

Questions Answered During Webinar		
Question	Votes	Response
Time delay in navigating between VTA screens In Webinar 7 it was stated that ROVER Release 7 will include upgrades to reduce navigation time issues between screens. What is the current status of investigations into these issues and what response times can be expected in future?	7	The department has invested heavily in performance improvements and deployed an upgrade package in early April. Following this upgrade there has been an overall 50% improvement in page load times, with some Compliance Information forms loading upwards of 70-90% faster than previously measured. Release 7 will include further improvements that will focus extensively on VTA applications to further improve performance and the user experience.
Industry Wide M&I - is possible for guidance material to be developed for commonly used Industry M&I's and allowances previously made under Admin Circulars, that detail the exact process to be used for CI and CDM? This will make assessment easier as user can reference predefined M&I. e.g. ADR 30/01	5	There are no provisions in the RVS legislation that allows for the department to bind any future decision maker. We are considering options to address industry's request.
What is the current status of the ADR administrator circulars..... What is the timeline for resolution on these?	0	Administrator's Circulars conveyed MVSA policy information and guidance and have no standing under the RVS legislation. MVSA Administrator's Circulars, with the exception of Australian Design Rule (ADR) Specific Circulars, were replaced by RVSA guidance material. The 'Transition to Road Vehicle Standards Act 2018 Guidance Materials' document (available on the department's website) outlines how content from Administrator's Circulars and other MVSA guidance material transitioned to RVSA guidance material.
For urgent cases, where vehicles are caught up waiting for a VTA to be approved (e.g. completed buses that urgently need to go into service), is there a mechanism available to have these approvals expedited? If so, how can this be done?	6	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. The guidance note 'Requesting priority assessment of an RVS application' is available on the 'Guides and resources' page on the department's website. It outlines in what circumstances requests for priority assessment might be considered.
The time being taken to reconcile RAV invoices is a MAJOR issue. Urgent action is required to either implement the solutions promised at ROVER Release7 to self manage this problem or to fix it properly. It's unthinkable that Government expect account payment in the absence of supporting information	6	Departmental invoices for RAV submissions contain the details of each RAV entry batch included on the invoice. Pre-approved RAV submitters can reconcile invoices against their RAV batch entries. The department is aware of a system issue that resulted in the department not invoicing for some vehicles contained in large RAV batches. The underlying cause has been identified and remediated, and those vehicles not previously included on invoices will be invoiced in arrears. In addition, the department has scheduled further ROVER development work to refine the monthly invoices following industry feedback.

<p>Does the government have any data showing application approval times based on application type (i.e.. VTA for light vehicles)? Understand legislative timeframe for making a decision, but actual performance would enable industry to understand actual vs. worst case (60 days).</p>	<p>5</p>	<p>Since 1 July 2021, the average processing times for all application types in ROVER has been 16 days.</p>
<p>Where a VTA variation Application has been made in ROVER and the '60 business' days' have lapsed, with no approval or RFI being raised for that application, what is the process to be followed to expedite the Approval for that application?.</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>Average processing time for applications is well within 60 business days. If you believe an application has not been processed within the legislated timeframe, please contact us via the 'Contact the department' button on the 'Application' page in ROVER, or complete the enquiry form on the department's website.</p>
<p>For Low ATM Trailers, when will the Model Name change over in RAV happen (e.g.. from TB to the actual model name)? How will the approval holders be notified for the change over? When will the Department release a guidance material for this?</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>This is currently in the test environment. Once adequate testing has been conducted, it will form part of a future ROVER Release. ROVER account holders and relevant peak bodies will be notified of the ROVER update. Anyone with incorrect low ATM trailer model names on the RAV will be given an opportunity to do a RAV correction.</p>
<p>A CTA update for say braking system on a bus chassis takes 60 days, and then an update on the VTA is another 60 days, this has a potential 120 business days for approval of a ECE certified brake certificate, what options are available here</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>CTA applications commenced in ROVER in mid/late 2020 to provide an opportunity for the industry to obtain CTA approvals before the VTA applications commenced in July 2021. ADR compliance can be demonstrated through a range of options, including referring to CTAs or VTAs, providing test results, etc. If the applicant holds test results from an approved testing facility then they could complete the test results option in the VTA application to demonstrate compliance against the ADR rather than waiting for a CTA application to be approved.</p>
<p>UN ECE Approval Nos When will the UN ECE Approval No issues identified in Webinar 7 be rectified using the “input approval details manually” function for a UN ECE Approval No?</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>The current CI form allows applicants to enter any format manually (and the relevant UN ECE document must be uploaded as well). Following a further review, and given this current functionality, no changes are planned. Supporting all possible formats is complex and would be difficult to implement.</p>
<p>UN ECE Approval Nos When will the Compliance Information templates be updated to reflect the current UN ECE legislative requirement (since 2017) instead of the old format?</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>See above.</p>

