

Questions answered during RVSA Industry Webinar #29 Thursday 29 February 2024	Score	Response
Why are assessors raising RFI's for previously approved evidence that has nothing to do with the current variation application?	11	<p>When an application is submitted to vary a vehicle type approval that was previously granted on the basis of non-compliance in minor and inconsequential respects, an assessor may raise a request for information if they are concerned that the scope of the non-compliance has changed, for example, due to the amendment of an Australian Design Rule. Assessors might also need to review previously approved evidence in case of changes to the scope of the approval.</p> <p>The department is continuously working to improve its processes. If you have an example of a request for information being raised where this is not the case, please provide this to ROVERinfo@infrastructure.gov.au</p>
Approval notification emails still do not have appropriate identification. VTA approval emails do not contain either VTA number or application number, and Variation approval emails only contain VTA number and not application number. Can emails please be changed to contain more information?	6	Consideration will be given to this suggestion for additional functionality to be developed in a future release.
When will the RVSA implementation review start, and what input will industry be able to have in this review?	6	<p>The department will be undertaking an internal review of the RVS legislation in the 2024-25 Financial Year. The intention is to commence the review in the second half of this year, including the release of a discussion paper for industry to provide feedback on.</p> <p>This will be 1 year from the end of the transition period, which follows the timeline set out in the original Regulation Impact Statement for an internal review after 2 years and an external review after 5 years.</p>
ROVER performance is still very poor and seems to change day to day. Some days you are waiting minutes between page loads when completing applications.	10	ROVER performance is a high priority for the department and we are aware there currently are a number of intermittent performance issues. The department is continuously working to improve the system's performance.
When will ROVER be updated to include a CI form for ADR 113/00? New models date: 1 November 2025, we would like to start certifying to this ADR ASAP.	5	The compliance information form for Australian Design Rule 113/00 was live on ROVER as of 29 February 2024.
When a new ADR is introduced, is the VTA holder required to vary the approval (adjust the Extent of Compliance) even if the ADR is not applicable? Eg, do we need to update every VTA for an ICE vehicle to state that ADR 109 (electric safety) and 110 (hydrogen) are not applicable? Or 35/07 for an MC?	5	<p>An existing approval will not generally be suspended if the Australian Design Rule (ADR) is not applicable for that vehicle.</p> <p>Variation applications will automatically populate the applicable ADRs and allow the extent of compliance to be updated to reflect the ADR is exempt. For example, ADR 110/00 is not applicable because it is not a hydrogen vehicle, or in the case of 35/07 full compliance because the vehicle has been tested to ADR 31/...</p>
Can the departments communication strategy be reviewed? Increasingly it is almost impossible to talk with anyone to seek advice or try and settle and issue with an application, but this can often the most efficient way to work for both sides.	10	<p>This issue is related to the applications process. From a regulatory perspective, it is the department's preference to keep all correspondence related to your application contained in the ROVER system i.e. through the Request For Information (RFI) process.</p> <p>The policy and operations teams are continuing to work together to improve the RFI process to ensure they are clear and precise.</p>
With ADR's such as 79/04 you may have some fully compliant evidence and some requiring M&I depending on the variants, but extent of compliance only allows selection of one option meaning that all evidence is flagged as M&I. Can this be modified?	3	Applicants are only able to select one option for the extent of compliance as the intention is for the approval to identify the lowest level of compliance.
Can the dept explain/justify why the implementation dates for ADR 99/00 for all non SFV's, have been brought forward WITHOUT any industry consultation??? Noting: both Euro and US sourced product need to retest - NO LOCAL TESTING AVAILABE	4	An amendment package with a new implementation date has been signed by the Assistant Minister. The new implementation date for ADR 99/00 will apply from 1 September 2027 for all heavy vehicles over 3.5 tonnes.
