

| Questions asked during RVSA Industry Webinar #34 on 29 August 2024 | Score | Response |
|---|-------|--|
| Please give us an update on the status of an RVSA Post Implementation Review which we were previously advised would only be able to commence after the RVSA had been fully operational for 2 years, i.e. 1 July 2024 | 4 | <p>The Minister has prioritised consultation on the New Vehicle Efficiency Standard and the subsequent independent review of Australian Design Rule harmonisation processes. This work will need to be completed before we are able to undertake the RVS legislation post implementation review.</p> <p>The post implementation review is now expected to commence in early to mid 2025. The Cost Recovery Implementation Statement review will be undertaken after the post implementation review to take account of cost implications that may occur following any legislative changes resulting from the post implementation review.</p> |
| EV Question: Are 3 pin power supply plugs inside EVs covered within the scope of the ADRs? | 4 | <p>There are no 3 pin or other specific connector requirements for a vehicle connector for electric vehicles (EVs) in the ADRs. However, ADR 109 does specify some performance requirements for vehicle connectors and, more generally, has high voltage electrical safety requirements for EVs. In addition to the ADRs, there are electrical standards required by various other laws in Australia, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> AS IEC 62196.2.2014 – Plugs, socket outlets, vehicle connectors of electric vehicles AS/NZS 3112 – Approval and test specification – Plugs and socket-outlets AS/NZS 60335.1 – Household and similar electrical appliances – Safety – Part 1: General requirements |
| Please provide an update on the request of Import Approval Application PDF file generation feature. I'm still waiting for a response from your development team. | 1 | <p>We are developing an Application PDF file for deployment in a future ROVER release.</p> |
| For every Compliance Information submission, there is a requirement to link this evidence to a variant. This is extremely cumbersome and was not previously required under MVSA. Can you please explain the justification for this linkage now required under RVSA? | 3 | <p>When applying for a vehicle type approval under the <i>Road Vehicle Standards Act 2018</i>, linking evidence to a variant in compliance information forms identifies the evidence that is applicable for each variant. This requirement ensures there is appropriate evidence available for all variants that will be supplied under that approval.</p> <p>Under the <i>Motor Vehicle Standards Act 1989</i>, this information was provided by the applicant in the Summary of Fleet form, which provided details on the 'worst case' variant that was tested to the applicable standard. The Summary of Fleet form is no longer in use and this information is now captured in compliance information forms.</p> |
| For Model Reports (SEVs), if compliance information is supplied by UN ECE compliance e.g. R48 for ADR13/00, do we still need to supply pictures of every single lamp compliance marking? | 3 | <p>Yes. Photos of lamp markings need to be included in Model Reports in order to meet the requirements of s17 of the determination made under Section 88 of the RVS Rules (the Road Vehicle Standards (Model Reports) Determination 2021), and so that RAWs and AVVs accessing the work instructions and checklist are able to confirm compliance of lamps.</p> |
| We have seen several examples where the Compliance team has been provided VINs by Road Authorities which are invalid or may not relate to the subsequent Investigation, what processes does the Department take to ensure that information provided to them is accurate before starting an investigation? | 2 | <p>The department is aware of this issue and takes action, to the extent reasonably possible, to ensure the information provided to it is accurate. It is not appropriate for the department to disclose internal processes or methods related to its compliance and enforcement activities.</p> |
| Is there a time frame (guideline/service standard) for a response from Investigation and Enforcement to supporting information submitted by an approval holder in relation to a RFI from them and if the response was satisfactory? | 2 | <p>When our assessors request additional or supporting information through the request for information (RFI) process, there is a legislated timeframe of 30 days for the applicant to respond.</p> <p>When our compliance officers request additional or supporting information to determine if a contravention of the RVS legislation has or has not occurred, this is requested as a condition of the relevant approval. If the additional supporting information is provided, our compliance officers then respond to the approval holder advising if the information they have provided is satisfactory, or seek further clarification and information. This process can take some time. It is important to note there is no legislated timeframe associated with these types of information requests.</p> |

| | | |
|---|----------|--|
| <p>Since the ROVER update, it is noted that the "Remarks" section of a VTA allows for documentation attachment during the application process. However, when this VTA is approved this is not shown with comment "Refer to attachment for detailed information" in this section only. Not detailing the mods.</p> | <p>0</p> | <p>We are considering ways to improve the Road Vehicle Descriptor (RVD) section in ROVER.</p> <p>Any text entered into the Remarks field is included in published RVD details, additionally, an applicant may choose to include an attachment in the General Information section of the RVD. The information published in the RVD and the ability to attach additional information are the same as they were before the ROVER portal was rebuilt.</p> <p>The ability to attach a file is only intended to allow the applicant to provide additional information to the assessment team, the attached file name and contents are not included in the published RVD details.</p> |
| <p>Are there any workings on harmonization of standards for model report concessions?</p> | <p>2</p> | <p>We are considering how to make it clearer which UN Regulations are applied in Australia and how the harmonisation framework applies to Australian Design Rules (ADRs).</p> <p>Each ADR sets out the alternative standards for that ADR under Alternative Requirements. However, as we have applied the Harmonisation ADR - Vehicle Standard (Australian Design Rule - Harmonisation) 2012 - an applicant is able to utilise any subsequent series of the listed UN Regulation that is in-force at the time that the vehicle or component is provided to the Australian market.</p> <p>The exception to this rule is when Australia chooses to no longer apply the regulation or if the UN Regulation is not valid or no longer valid.</p> <p>For UN Regulations applied by Australia, we will recognise an applicant's valid UN type approvals to that regulation for the vehicle or component.</p> |
| <p>SEVs and MREs used to be 1 SEV has many MREs. This got changed some time ago. Now SEVs and MREs are many to many. As previously mentioned, the variants data got issue. Not only the variants, the meta data they provided for SEVs is a disaster if you look into them. Do you think we should revert back?</p> | <p>0</p> | <p>We are not considering reverting back to the previous system.</p> <p>The RVS Rules allow for a person to apply for a Model Report that applies to "a model, or one or more variants, of a road vehicle" that is entered on the Specialist and Enthusiast Vehicles (SEVs) Register. In some cases, multiple variants of a vehicle are entered on the SEVs Register across multiple entries and so Model Reports must have the capacity to list all the applicable SEVs entries.</p> <p>In addition, when an entry on the SEVs Register expires, any associated Model Reports remain in-force and any concessional RAV entry approvals granted before the expiration of a SEVs Register entry remain valid. Then, if an application is submitted and the model or variant(s) is found eligible to be re-entered on the SEVs Register, it will be re-entered with a new entry number.</p> <p>Model Reports have to be able to simultaneously list expired and re-entry SEVs entries so that vehicles previously approved under the expired entry and those approved under the new entry can all be modified in accordance with the Model Report and eventually added to the RAV.</p> |