# NATIONAL HEAVY VEHICLE ACCREDITATION SCHEME (NHVAS)

# Mass Management Audit Matrix

## Name of NHVAS Operator:

## Name of Auditor: Where was the audit conducted:

## Audit Date: Accreditation Number:

## Audit Matrix ID Name/ No. :

## NHVAS Manual Version Number and Date of Issue:

# Introduction

## Using the Matrix

The Audit Matrix is designed to provide auditors with a clearer understanding of the systems expected of heavy vehicle operators to meet each of the Standards in the Mass Management module. It outlines the scope of each criterion in the Standards and explains the intent behind each. It also provides examples of the type of evidence that auditors may examine to indicate that the operator has the required system in place.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Explanation of Terms in Audit Matrix | |
| **Scope** | A description of the intent behind the criterion, to provide further direction to assist with interpretation of the criterion |
| **Possible Evidence** | Examples of possible sources of evidence that may indicate conformance with the criterion |
| **Notes** | Further assistance to guide auditors in the interpretation of the criterion and the evidence to be sought |

This list of evidence is not exhaustive. Operators do not need to have everything on the list in place and may have other means by which the Criterion can be addressed.

The Matrix also provides space for the Auditor to explain:

* How the operator does (or does not) meet each criterion,
* The evidence sighted by the auditor to support that conclusion, and
* The audit Result of the audit for that criterion, using the following compliance codes:

*NAP:* Not Applicable

*NA:* Not Assessed at this Audit

*V:* Conformance Verified

*NC:* Non-conformance

*SFI:* Suggestion for Improvement

When conducting an audit on an organisation of substantial size the auditor should consider using an audit team.

# Standard 1: Responsibilities

| Criteria 1.1 | The appropriateness of each person’s position, qualifications or training for the responsibilities allocated to him or her. | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Scope** | Responsibility for the operation of the Mass Management System rests with appropriate people within the road transport operation, as nominated by the operator. The authorities, responsibilities and duties of all positions involved in the management, operation, administration, participation and verification of the Mass Management System are current, clearly defined and documented and carried out accordingly. | **How Does Operator’s System Meet /Not Meet the Criterion – Auditor to complete.** |
| **Possible Evidence** | * Position descriptions * Duty statements * Role descriptions * Organisational chart showing company structure   The aim is to establish how management ensures that the mass management system procedures as documented are being complied with in practice. For a small operation, management will have a hands-on role, which enables them to be satisfied that procedures are being followed. In larger organisations, particularly those which span multiple locations, management will require specific mechanisms to ensure that the authorised procedures are being followed correctly and consistently at all locations. | **Evidence Sighted By Auditor:** |
| **Notes** | This section may not be highly detailed for a small operator where all roles are performed by the accreditation holder and a formal management structure specifically for Mass Management is not appropriate. However, for a larger organisation, particularly one spanning locations, a formal structure may be appropriate to define roles and responsibilities in respect of mass management of persons at both head office and at individual locations. The auditor should consider the level of detail to which documented procedures should be prepared in order to clearly convey how tasks should be performed in order to avoid misinterpretation or misunderstanding.  The level of detail provided for each task should be appropriate for the complexity of the task being described. As well as reflecting the complexity of the task, the detail necessary should also consider the training and experience of the person performing the task. | **Audit Result (Code):** |

| Business Rule | There is a documented procedure for Notifiable Occurrences to be reported. | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Scope** | A documented procedure for providing notification of a notifiable occurrence is included in the management system. The procedure is to identify who is responsible and instruction that the NHVR Portal is used to submit the report along with the required timeframes for submitting a report. | **How Does Operator’s System Meet /Not Meet the Criterion – Auditor to complete.** |
| **Possible Evidence** |  | **Evidence Sighted By Auditor:** |
| **Notes** |  | **Audit Result (Code):** |

