

| Questions asked during RVSA Industry Webinar #35 on 31 October 2024 | Score | Response |
|--|-------|---|
| Has there been any further work done on developing a Light Trailer braking procedure? | 2 | <p>A new vehicle standard for trailer braking is being developed for TA and TB category vehicles, with an associated consequential amendment to Australian Design Rule 38/05.</p> <p>Public consultation is expected to begin early 2025, however, as with existing Australian Design Rules, we will not be developing a procedure for how industry should meet the requirements of the new standard.</p> |
| The cab chassis question (yes or no answer required) under General Information on the RVD does not save when you answer it. Is this a known problem? | 1 | <p>Yes, we are aware of this issue and it has been resolved.</p> <p>Due to a Microsoft update, there was a bug in ROVER where users' responses to the cab-chassis question in the Road Vehicle Descriptor (RVD) were being saved in the back end of the system but the information was not being displayed to the user.</p> <p>If you are still experiencing this issue, please contact ROVERinfo@infrastructure.gov.au for assistance.</p> |
| <p>RAWS QMS, Appendix 3: Modification Procedures. Is a complete modification procedure required or an outline would suffice as there might be a change in the variant when buying the actual vehicle?</p> <p><i>(Clarification from participant: When you apply for a new role and get a Model Report, but the tool list will only be available once you test and research).</i></p> | 2 | <p>No, a registered automotive workshop (RAW) does not need to provide a complete, detailed modification procedure in a quality management system (QMS) summary. A QMS summary is intended to describe the type of modification work a RAW will engage in at a high level, as outlined in the Guide to registered automotive workshops—Appendix 3 (https://www.infrastructure.gov.au/department/media/publications/guide-registered-automotive-workshops-appendix-3-details-expected-quality-management-system-summary).</p> <p>However, the QMS and QMS summary are "living" documents that are to be updated as needed. For example, if the RAW finds a new tool is required then the QMS and QMS summary should be updated to list that tool as well as its calibration and maintenance.</p> <p>Additionally, the QMS summary does not need to be so detailed that it identifies specific variants. However, any and all variants to be modified must be covered by an approved Model Report and every step required to bring the vehicle into compliance must be detailed in the Work Instructions.</p> |
| The current ADR 79/05 guidance note requires ADR 111/00 and ADR 112/00 to be listed as exempt when using an EU TA. Listing ADR 111/00 and ADR 112/00 as exempt is currently not possible in ROVER. Can it be confirmed how to manage ADR 111/00 and ADR 112/00 when using an EU TA? | 0 | <p>Australian Design Rule (ADR) 79/05 will apply to all new model vehicles (in vehicle categories MA, MB, MC, MD and NA) from 1 December 2025.</p> <p>Vehicles that will be provided to the Australian market prior to 1 December 2025 would be considered existing models and will not need to comply with the new model applicability date for ADR 79/05. In this case, the applicant should identify the level of compliance with ADR 79/05 as 'Not applicable'.</p> <p>Please see the <i>Guide to vehicle type approvals</i> for more information (https://www.infrastructure.gov.au/department/media/publications/guide-vehicle-type-approvals).</p> |
| If using MVSA test report for the organisation that has a RVSA test facility covering same ADRs as test report, is a quote still required? | 1 | <p>If an approved testing facility under the <i>Road Vehicle Standards Act 2018</i> was previously a registered testing facility under the <i>Motor Vehicle Standards Act 1989</i> (MVSA), then test reports for testing conducted under the MVSA would become accepted as evidence of compliance to national road vehicle standards.</p> <p>Please see Section 19 (2) of the <i>Road Vehicle Standards Rules 2019</i> (https://www.legislation.gov.au/F2019L00198/latest/text).</p> |

