

## Questions Answered During Webinar

### Question

There have been instances where VIN's that have been successfully transferred to the RAV are not found when searching the public site. Is the cause of this problem known and countermeasures identified? Is it possible to confirm a batch of VIN's is searchable other than a one by one manual check?

What is the realistic expectation for new VTA assessment timing? 60 days was always communicated as a 'legislative timeframe' and that the 32 charter was something that industry could continue to use for planning purposes.

Authority to Act verification is taking over two weeks in some cases. Is there available resources to speed this up, as it is slowing down the Opt-In process?

At Webinar #1, department advised guidance material is being prioritised regarding the departments position on "Provide to a consumer for the first time in Australia". Is there any update or timeline for issuance of the guidance material?

From previous discussion it was understood that common issues were being raised by industry and department either has workarounds or is working to rectify the issues. Does the department have an issues tracking log that can be shared?

### Votes Response

11 The department has escalated this issue as a priority for action and in the meantime a manual checking process has been implemented to ensure transfers happen reliably. For information: To confirm whether a batch of vehicles appears on the public search, it is only necessary to check one vehicle from the relevant batch.

6 The department is working to assess all RVSA applications within the legislated timeframes. The legislated timeframe for VTA approvals is 60 business days. There is an expected increase in assessment efficiency, as well as the development of "back-end" ROVER features, which will decrease assessment timeframes over time. As additional ROVER features are expected to be in place by the end of March 2022, consideration of establishing shorter assessment timeframes would be best conducted as part of the intended RVSA policy review following the transitional year (i.e. after 30 June 2022). This also takes into consideration that the department will only be assessing RVSA applications at this time and we will no longer be working on MVSA applications made under the transitional rules.

8 The department allocated additional resources to clear the backlog of authority to act verifications. ROVER Release 6 enhancements now allow organisations to manage their own authorities to act.

5 Responded to previously, see <https://www.infrastructure.gov.au/sites/default/files/documents/qas-rvsa-industry-webinar-15-september-2021-answered-during-webinar.pdf>

5 The department does log and track all issues but for commercial confidentiality and regulatory risk assessment reasons it would not be appropriate for it to share its internal working documents. The department will, however, provide greater clarity on future ROVER enhancements so that industry can prepare for upcoming improved functionality.

Companies are hesitating on Opt-In dates because of the delays they are experiencing with shipping due to the covid situation. They are not prepared to lock in a nominated date because a shipment on it's way that was manufactured to MVSA requirements may arrive after the nominated date.

The Department has provided guidance for ROVER applications when using UN-ECE R48 approvals for Lighting ADRs, however how will ROVER/the Department treat/handle UN-ECE approvals for other "systems", for example seats and seat belts?

Has there been any further consideration of more immediate communication of ROVER issues to industry?

Is there a way to have common evidence for a Manufacture to be held at an organization level, not at an application level? Example - QMS documentation. RFIs are being raised on evidence that has previously been accepted.

As a light trailer manufacturer fabricating own drawbar, i have my safety chain attachment points tested (ADR 62) from an MVSA facility years ago, but not operating anymore. Is the report still an acceptable evidence, noting that the drawbar design is the same? Or do I need to get it tested again?

Further to Webinar # 3 discussions; are you able to provide an update of the Department review status for retaining chassis SARN data sheets and chassis SARN plates. In webinar # 3 The Dept indicated that SARN data sheets and SARN plates would not continue in ROVER

6 When opting-in the initial VTA approval is identical to the IPA approval, so if a vehicle arrives after the opt-in approval commences the vehicle can be added to the RAV. An issue may arise, however, where a new ADR came into effect between manufacturing the vehicle and the opt-in and the vehicle does not comply with the ADR. Organisations should carefully plan their operations to avoid that situation. In response to industry feedback, the department is updating guidance on adding vehicles to the RAV to include guidance on vehicles already fitted with a plate - this is expected to be published by 15 October.

4 The department accepts both whole vehicle and limited type approvals, so either can be submitted through ROVER. Regarding combined ECE regulations and obtaining approvals that cover individual ECE approvals, the department is looking for traceability. It is acceptable to provide this via email. If individual components can be traced back to a systems approval then there is no need to submit individual approvals. This is a similar approach to lighting.

4 Yes, the department has sent ROVER Alert emails to stakeholders for more urgent updates and has developed functionality to provide warnings and updates on the front page of ROVER.

3 If you have previously provided QMS documentation, you can include this advice in the comments section when submitting an application, this should reduce the likelihood of an RFI being raised. ROVER Release 6 includes additional functionality – better traceability, different risk approaches and triggers to request information, this functionality will make it easier for assessors to see QMS documentation has previously been submitted (as well as whether it has passed an expiry date).

3 The concession to accept older evidence from facilities that don't exist any more only extends to components that are part of an opted-in approval (from IPA to VTA). As low ATM trailer manufacturers were not previously required to hold an IPA the report cannot be accepted and further evidence will be required.

3 Manufacturers can upload data sheets for some components in ROVER (the same set of components they could upload data sheets for under MVSA). Manufacturers can choose whether they want to make this information public, it is not mandatory. The department is examining feedback provided on this issue at previous Webinars.

Are you aware that the CTA list on the ROVER website currently "times out" and is effectively inaccessible. This has been raised previously with the ROVERinfo help email.

2 See response below.

Form Webinar #3, the Department advised to consider if enhanced search function for CTA and TF in the future. As the lists are increasing, isn't it logical to have an enhanced search function (eg. ADR and site location search) implemented soon?

2 ROVER Release 6 includes an enhancement to the CTA and VTA list function that greatly reduces the search time. The department is also looking at further enhancing the search functionality in future releases.

According to UNECE -----Access to DETA is currently limited to Contracting Parties (CP) The Contracting Parties of the 1958 Agreement can --- manage the access and users accounts of the said Contracting Party. -- Is the Department setting up an focal point which components are oin the Deta Database

1 This has been provided as an option to make it easier for applicants where information is on DETA. If applicants have access to this information they can use it in their applications. It is not the department's intention to share what information is available on DETA.

It appears as though nearly all approved Concessional RAV Entry applications do not have the approval documents uploaded. I am aware that this is a bug and needs to be manually processed by the Department. Have you done testing to ensure that this does not occur with the next Rover release?

1 Significant testing has been undertaken to ensure this is resolved in as part of ROVER Release 6.

When in October is the next release due please?

0 Advice about the necessary ROVER outage to implement Release 6, which went live on 11 October, was provided in RVS News Update edition 9 (distributed on 30 September).

A CTA or VTA application cannot be changed, revised, added to once it has been submitted, and before approval. Why is this the case? RVCS allowed ongoing revisions before an approval was granted.

1 Applicants will have the ability to withdraw, correct and resubmit applications from Release 7.0.

Just so that this question is documented How will the new UN Approvals for Lighting be handled in ROVER? What approvals will need to be uploaded? EG UN 148, 149, 150

0 R148, R149 and R150 supersede the current allowed alternative standards R48 and R53 for lighting. Applicants can comply with R148, R149 and R150 for a VTA, but will need to seek a minor and inconsequential (M&I) request and provide an extract summary of the UN approval document through the ROVER VTA application process.

Is there a RAV invoice cut off for the vehicle when the VIN is uploaded in the last day of the month. Let say a VIN upload into RAV @ 18:30 on 30th Sept. How is the invoice will capture for this VIN, Sept invoice or Oct invoice.

0

The invoicing function for pre-approved RAV submissions continues to be refined, but the expected functionality is that the invoice will be generated on the first of the month and will incorporate all RAV entries from the previous calendar month.