# Standard 2: Vehicle control

| Criterion 2.1 | A documented procedure to record details of each vehicle nominated in the module. | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Scope** | What is the method and procedure for recording the details of all nominated vehicles?  The procedure must able to record the vehicle make, type of unit, date of construction, GVM, registration number and unique identifier.  The auditor should determine is the method reliable suitable and auditable.  Documentation exists, which specify how and who maintains the register so as to ensure that it remains up-to-date. | **How Does Operator’s System Meet /Not Meet the Criterion – Auditor to complete.** |
| **Possible Evidence** |  | **Evidence Sighted By Auditor:** |
| **Notes** | There is no restriction on the method used to record the vehicle details as long as the method can be relied upon, retained, retrieved, maintained and is auditable. | **Audit Result (Code):** |

| Criterion 2.2 | A register of nominated vehicles is kept and regularly updated. | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Scope** | The register of nominated vehicles must at a minimum include:   1. the name of the owner of the vehicle (identified as subcontracted if applicable) 2. registration number 3. state of registration 4. manufacturer 5. VIN unique identifier 6. type of unit (For example, prime mover, trailer, dolly, rigid truck) 7. date of construction/manufacture (year is enough) 8. vehicle tare weight 9. Road Friendly Suspension Certification Number (If applicable) 10. manufacturer's (technical) specifications of GVM and GCM or ATM   Note: Prime movers have both a GVM and GCM to be recorded   1. allowable (authorised) axle and gross mass limits applicable to the mass concession (i.e. CML or HML) 2. NHVAS label number (if applicable) 3. date of joining and exiting NHVAS Mass Management Scheme (If applicable) | **How Does Operator’s System Meet /Not Meet the Criterion – Auditor to complete.** |
| **Possible Evidence** |  | **Evidence Sighted By Auditor:** |
| **Notes** |  | **Audit Result (Code):** |

| Criterion  2.3 & 2.4 | All nominated vehicles have the technical specifications to conform to the allowable mass limits and mass authorisations to use the road network. | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Scope** | The specifications for the nominated vehicle meet or exceed mass limits applying to the vehicle.  Mass authorisations required to use the road network are in place. (Eg HML route permits, IAP requirements) | **How Does Operator’s System Meet /Not Meet the Criterion – Auditor to complete.** |
| **Possible Evidence** | * Vehicle compliance plate details * Vehicle build specification sheet including axle ground ratings * Registration certificate details * IAP provider details | **Evidence Sighted By Auditor:** |
| **Notes** |  | **Audit Result (Code):** |

| Criterion 2.5 | Evidence that subcontracted vehicles are captured to the accreditation holder | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Scope** | The register identifies nominated vehicles that are sub-contracted to the operator. Documentation should exist which specifies how vehicles, which are sub-contracted to the operator, are to be ‘captive’ or secured. | **How Does Operator’s System Meet /Not Meet the Criterion – Auditor to complete.** |
| **Possible Evidence** | * A written contract with subcontractor; * A financial bond; * A requirement that the vehicle be painted in company colours. | **Evidence Sighted By Auditor:** |
| **Notes** |  | **Audit Result (Code):** |

# Standard 3: Vehicle use

| Criterion  3.1 & 3.2 | Verify procedures demonstrate how product loading is controlled prior to departure. | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Scope** | A documented instruction exists that objectively demonstrates that product loading is controlled to ensure that axle mass and gross mass remain within the limits allowable under the HVNL Mass Management System.  Mass is determined by a method of assessment or weighing.  How are vehicle loading limits are established?  How does the operator ensure that loading complies with axle/gross mass restrictions applicable to a vehicle?  The loading system should cater for all possible variations including density, number, volume etc. | **How Does Operator’s System Meet /Not Meet the Criterion – Auditor to complete.** |
| **Possible Evidence** |  | **Evidence Sighted By Auditor:** |
| **Notes** | A method of assessment may include filling to a marked line in the vehicle body or loading a known volume of liquid at a known specific gravity. | **Audit Result (Code):** |