No consultation or ability to test ADR 99/00 in Australia, short introduction timeframe and does not cover Australian Line marking, also a published ADR (99/01) with reserved alternative standard is a joke. Can certify today to ADR 99/01 which does not include Au line and in future it will?	2	

How is the Depart. issuing RAWs approvals for non-residents and O/S based directors. Recalls/non compliance - who is accountable given that Australian Law doesn't apply. This loophole needs to be closed - as they are circumventing the RVSA and operating unchecked knowing they can't be caught. UNFAIR	2	<p>An overseas company may meet the requirements to be granted a Registered Automotive Workshop (RAW) approval.</p> <p>The concessional RAV entry approval for a vehicle to be modified by a RAW requires the applicant to be the owner of the vehicle. If the vehicle is provided in trade or commerce then the recall obligations would apply to the owner who provided the vehicle.</p> <p>The department has an established mechanism to report concerns about these issues and encourages members of the public and industry to submit a vehicle safety or non-compliance report through ROVER where they see an issue: <a href="https://rover.infrastructure.gov.au">https://rover.infrastructure.gov.au</a></p>
Have the Department secured further funding for additional development of the ROVER system? When it was discussed last year, it was awaiting review.	6	ROVER will soon move in to a "business as usual phase" and will be funded for ongoing maintenance and support. Further ROVER development will be on an as-needed basis. Later this year, the department will consult industry on a new Cost Recovery Implementation Statement, which will set out all ROVER costs for comment.
Why has the department forged ahead with implementing ADR 113/00, ignoring industry feedback that there are currently no facilities in Australia that can test to the ADR for locally completed heavy vehicle bodies?	2	<p>Clause 6.4 of Australian Design Rule 113/00 provides an alternative method for heavy vehicles to demonstrate compliance, where a completed vehicle is substantially similar to a model that complies.</p> <p>The department is continuing to consult with the peak industry bodies on a solution to demonstrate compliance for locally completed models that do not meet this criteria.</p>
When a message is sent, it does not contain any references to the application number making it very hard to find which RFI it relates to. Can the department add application numbers when sending messages through RFIs?	3	When a request for information is created, the notice is generated by the system to alert you and suggest that you check ROVER to see which application it applies to.
Upon filing variations in Applications, we are unable to edit the extent of compliance and enquiries need to be raised to fix the issue. Can the department fix this?	1	<p>The extent of compliance for an approval cannot be changed between standard (fully compliant) and non-standard (substantially compliant - otherwise suitable).</p> <p>Additionally, where an approval has been granted with minor and inconsequential respects to non-compliance, this could be changed to fully compliant but not changed to non-standard (substantially compliant - otherwise suitable).</p>
Previous ADR version testing is not being accepted. Manufacturers told to retest to current ADR, even when the test facility provides a signed statement that the testing is identical. Contravenes Department's advice that onerous testing costs would not be placed on manufacturers where not necessary.	3	Manufacturers are required to provide evidence of testing to Australian Design Rule standards. If the testing design has not changed following an amendment of an Australian Design Rule, we may consider evidence of previous testing on a case-by-case basis.
Questions to rover emails go unanswered or unacceptable lead-time, this is the only avenue for questions and something must be done	2	Our call centre processes a high volume of calls and emails and are able to respond to most enquires quickly. Complex queries are referred to either the policy or technical teams and these will take more time to answer.
2 part question, part 1: VSB1 Rev6 was substantially updated recently in November. However there was no announcement. In particular the brake efficiency has been further defined. see next question...running out of space	3	<p>Vehicle Standards Bulletin 1 (Revision 6) was updated in November 2023 to provide additional guidance to address the high volume of questions we received from industry. These changes are outlined on page 2.</p> <p>The amendment added examples of what a manufacturer may use to confirm their braking system is efficient. It includes the ability for the manufacturer to set their own requirements to identify what is efficient.</p>
Part two VSB1 REV6 Would you please further explain this option further: test results to the requirements determined by the manufacturer, that may be based on other international low ATM trailer braking regulations and/or on-road low ATM trailer braking regulations in Australia.	2	
As a CTA holder, do we need to vary the approval whenever there is a revision to the original UNECE type approval that was used as the basis for the CTA?	1	There is no need to vary the component type approval if the approval granted by the UN ECE is still valid and the number remains unchanged.
Example: VTA-051560 has been under embargo for almost 7 months. Is there a maximum duration an embargo can be in place for? Can we please look at including the embargo date (not the details) in the RVD so clarity on when additional work can be conducted? The embargo date is not critical IP surely	4	The department will consult with industry to determine if vehicle type approval holders are comfortable with including the embargo date in the Road Vehicle Descriptor. We will provide an update when more information is available.

