

Questions answered during RVSA Industry Webinar #26 Thursday 28 September 2023	Score	Response
Please clarify are there changes to the expectations for brake test reports? Two RFIs this week requesting full test data for the brake fade tests (the 20 test runs), whereas previously (for the last 15 years), a statement was all that was expected in a report, along with the final run results.	4	Some approved testing facilities appear to not be carrying out Australian Design Rule (ADR) 35/06 brake testing in accordance with the requirements detailed in the ADR. The brake fade test requirements in the ADR have a clear set of procedures to follow for heavy vehicle brake testing that should not be deviated from. The same brake fade test requirements for ADR 35/06 have been in place since 2005.
There are several OEM manufacturers that issue interim safety critical recalls without a solution as a parts are still underway. Are importers allowed to modify vehicles (per RAWs requirement) that have recalls on them subject to a risk assesment and rectification plan.	4	As part of the Model Report Work Instructions, RAWs are required to identify an outstanding recall. If there is an outstanding recall on a vehicle, paragraph 19(3)(c) of the Road Vehicle Standards (Model Reports) Determination 2021 states that a RAW approval holder should "not proceed to the next stage of the Work Instructions unless and until the vehicle is rectified".
With all Due respect to all those speaking - please read the ADR wrt to the Fade test and conduct it properly. If certain parameters can't be met ask for an M&I - discussions of this type show lack of knowledge and makes the industry look silly for the sake of a few people looking for an easy out	5	This relates to the first question on brake testing (above). The brake fade test requirement is to conduct 20 successive deceleration tests that are not more than 70 seconds apart and a total of 20 applications completed within a 20 minute time period. Heavy vehicle braking is a primary vehicle safety feature for both the heavy vehicle operator and other road users. Testing to prove that a heavy vehicle's braking is adequate should not be compromised.
If an ADR refers to a an alternate overseas standard that has been superseded by either a regulatory authority like UNECE or the owner of the standard like ISO or SAE is the applicant allowed to follow the new alternate standard as per the owner of the standard. eg. UNECE Regulation revisions.	2	ADR 0 relates to harmonisation of ADRs. It depends on whether the standard has been applied in Australia. Please see <i>Guide to vehicle type approvals—Appendix 4—ECE Regulations</i> for what UN Regulations have been applied (www.infrastructure.gov.au/department/media/publications/guide-vehicle-type-approvals-appendix-4-ece-regulations-have-been-applied). This would not apply to other referenced standards such as ISO or SAE standards.
Under Mobility Criteria, how are MRE's being approved and vehicle's being entered on the RAV that do not meet the AS/NZS for w/chair restraints and ramps, despite it being a requirement for mobility vehicles under the RVSA Act/Rules and determinations?	1	Section 18 of the Road Vehicle Standards (Model Reports - Compliance with Standards) Determination 2021 requires that vehicles fitted with mobility features meet the standards outlined in Schedule 2 i.e. Australian Standards and warning label requirements apply. Any vehicles modified or manufactured using a Model Report and provided to the Australian market that do not meet these requirements should be referred to the department's Compliance and Enforcement team.
Can you please look at a quicker, simpler process to allow old evidence forms to be deleted from an existing / current application. To delete old evidence takes as long as uploading new forms. Maybe radio buttons/check boxes could be added so you can select and delete multiple forms at one time.	2	The request to make it faster to remove old evidence forms in ROVER has been noted as a change industry would like to see implemented in a future release. At this stage, we are unable to advise whether it can be delivered as part of the next release due to other priorities.
Under Approval Holder for RAV entry, is the AVV required to but the RAWs name or approval number? note - when the RAW approval number is written in the upload the RAWs name appears on the RAV	0	The approval holder name field must include the <u>RAW approval number</u> and not the name of the RAW. This change was implemented as part of ROVER Release 8C when we brought the RAV-house. The <i>Guide to the Register of Approved Vehicles for authorised vehicle verifiers</i> (www.infrastructure.gov.au/department/media/publications/guide-register-approved-vehicles-authorized-vehicle-verifiers) was updated to reflect this change.

Questions answered during RVSA Industry Webinar #26 Thursday 28 September 2023	Score	Response
RVSA was sold as providing more choice to the Australian consumer. This does not seem to be the case based on the administrative burden the RVSA system that are in place and the requirements to achieve this.	1	<p>The changes to SEVs requirements in the RVS legislation improve consumer choice via a range of provisions, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - allowing access to the variant level for vehicles not available in Australia (under the MVSA it was at the model level); - allowing entry on the SEVs Register 3 months after being available in another market (under the MVSA it was 18 months); and - removal of number restrictions so that RAWs are not limited in the number of vehicles that can be supplied. <p>To balance these concessions, measures have been put in place to ensure that only genuine specialist and enthusiast vehicles are eligible, and that those vehicles are appropriately modified (and checked) so that they comply with applicable national road vehicle standards.</p>
Could you please provide details on what pathway a LPPC vehicle (brand new) or EU Small Series Type Approval (brand new vehicles) is to use. It seems a VTA is not possible and the concessional RAV via Model Reports is for used vehicles. The Low Volume system under MVSA has disappeared. What do we do?	0	<p>The most appropriate pathway is the concessional RAV entry approval (vehicles to be modified by the holder of a RAW approval) pathway. One of the Specialist and Enthusiast Vehicles criterion is the rarity criterion (see section 135 of the Road Vehicle Standards Rules 2019). This affords a significant number of concessions aligning with the MVSA LPPC arrangements. It may be possible to use the vehicle type approval pathway in some circumstances, however, the same concessions are not available.</p>
If an SSM vehicle based on an NA category vehicle has been fitted with a body, built to comply with the OEM Bodybuilders Guidelines, would it be reasonable to assume its equal to the least dynamically competent variant tested by the OEM as part of ESC testing and complying with 35/05 or 88/00?	0	<p>Vehicle features altered by a SSM that significantly influence the performance of the Electronic Stability Control System (e.g. maximum mass, centre of gravity position, track width, distance between axles, tyres dimension and the design of the braking system) will need to have testing undertaken as per the requirements of the ADR.</p>