# Standard 4: Records and documentation

| Criterion  4.1 & 4.2 | Records are kept for any trip that involves vehicle masses above GML (axle or gross). | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Scope** | Records are to include details that identify the trip and vehicles involved. Identify the person or organisation completing the loading processes.  Verify that:   * All records are legible and identifiable to the vehicle and trips involved. * For each trip do they keep documentary evidence (eg. Manifests/Run sheets/Log sheets/Work diaries) of the following:   + The vehicle’s registration number or fleet number.   + date/s of trip   + loading and destination locations   + established gross mass (both axle and gross mass records are to be kept where practical) | **How Does Operator’s System Meet /Not Meet the Criterion – Auditor to complete.** |
| **Possible Evidence** |  | **Evidence Sighted By Auditor:** |
| **Notes** |  | **Audit Result (Code):** |

| Criterion 4.3 | A register is kept of any vehicle defect notice or infringement notice issued for a vehicle in relation to its suspension. | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Scope** | The register must include the following details:   * the registration and VIN of the vehicle to which the notice was issued * the date, time and place the notice was issued * the nature of the contravention (description of the notice and or defect)   If a notice is in relation to vehicle standards   * the date the defect must be repaired by * who conducted the repairs * the date the repair was completed * the authorised entity that cleared the notice. | **How Does Operator’s System Meet /Not Meet the Criterion – Auditor to complete.** |
| **Possible Evidence** | * Completed fault reports. * Repair orders * Invoices | **Evidence Sighted By Auditor:** |
| **Notes** |  | **Audit Result (Code):** |

| Criterion 4.4 | A register of all persons with a designated responsibility under the accreditation is kept and regularly updated. | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Scope** | The name of persons that have a delegated responsibility under the mass management system appears in a register that is kept up to date. | **How Does Operator’s System Meet /Not Meet the Criterion – Auditor to complete.** |
| **Possible Evidence** |  | **Evidence Sighted By Auditor:** |
| **Notes** | The register of people with a designated responsibility may be kept in any format. | **Audit Result (Code):** |

| Criterion 4.5 | Documentation is available to all relevant personnel at all relevant locations. | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Scope** | Current documentation must be available for all relevant staff and at all locations where the vehicle would need to be inspected or repaired.  Documents must be identifiable as current by version numbering. The policy & procedure manual should identify the latest form or procedure and if changes have been made the details have been recorded in the amendment schedule.  Where the operator has more than one site, the Auditor must ensure that repair staff at all sites have access to all current procedures and documentation. | **How Does Operator’s System Meet /Not Meet the Criterion – Auditor to complete.** |
| **Possible Evidence** |  | **Evidence Sighted By Auditor:** |
| **Notes** | Versions of procedures and documents through all depots must be the same. Version control critical for this criterion. | **Audit Result (Code):** |

| Criterion 4.6 | Documented evidence that demonstrates records, procedures and methods are regularly reviewed | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Scope** | Records procedures and methods must be kept up to date and preserved for the minimum prescribed time  (3 years).  A documented instruction for who, when and how procedures are to be reviewed needs to be sighted.  How are records kept up to date and preserved?  Have adequate record preservation methods been used against flood & fire?  What archiving processes are used and are records retrievable when required? | **How Does Operator’s System Meet /Not Meet the Criterion – Auditor to complete.** |
| **Possible Evidence** |  | **Evidence Sighted By Auditor:** |
| **Notes** | For larger organisations specific procedures for record archiving and retrieval may be required. | **Audit Result (Code):** |
|  |  |  |

