

Issues Paper: 2017 Drafting of National B-double Notice

Please fill out this form to provide your organisations feedback on the draft policy positions outlined in our issues paper.

If your organisation supports or does not support our policy positions with changes, we would appreciate a brief summary of the requested changes.

Completed feedback forms should be submitted by email to info@nhvr.gov.au by **COB 29/09/17**

Have your say

Your details

Name:		Organisation:	ATA ALRTA
Location:		Position*:	
Phone number:		Email address:	

*For an organisation, the person nominated must be the relevant officer who can provide any additional information, if required.

Submission

Section from Issues Paper	NHVR Policy Position	Stakeholder's Position	
Example 6. Balance Clear Space Rule	Example 6.3	Supported without changes	
3. General Access	3.3	Supported without changes	
4. General Access Mass Limits	4.3	Supported without changes	
5. General Access Axle Spacing	5.3	Supported without changes	
6. Balanced Clear Space Rule	6.3	Not supported	<p>The XY rule should be removed for the tri-tri B-double combination.</p> <p>The rule only applies to tri-tri B-doubles and the proposed exemption for "light" B-doubles is meaningless as the combination will operate up on its weights or not be economically viable.</p> <p>The X-Y rule has been relaxed previously due to its negative impact on vehicles specification.</p> <p>The current range of bridge formula rules should be used for vehicle design along with an overarching design criteria for module combinations.</p>
7. B-double Networks	7.3.1	Supported without changes	
7. B-double Networks	7.3.2	Supported without changes	
7. B-double Networks	7.3.3	Supported without changes	
8. Reversing Manoeuvre	8.3	Supported without changes	<p>NOTE: While ATA & ALRTA are generally supportive of removing superfluous notice conditions that do not have a legislative basis in the HVNL, it remains imperative that a nationally harmonised approach is taken on such issues.</p> <p>In some cases (e.g. where national ADRs are applicable) it is quite reasonable to rely on external instruments to ensure national consistency. However, in cases where national instruments do not exist, NHVR must ensure that an alternative process is instigated to ensure a nationally consistent outcome will be achieved. Under no circumstances should such matters simply be left to the discretion of individual states.</p>
9. Maintenance Management Accreditation	9.3	Supported without changes	See 8.3
10. Inspection Label	10.3	Supported without changes	See 8.3
11. Total Number of Axles	11.3	Supported without changes	

Section from Issues Paper	NHVR Policy Position	Stakeholder's Position	
12. Warning Signs	12.3	Supported without changes	
13. Inter-Axle Differentials	13.3	Supported without changes	
14. Assembly/Disassembly of Vehicles and Roadside Parking	14.3	Supported without changes	See 8.3
15. Emissions	15.3	Supported without changes	See 8.3
16. Front Protrusions	16.3	Supported with changes	<p>ADR 84/00 front underrun impact protection became mandatory from 1 January 2012. From this date, no additional plating or labelling should be required for the device, unless the FUPD was fitted or modified in the after-market.</p> <p>We propose that both the ACT and Tasmanian requirements be removed for trucks ADR plated 2012 or later.</p> <p>We support further work currently being taken by NHVR regarding VSB6 and H6/7 requirements with it necessary to provide some form of clarity and exemption for "small" or non-structural forward protrusions.</p>