<p>Can the Department please give average processing times for each VCC Category VTA applications? I.e. TD, TC etc.</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>See response above regarding average processing times.</p>
<p>During RAV trials, the RAV Exception Report showed that the Vehicle Type Approval (VTA) number is invalid (following the accepted format). How can this issue be resolved?</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>The Test RAV is a different environment to the production RAV. If you are using Test RAV you will need to use a test approval that is available in Test ROVER with the corresponding make and model. In the production RAV, sometimes users get a response that the VTA number is invalid. This occurs when you do not include the exact approval number, for example, missing the hyphen or the leading zeros.</p>
<p>Is the department investigating ways to improve the response times to industry enquires? - e.g.. have a process so that any enquiry is first screened asses whether it's a simple or complex. Simple enquires should be processed quickly.</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>The department monitors response times and has implemented a range of measures over time that have significantly improved enquiry response times. Emails are responded to within 48 hours (excluding 4 day weeks, when there may be a backlog of emails) and we are currently answering an average of 87% of calls during business hours (9am to 5pm). Callers who are unable to get through are able to leave a voicemail message.</p>
<p>UN ECE Approval Provision of Part Nos When using a UN ECE Approval as evidence of compliance why are lighting component Part Nos necessary in a CI template as the Approval No already contains all required detail for audit/traceability. Approval Ext Nos are not reqd in ROVER so why Part No details?</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>The component part number is currently set up as a required field. The removal of this requirement has been added to our backlog and will be considered for prioritisation. The earliest this could be implemented would be in ROVER Release 8, a deployment date for which has not yet been determined.</p>
<p>In lieu of functionality to submit consecutive variations against a single Approval at one time Despite the Industries' multiple requests, could ROVER be modified to allow for a 'cue' of variation that would be processed once the outstanding variation is approved?</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>ROVER Release 7 will include the ability to withdraw, amend and resubmit an application. This means that if you have submitted an application that has not been assessed, you can withdraw the application, add variations, and resubmit it for assessment. Please note that when you withdraw and resubmit an application, the application goes to the back of the assessment queue and the assessment clock is reset.</p>

<p>Some customers want different rims and tyres to our normal offering. How do we manage this when the submission states our standard tyre and rim details?</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>The department recently published a guidance note on 'When a road vehicle on the RAV is considered to be provided to consumers for the first time' (available on the 'Guides and resources' page of the department's website). It outlines when we would consider a vehicle to be provided for the purpose of doing small modifications that may affect your approval. For example, if your vehicle is on the RAV and there is a contract for sale, then we accept it as being provided for the purpose of making those modifications. If you are looking to change the tyres and wheels to put it on the showroom floor and it has not been sold to a customer, then the vehicle must be done in accordance with the instructions of the approval holder, without abstracting the ADR. States and territories regulate vehicles that have been modified after they have been provided to a consumer.</p>
<p>For the cost recovery of Concessional RAV Entry applications for SPVs, how was the cost value calculated given most SPVs did not need to be assessed against Vehicle Standards under the MVSA? The value is excessively high, especially since it is for single vehicle applications.</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>The department worked with a dedicated cost recovery expert to calculate application costs using information available at the time. This occurred prior to commencement of the legislation. The Cost Recovery Implementation Statement (CRIS) is available on the department's website and provides information on how the department undertakes cost recovery arrangements for administrative and regulatory activities under the RVSA and related legislation. The CRIS will be reviewed after full implementation of the RVS legislation i.e.. once the transition period has ended and there is sufficient data when operating solely under the RVS legislation to be able to conduct a meaningful review.</p>
<p>I'm curious why some models which were previously on the SEVs list are now no longer able to be added to the new list. an example is the Nissan leaf AZEO 2014-2016.</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>The Nissan Leaf AZEO was added to the MVSA SEVs Register for the date ranges 6/2013 to 9/2017. The Nissan Leaf AZEO is currently on the RVSA SEVs Register (approval number SEV 000178) under a different date range due to Nissan Australia supplying this vehicle type to the Australian market from 6/2011 to 6/2016. The new date range on the RVSA SEVs Register is 6/2016 to 9/2017.</p>