# Standard 5: Verification

| Criterion 5.1 | A documented instruction exists that demonstrates that the system produces and records evidence of weight specific to a vehicle or combination. | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Scope** | Procedures exist specifying the method and frequency for the vehicle mass is to be verified in line with at least the minimum frequency established in the standards. | **How Does Operator’s System Meet /Not Meet the Criterion – Auditor to complete.** |
| **Possible Evidence** |  | **Evidence Sighted By Auditor:** |
| **Notes** | The intent is to ensure that the method of assessment used to ensure that the vehicle loads remain within allowable limits is verified at suitable frequencies. For example, if loading is controlled by means other than weighing (e.g.: by volume) the operator needs to periodically verify that volume limits used actually continue to achieve allowable weight limits (e.g. periodically weighing vehicles and loads to confirm the relationship between volume and weight limits). | **Audit Result (Code):** |

| Criterion 5.2 | The verification of a vehicle’s mass when loaded according to procedures described as part of Standard 3 must be conducted at least bi-annually | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Scope** | The mass of the vehicle is measured using a weighing device that has been certified/calibrated within the last twelve (12) months. | **How Does Operator’s System Meet /Not Meet the Criterion – Auditor to complete.** |
| **Possible Evidence** | * Weighbridge dockets * Potable scale photographs | **Evidence Sighted By Auditor:** |
| **Notes** | Where the documented policies & procedures adopted for standard 3 can demonstrate that vehicle loading is controlled within allowable axle and gross limits for every load and trip it can be taken that the criteria for Standard 5 have been met. | **Audit Result (Code):** |

# Standard 6: Internal Review

| Criterion  6.1 ,6.2 & 6.3 | Procedures exist that define how the annual internal review is to be undertaken. | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Scope** | The operator must have a documented procedure for how an annual internal review is to be undertaken.  The procedure must clearly define:   * the scope of activities to be undertaken as part of the internal review * the responsibilities of staff as part of those reviews * the documentation to be generated as part of that review (e.g. a report, list of non-conformances, recommendations for improvements, etc). * a schedule for when the review is to take place   Wherever practicable, the review should be undertaken by persons independent of the activity being reviewed. For example, someone other than a driver should review the process for daily vehicle checks; someone other than the workshop should review the process for repair of vehicles. | **How Does Operator’s System Meet /Not Meet the Criterion – Auditor to complete.** |
| **Possible Evidence** |  | **Evidence Sighted By Auditor:** |
| **Notes** | While the responsibilities of parties conducting reviews MUST be documented, it may be difficult for very small operators to ensure “independent” internal reviews. For all other operators, independent reviews should be mandatory. | **Audit Result (Code):** |

| Criterion  6.4 & 6.5 | There is a documented method to identify and correct all non-conformances | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Scope** | A documented procedure must be sighted for how non-conformances are to be detected and corrected.  The procedure must include the controls for ensuring the incidents are not repeated.  The position responsible for the management of non-conformances is to be identified.  The procedure must be current and have the responsibilities clearly defined. | **How Does Operator’s System Meet /Not Meet the Criterion – Auditor to complete.** |
| **Possible Evidence** |  | **Evidence Sighted By Auditor:** |
| **Notes** |  | **Audit Result (Code):** |

| Criterion 6.6 | All non-conformances and action taken to correct them are recorded | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Scope** | Evidence that all non-conformances identified have been recorded and the corrective action nominated was implemented and reviewed for its success or otherwise. | **How Does Operator’s System Meet /Not Meet the Criterion – Auditor to complete.** |
| **Possible Evidence** |  | **Evidence Sighted By Auditor:** |
| **Notes** |  | **Audit Result (Code):** |

| Criterion 6.7 | A quarterly compliance statement is produced and accepted by the responsible party. | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Scope** | A documented procedure for the completion of Quarterly compliance statements must be sighted. Quarterly compliance statements must be signed as being accepted by the responsible person in the organisation.  Up to date statements must be sighted and retained for a minimum of three years.  The statement must record;   * the number of vehicles in the nominated fleet * the number of trips undertaken above GML limits * the number of trips undertaken which were non-compliant with concessional mass limits * the level of excess mass for each non-compliant trip * the number of defect notices issued for vehicles not complying with a vehicle standards regulation in relation to the suspension of the vehicle * the number of charges or infringement notices received for breaches against the mass, dimension and loading regulations. | **How Does Operator’s System Meet /Not Meet the Criterion – Auditor to complete.** |
| **Possible Evidence** |  | **Evidence Sighted By Auditor:** |
| **Notes** |  | **Audit Result (Code):** |

