

Questions asked during RVSA Industry webinar #38 on 26 June 2025	Score	Response
When was GVM on RAV made optional for NB1?	0	Gross vehicle mass (GVM) has been optional for light vehicles since the Road Vehicle Standards (Information on the Register of Approved Vehicles) Determination 2021 was amended in September 2024. This amendment removed the GVM requirement for light passenger and commercial vehicles.
So for NVES even models not covered need to use new template, but leave the additional fields blank, is that correct	0	Yes. From 1 July 2025, all submissions to the Register of Approved Vehicles must include fields for both motive power and for the New Vehicle Efficiency Standard (NVES) data. Providing data for motive power is currently optional and will become mandatory from 1 July 2026, noting it is not applicable to trailers. If you are not providing data for motive power or NVES fields they should be left blank.
We have an instance we a SSM VTA has been approved from an external company based on our SSM VTA. It was my understanding an SSM can only be based on FSM. Please clarify	0	It is possible to have a third-stage of manufacture on a vehicle, however, the third-stage vehicle type approval would need to reference the second-stage approval.
Feedback on Approval Renewal – While the process was overall positive, it required manual intervention from the tech support team to ensure that the number was carried over. This is not practical once the volume of these type of application increases.	1	We appreciate your feedback and will continue to work through this process to identify possible improvements.
Is there a way we can correct the RAV entry pathway on your end?	0	<p>When you submit vehicles to the Register of Approved Vehicles (RAV), the RAV entry pathway field is now validated against the vehicle type approval's level of compliance.</p> <p>A vehicle type approval cannot cover both 'standard' and 'non-standard' vehicles because they are considered different models. If your RAV submission is failing for this reason, you may need to vary your approval to demonstrate that the vehicle is standard—and fully complies or has minor and inconsequential non-compliance to applicable Australian Design Rules—or non-standard. If you have both standard and non-standard vehicles, you will need to apply for a new vehicle type approval to cover the second model.</p> <p>Additionally, if historic RAV entries have incorrect RAV entry pathway, you will need to submit a request to correct an error on the RAV. For more information, read the <i>Guidance note—Amending entries on the Register of Approved Vehicles</i> (www.infrastructure.gov.au/departments/media/publications/guidance-note-amending-entries-register-approved-vehicles)</p>
Is it possible to expand the search function for Test facility to search by name	1	<p>We will take this suggestion into consideration as a future ROVER enhancement.</p> <p>Currently, you can filter the List of approved Testing Facilities by Australian Design Rule (ADR) and State. However, you can also sort the list by name (alphabetically or reverse alphabetically), which may help you locate the testing facility you are looking for.</p>
With the requirement to re-certify all opted-in VTAs next year, is there any plan for a near-term update to ROVER to improve the RVD logic and support more efficient data entry? These RVD-related enhancements have previously been raised with the Department via the FCAI.	3	While we always welcome feedback from industry, there are no changes to the Road Vehicle Descriptors (RVD) logic being planned at this time. We most recently introduced changes to the RVD in November 2024 as part of ROVER Release 9.2 to address industry feedback on how to improve accessibility of entries, which included changes raised by the Federal Chamber of Automotive Industries on behalf of its members. For further information, visit the ROVER Release 9.2 webpage (www.infrastructure.gov.au/infrastructure-transport-vehicles/vehicles/vehicle-portals/rover-releases/rover-release-92)
When will the revised guidance for re-certification of opted-in VTAs be released?	1	The updated <i>Reapplying for an expiring or expired approval</i> guide was published on our website on 18 June 2025. (https://www.infrastructure.gov.au/departments/media/publications/reapplying-expiring-or-expired-approval)
If an expiring Opt-In doesn't want to retain its existing VTA No# is that still considered an existing model?	0	As outlined in the <i>Reapplying for an expiring or expired approval</i> guide, if the application is for exactly the same model, the vehicle will be treated as an existing model for Australian Design Rule applicability. You will still need to add in the Comments and any other matters field of the application that the vehicle is the same as the previous approval but note that you do not want to keep the previous approval number.
Will the department relax ADR42/05 lighting connector requirements for new-model VTAs? Rolling over opted-in VTAs will prolong the industries pain in having double standards.	0	<p>No, we are not planning on relaxing the electrical connector requirements set by Australian Design Rule (ADR) 42/05 - General Safety Requirements in clauses 21.2 to 21.5.</p> <p>Trailer lighting and light signalling devices are important safety components for vehicle towing and limiting the variation in electrical connector configurations under ADR requirements is necessary to improve compatibility amongst the vehicle fleet in Australia. This is why ADR 42/05 clearly outlines designated standards for lighting electric connectors to align with.</p> <p>However, we will consult with industry when a new standard in this ADR series has been developed. Our intention is for the new ADR to specify a common electrical connector to ensure compatibility for new vehicles, while also allowing for additional electrical connectors meeting minimum performance requirements to be fitted on heavy vehicles where the manufacturer or operator wants flexibility and/or integration of auxiliary power.</p>
safety chains are based on ATM , category is based on GTM, a lot of the registering authorities get them mixed up	0	We will discuss this with the jurisdictions at our next webinar.