

Geoffrey Taylor

1 Aug 2019

What risks to safe vehicles that are currently out of scope for the HVNL should be brought into scope? What is in scope that shouldn't be?

I refer to long vehicles with flatbed trailers, one or two.

Speaking as a car driver alongside one of these, they need portable highly visible stalks carrying lights along the sides and at the rear above the level of the trailer decks. They also need signs on each side of each component vehicle of the train indicating number of component vehicles and the length.

The rear posts mentioned also provide additional messaging for a following driver.

Have we covered the issues relating to safe vehicles accurately and comprehensively? If not, what do we need to know?

How can the future HVNL most effectively deliver safer vehicles to the road? Which aspects of the PBS scheme are working well, and which aren't? What barriers to the broad uptake of safer vehicles exist?

How can the future HVNL encourage suitable maintenance programs? How can it most effectively identify and remove dangerous vehicles from the road?

How can the future HVNL meet the assurance needs of all Australian state and territory road transport authorities in a way that does not unreasonably impose on operators?

Do we need assurances regarding repairs and replacement parts? If so, could these be achieved using standards? Should third-party repairers be explicitly included in the Chain of Responsibility? How can defect clearance processes be reasonably expedited?

Should the future HVNL apply a risk-to-safety threshold for vehicle standards and loading matters?