| Criterion 6.8 | Changes to documents and procedures are recorded and the original documents and procedures are kept for a minimum of three (3) years | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Scope** | The auditor should check the amendment register to identify any changes that have been made to the system and that documents relevant to before changes were made have been kept for a minimum of three years. | **How Does Operator’s System Meet /Not Meet the Criterion – Auditor to complete.** |
| **Possible Evidence** | * Amendment Register * Document version control procedures * Version control detail included with documents. | **Evidence Sighted By Auditor:** |
| **Notes** |  | **Audit Result (Code):** |

# Standard 7: Training and education

| Criterion 7.1 | Persons who hold a position of responsibility under the Mass Management System are trained and familiar with policy procedures | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Scope** | Sight a documented instruction that details how persons assigned a role of responsibility within the Mass Management System are trained in the specific policies, procedures and responsibilities they are to carry out. | **How Does Operator’s System Meet /Not Meet the Criterion – Auditor to complete.** |
| **Possible Evidence** |  | **Evidence Sighted By Auditor:** |
| **Notes** |  | **Audit Result (Code):** |

| Criterion 7.2 | Relevant training records for those in a role of responsibility within the Mass Management System are maintained. | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Scope** | Sight documented evidence for the training of all involved parties. The training should be relevant to the responsibility of the role performed.  Training records need to identify the trainer, trainee, date the training was completed, and the subject material covered during the training.  The operator must have evidence that all persons involved in identifying and rectifying faults have been trained in the relevant procedures. This training must include the process for reporting/remedying:   * Major (critical) faults * Faults detected away from the vehicle’s home base, including “on the road”   Staff involved in vehicle fault/repair process need to be trained to undertake the tasks they have been assigned.  The Auditor should review evidence that this training has occurred. The Auditor could verify training by examining the training package/s (to verify the content of the training) and the Training Register (to verify who has been trained). Where there is no Training Register, the Auditor may need to review the personnel files of a selection of staff from the relevant groups (e.g. drivers/workshop staff, etc).  The training should match the responsibilities of the particular role within the system. | **How Does Operator’s System Meet /Not Meet the Criterion – Auditor to complete.** |
| **Possible Evidence** | * Training register * Induction records * Personal training records * Training needs analysis | **Evidence Sighted By Auditor:** |
| **Notes** |  | **Audit Result (Code):** |

# Standard 8: Maintenance of Suspension

| Criterion 8.1 | Documented procedures exist that detail the instructions and specifications for the maintenance and repair of the suspension systems utilised in the nominated vehicles | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Scope** | Sight a documented instruction that details how repair instructions and specifications for the suspension systems used on mass management nominated vehicles can be accessed. Sight certification for suspension systems claimed to be classified as “Road Friendly”. | **How Does Operator’s System Meet /Not Meet the Criterion – Auditor to complete.** |
| **Possible Evidence** | * Internet links * Manufacturer manuals * Manufacturer websites * RFS certificates | **Evidence Sighted By Auditor:** |
| **Notes** | Only vehicles operating at HML are required to have “Road Friendly” suspension systems. | **Audit Result (Code):** |

| Criterion 8.2 | Documented procedures exist that detail when the suspension is to be checked. | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Scope** | Instructions for checks are based on manufacturer’s or a qualified mechanical engineer’s specifications of time and/or distance and taking into account the ARTSA Air Suspension Code).  Instructions are to include who is to carry out the checks and how the checks are to be recorded. | **How Does Operator’s System Meet /Not Meet the Criterion – Auditor to complete.** |
| **Possible Evidence** |  | **Evidence Sighted By Auditor:** |
| **Notes** |  | **Audit Result (Code):** |