similar to a previous question: Quality applications are what is being asked for, however some of the RFI's have been of very low quality, to the point of asking for things that are plain wrong or not required. Also why are applicants asked almost every time an RFI is raised to withdraw?	3	<p>Withdrawing and resubmitting an application remains an option for the applicant if you are unable to respond to or action a request for information immediately.</p> <p>As part of our work on the request for information process, the department has been reviewing the language around the option to withdraw as the current wording may have been too strong.</p>
Can the department share why there is a in ROVER's operations? Examples include processing times are typically near the legislated timeframe, page loading times are such a headache, poor RFI quality, lack of support (calling the hotline is the only direct assistance but the call centre is helpless)	3	<p>Our call centre is the most effective way to contact the department and we receive very positive feedback about our call centre staff. The call centre staff are not technicians, however, they do ensure the high volume of enquiries we receive are allocated to the appropriate areas.</p> <p>On average, applications are being assessed well within the legislative timeframes and we are hoping to publish the assessment timeframe shortly.</p>
Some TIC members have raised issues with monthly RAV invoices, invoice emails are not being sent/received, however invoices are still appearing in ROVER. Has the process changed, no more email invoices? And once invoice payment has been made, invoices are appearing as "unpaid" in ROVER.	1	<p>The department continues to send monthly invoices and are not aware of any invoices that have failed to send. If you are not receiving invoices, you should check your organisation's contact details, consider adding a secondary billing email address and check that our emails are not being blocked or marked as spam at the receiver's end.</p> <p>Incorrect or missing reference numbers can cause a bank to delay payment and result in the invoice showing as "unpaid" in ROVER. We will follow up with you regarding unpaid invoices before any action to suspend is taken.</p> <p>If you are experiencing an issue, please reach out for assistance to <a href="mailto:ROVERinfo@infrastructure.gov.au">ROVERinfo@infrastructure.gov.au</a></p>
Have the employees of the government had their work affected in a negative way due to the lack of performance of ROVER - it is clear that so many people/businesses in the industry are being affected by the this. It almost feels like the department is so out of touch with the reality of the situation	11	<p>On average, the department is processing applications well within the legislative timeframes. However, if a department wide-platform experiences a significant issue, this will affect our work.</p> <p>To better understand your experiences, the department runs regular webinars and engage with members of industry as much as possible. If you are experiencing an issue with ROVER, please provide specific examples to <a href="mailto:ROVERinfo@infrastructure.gov.au">ROVERinfo@infrastructure.gov.au</a> - providing specific examples of your issue will allow us to investigate the matter more effectively than when we receive anecdotal evidence.</p>
We recently received an RFI to change the "ADR exempt" for something that has not been fitted to "not applicable", when the guide to VTA's clearly states to use "ADR exempt" to be used for components that are not fitted. Reference: Guide to VTAs: Identifying ADRs as Not Applicable or Exempt page12	4	<p>Where an Australian Design Rule is not relevant for your vehicle: <b>Not applicable</b> should be used where the ADR is not yet applicable to all vehicles or does not come into effect until a future date.</p> <p><b>ADR exemption</b> should be used where the ADR relates to a component that is not fitted to the vehicle.</p> <p>The department is continuously working to improve processes. If you have an example of a request for information being raised where this is not the case, please provide this to <a href="mailto:ROVERinfo@infrastructure.gov.au">ROVERinfo@infrastructure.gov.au</a></p>
Graham you mentioned you wont spring it on us (industry), yet new published ADRs, updated ADRs and implementation dates, new RAV webpage and link, new links for published ADRs, there is a distinct lack of communication to industry of changes in every direction	8	<p>The department endeavours to communicate all important messages and changes as far in advance as possible. These are sent directly to peak industry bodies as well as those affected by any changes.</p> <p>Information is also provided to industry more broadly through RVS News Updates and RVSA Industry Webinars.</p> <p>You can subscribe or manage your preferences to be notified when we provide information to industry through RVS News Updates at: <a href="http://www.infrastructure.gov.au/RVS-subscribe">www.infrastructure.gov.au/RVS-subscribe</a></p>
When filing an import approval, does the month need to be accurate? Even if SEVS is met?	4	<p>Yes. The month and year of the build date you provide when submitting an application for an import approval must be accurate. For specialist and enthusiast vehicles, this is used to ensure the vehicle meets the eligibility criteria for entry on the SEVs Register.</p> <p>Even where the month is not relevant to eligibility - e.g. where the vehicle is new and the SEVs Register entry has no build range end-date - the build month is required by the approved application form and it is a contravention of the RVSA to provide false or misleading information.</p>