| | | |
|--|----------|---|
| <p>Please clarify if a renewed VTA approval, which has been opted into, will be regarded as a new model or an existing model concerning the implementation dates for new ADRs.</p> | <p>3</p> | <p>Vehicle types that will be continuously provided to the Australian market beyond the initial approval expiry date will be considered as existing models for the purpose of complying with Australian Design Rule applicability dates.</p> |
| <p>Following extensive discussion at this webinar, it is evident that clear guidance regarding how opted-in approvals must be renewed is needed. There are many items that need clarification such as new vs existing model, VTA number roll over, necessity to change model name etc.</p> | <p>1</p> | <p>We are aware that there is significant interest in the matter of vehicle type approval renewals from industry and we are continuing to work on the matter at all levels, including determining possible enhancements to ROVER.</p> <p>We will provide updates on developments and make guidance material available to industry as early as possible.</p> |
| <p>Please provide guidance material ASAP for expiring Opt-In approvals, and the departments process and requirements for new applications relating to these Opt-In approvals.</p> | <p>1</p> | |
| <p>Does ROVER have the functionality to notify (email) approval holders 6-12 months before their approvals expire?</p> | <p>2</p> | <p>No, ROVER does not currently have the functionality to generate an email notifying an approval holder that the expiry date for their approval is approaching.</p> |
| <p>To add ADR to Extent of Compliance: - Some ADRs are added as additional ADRs - When done so cannot mark them as Not Applicable Will Department accept: - VTA with no record for these ADRs, or - Set ADRs as Full Compliance & add "Info supporting a declaration" & add Not Applicable comment?</p> | <p>0</p> | <p>ROVER will autopopulate Australian Design Rules (ADRs) into vehicle type approval applications 6 months before the ADR applicability date. If an ADR has been autopopulated but the ADR requirements do not apply to the vehicle category in your application, you should identify the extent of compliance as 'Not applicable'. For example, if you are applying to vary your approval and the ADR applicability date is for new model vehicles, the ADR would not be applicable to existing models.</p> <p>Clarification was recently added to the Guide to vehicle type approvals to explain the use of 'Not Applicable' and 'ADR Exempt'.</p> <p>If you have an application where this is not the case and an ADR is not being autopopulated, please contact ROVERinfo@infrastructure.gov.au for assistance.</p> |
| <p>Can a VTA have varying axle numbers (i.e. 2 and 3 axle) under the same approval?</p> | <p>1</p> | <p>Generally, road vehicles would not be considered the same model if they have a different number of axles and would not be considered under the same approval.</p> <p>The only exception to this may be trailers with an aggregate trailer mass (ATM) of 4.5 tonnes or less—low ATM trailers. In this case, a low ATM trailer in a TB vehicle category could have variants with single and dual axles under a single approval.</p> <p>Please see the <i>Guide to vehicle type approvals</i> for more information (https://www.infrastructure.gov.au/departments/media/publications/guide-vehicle-type-approvals).</p> |

| | | |
|--|----------|---|
| <p>How can recent developments in driver security enclosures with high reflective impacts not breach ADR forward field of vision requirements. ADR 42. 10. 1 and also in 93.</p> | <p>0</p> | <p>While the modification of in-service vehicles is regulated by the relevant state or territory government, we are currently working with the states, territories and bus industry to examine how driver protection screens can appropriately interact with Australian Design Rules.</p> |
| <p>Is there a mechanism DIRD/ROVER can support to notify SSM that the FSM type approval has changed or been canceled.</p> | <p>0</p> | <p>No, there is no mechanism in ROVER to notify second stage manufacturers (SSMs) of changes to the vehicle type approval held for the base vehicle. SSMs are required to have processes in place to continually monitor for changes to the base vehicle as part of their quality management system.</p> |
| <p>Adding a new ADR under “extent of compliance” section, you can manually add, but not subtract if it was mistakenly added. The only option then is to delete the application and start again, or fill out the Compliance Information and stating it’s not mandatory at this point. can a feature be applied?</p> | <p>0</p> | <p>An applicant can remove an Australian Design Rule (ADR) revision that has been added under the Additional ADRs section by clicking on the red bin icon on the right-hand side of the page, then clicking the save button.</p> |
| <p>Opt-in expiry applies on the same day (for 25 current VTAs) Will the “60 business days” lead time for approval be strictly applied by Govt? Or will resource planning be applied to achieve actual lead times which are a lot shorter currently, as this will benefit manufacturers workload density</p> | <p>1</p> | <p>On average, the department is processing applications well within the legislated timeframes and we are aware of the volume of opted-in vehicle type approvals that will be expiring in a short period.</p> |