fix this issue. At this stage, the low ATM trailer approvals experiencing this issue can correct it by varying the approval to have a unique model name, for example, adding the vehicle category code/approval holder as a suffix.</p>
<p>Is the below a standard approval? where can further information be found on standard? This road vehicle type substantially complies with the applicable national road vehicle standards and the non-compliance is only in minor and inconsequential respects or to a minor and inconsequential extent.</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Minor and inconsequential non-compliance is grouped with standard. See response above.</p>

Part 1 Section 19 (4) A type of vehicle satisfies subparagraph (3)(b)(ii) only if, were the type of vehicle used on a public road in Australia, it: (a) would not pose an unacceptable risk to public safety; and (b) would be appropriate for such use.	1	Approvals granted on the basis of the matter in paragraph 19(3)(a) and subparagraph 19(3)(b)(ii) of the Rules are entered on the RAV as 'Type approval—non-standard'.
Part 2 Section 19 - Can I use an EU small series type approval (Brand New vehicles) with exemption to certain regulations however would not pose a risk to the public. Is that what this clause means?	1	Section 19(2) allows the decision maker to consider certain matters when assessing whether a vehicle complies with ADRs. An EU small series type approval is not covered in that section. You need to be able to demonstrate the document was issued by a competent authority of a government that is a contracting party to the 1958 Agreement and the document demonstrates that the type of vehicle complies with the requirements applying under that agreement that are equivalent to the requirements in the applicable ADR.
RAV submission error received as "Failed to Find Approved Record for Make and Model". How to fix this error? Contacted RAV team but no solution provided.	0	The ROVER development team is currently investigating this issue. We will provide an update shortly. Please report through the Contact us form if this error occurs.
Some VTA variations regarding ADR 43/04 and safety radars that are not UN ECE R151 are taking much longer to be assessed than the standard processing time. We cannot work on any other variations due to this. If the answer is no, it would make life simpler. But we are not getting any answers at all.	0	These are being cleared now. Testing to a standard other than UN ECE R151 that is accompanied by a letter of in-principle support from the NHVR will not be delayed.
UN ECE Approval Nos Where a UN ECE Approval No has been entered manually in a CI form it is not possible after submission to "view" the data submitted in the CI form. Can this be corrected?	1	We have provided your feedback to the ROVER development team who will look into this issue.
ADR 42/04 The ADR 42/04 CI form does not include a "Proof of Compliance" option to enter data but is available for ADR 42/05. Is there a reason why this option is not available for ADR 42/04?	1	Please select the 'Information supporting a declaration' option and upload a copy of the previous Summary of Evidence form or document showing similar information to the compliance information form.
ADR 95/00 The CI form requires each nominated tyre size to be entered which results in multiple CI forms for a single tyre installation approval no. Is there a reason for this repetition of data?	1	We are investigating options to simplify the entry of 'installation of tyre compliance' data on the compliance information form for ADR 95/00.
Can the layout of the RVD output file of a VTA be improved. Some files could be 60+ pages that have minimal information on each of the pages. Thanking you.	0	The downloadable PDF of a Road Vehicle Descriptor (RVD) was redesigned in Release 8A to improve readability and navigation. The amount of information on each page will vary by RVD. RVD documents that contain many variants or components will be longer as they will have a lot of data. Downloadable RVD documents have a table of contents that makes it easier to jump to the information you wish to read, for example, each variant is a clickable link.
It has come to our attention that the eforms program will not longer be accessible moving forward, this is going to cause compliance issues as VTA holders may not be able to open these older compliance forms. Flagging this as an issue.	0	Vehicle type approval holders must have their own records to confirm compliance as entered into the Summary of Evidence forms and should not rely on RVCS. This information is clearly stated in the conditions of the Identification Plate Approvals ie. the licensee shall supply upon request, to the satisfaction of the Administrator, any additional information for the purpose of demonstrating compliance with such of the Australian Design Rules specified in Schedule 4.