Are test reports from Designated Technical Service (DTS), regarded as a competent authority for the purposes of the 1958 Agreement and therefore test reports issued by a DTS are valid CI without the CI having a TFA?	3	<p>Section 19(2)(b) of the Rules allows an approval or other document:</p> <p>(i) issued by the government of a foreign country that is a contracting party to the 1958 Agreement, or by a person who is a competent authority of such a government for the purposes of that agreement; and</p> <p>(ii) that indicates that the type of vehicle complies with requirements applying under that agreement that are equivalent to the applicable national road vehicle standards as in force at the time the Secretary decides the application.</p> <p>Page 22 of the text of the 1958 Agreement, page 22 (3rd reference if you search the word "competent") includes the definition - "Competent authority" means either the approval or designated authority, or an appropriate accreditation body acting on their behalf respectively. The competent authority is responsible for assessing the skills of the technical services under that agreement.</p> <p>A 'competent authority' mentioned in the RVS Rules includes the 'designated type approval authority', but does not include the 'designated technical service' identified at <a href="https://unece.org/sites/default/files/2024-03/ECE-TRANS-WP.29-343-Rev.32-Add.1e..pdf">https://unece.org/sites/default/files/2024-03/ECE-TRANS-WP.29-343-Rev.32-Add.1e..pdf</a></p>
Build date is on the Export Certificate/registration documents and the VIN decodes to a Build date - another example of an attempt to circumvent the SEVS rules and the CRE process	3	The VIN code includes only the build year, not the build date. Additionally, registration documents show the first registration date rather than the build date.
Is it necessary for there to be as many pageloads during an application as there currently are? For example: ticking the 'No' box for 'Contravention of road vehicle legislation' takes two pageloads, which can at times take minutes, for something that takes a second to click. Feels very inefficient.	1	The department is that aware the number of page loads when submitting an application in ROVER is frustrating for industry. We are looking into this issue to see what improvements can be made.
Has there been any further development in implanting the RVCS system into ROVER so that past approvals/compliance forms can continue to be accessed? The 'Participants Log On' side of RVCS has been inaccessible for around 12 months now.	2	<p>There are no plans to bring the RVCS site into ROVER as it is a legacy system.</p> <p>The department is aware of the ongoing issues with the RVCS site. We have recently resolved one of the concerns and continue to work on a resolution for the remaining issues.</p>
Under ADR 38/05 - Does the booster/actuator brand matter anymore e.g. TSE, BPW, K Hitch etc. Thanks	0	Brake componentry make and model is important for traceability of testing. It is generally included in the brake calculation report but is not captured in compliance information forms.
ADR 99 says that vehicle is not required to comply with the standard if "designed for off-road" use, following three criteria (A, B and C). The car in question is designed for on-road and off-road use...	0	A vehicle is not required to comply with Australian Design Rule 99 if it is 'designed for off-road use', according to the applicable definition in Appendix B of the ADR.
Does trailer brake efficiency test have to be performed by an approved testing facility, or is it a manufacturer statement? In relation to option 3 of VSB1 "test results to the requirements determined by the manufacturer, that may be based on other international low ATM trailer braking regulations.	1	<p>If you are using test results as evidence of compliance with an Australian Design Rule, testing must be completed by a testing facility approval holder under the Road Vehicle Standards legislation.</p> <p>If you are complying with the Australian Design Rules through other methods, an approved testing facility is not required.</p> <p>The Vehicle Standards Bulletin provides guidance on efficient braking systems.</p>
Hi There can you please advise when the next Rover update will be	0	We will provide industry with as much notice as possible for the next ROVER release and hope to provide advice soon.
There are many poor standard RFI's still being raised. We are constantly told by Umesh that applications need to be of good quality to speed up assessment, and yet the quality of RFI's is not improving! Also, requests for test reports on day 40+ of assessment is very frustrating!	11	<p>We are continuously working to improve our request for information processes.</p> <p>If you have an example of a poor quality RFI being raised, please email <a href="mailto:ROVERinfo@infrastructure.gov.au">ROVERinfo@infrastructure.gov.au</a></p>
Poor RFIs are a theme of the ROVER system. Why is the Department (Assessors) raising RFIs that are a standard type of RFI (copy and paste). ?	4	
Front axle can be disengaged (A), rear differential is equipped w/ Power Lock (B) and it can climb a 67% slope. Can I consider the car not having to comply with ADR 99?	0	A vehicle is not required to comply with Australian Design Rule 99 if it is 'designed for off-road use', according to the applicable definition in Appendix B of ADR 99.