| Criterion 8.3  (a) & (b) | Documented instructions on how faults detected at other times (i.e. when detected “on the road”) are to be reported. | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Scope** | There must be a documented procedure outlining how drivers report faults detected “on the road”.  Auditors need to sight the documented procedure and to ensure that it provides instructions to drivers on how faults occurring “on the road” are to be reported to the person/area responsible for repairing the fault. | **How Does Operator’s System Meet /Not Meet the Criterion – Auditor to complete.** |
| **Possible Evidence** | * Documented procedure * Driver Manual | **Evidence Sighted By Auditor:** |
| **Notes** | A single procedure covering the different circumstances in Criteria 8.3(a) to 8.3(d) is acceptable. | **Audit Result (Code):** |

| Criterion 8.3(c) | Method to identify and assess fault and place a priority on its repair. | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Scope** | There is a system for identifying faults and prioritising their repair according to severity.  The operator’s documentation must include a method (e.g. list of critical faults) for determining vehicle faults that require immediate repair. This system should give reporting and repair priority to “safety critical elements” such as problems with brakes, steering and suspension. | **How Does Operator’s System Meet /Not Meet the Criterion – Auditor to complete.** |
| **Possible Evidence** | * Procedures and policies * Documented instructions * Staff Manuals | **Evidence Sighted By Auditor:** |
| **Notes** | An operator’s decision to defer a repair cannot apply to “safety critical faults” such as braking, steering and suspension. A single procedure covering the different circumstances in Criteria 8.3(a) to 8.3(d) is acceptable. | **Audit Result (Code):** |

| Criterion 8.3(d) | Documented instruction allowing for major or serious faults to be fixed as soon as possible, even if the vehicle is away from home base. | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Scope** | There must be a procedure to ensure that all major/serious faults are fixed asap even if detected “on the road” or away from the depot. The procedure must specify:   * what is a major/serious fault (this should at least include brake, steering and suspension faults) * communication process between driver and base * whether and how the vehicle will be safely transported for repair * the responsibilities of key parties including the driver and the party repairing the fault. | **How Does Operator’s System Meet /Not Meet the Criterion – Auditor to complete.** |
| **Possible Evidence** | * Documented procedure * Driver Manual * Emergency procedures including emergency contact numbers | **Evidence Sighted By Auditor:** |
| **Notes** | A single procedure covering the different circumstances in Criteria 8.3(a) to 8.3(e) is acceptable. | **Audit Result (Code):** |

| Criterion 8.3(e) | Documented instructions on how faults detected at other times are reported to the maintenance provider as soon as possible. | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Scope** | There must be a documented procedure outlining how personnel (including drivers and other relevant personnel) will report faults detected at other times e.g. whilst the vehicle is at the depot or when starting or finishing a shift.  Auditors need to sight the documented procedure and to ensure that it provides instructions to drivers on How faults occurring at times other than “on the road” are to be reported to the person/area responsible for repairing the fault.  This criterion is targeted at the system that the operator has in place to record both vehicle faults and repairs. This documentation should:   * Be capable of tracking the fault/repair history of each vehicle in the fleet * Include dates for both faults and repairs * Include details of the nature of the fault * Include details of how the fault was repaired and who undertook the repairs. | **How Does Operator’s System Meet /Not Meet the Criterion – Auditor to complete.** |
| **Possible Evidence** | * Documented procedure * Driver Manual | **Evidence Sighted By Auditor:** |
| **Notes** | A single procedure covering the different circumstances in Criteria 8.3(a) to 8.3(e) is acceptable. | **Audit Result (Code):** |

| Criterion 8.4 | Documented procedures exist for decision making with respect to suspension maintenance. | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Scope** | Documentation of the decision making with respect to suspension maintenance. This is to include the final sign-off of the repair when completed. | **How Does Operator’s System Meet /Not Meet the Criterion – Auditor to complete.** |
| **Possible Evidence** |  | **Evidence Sighted By Auditor:** |
| **Notes** |  | **Audit Result (Code):** |

| Criterion 8.5 | Persons maintaining vehicles under the Mass Management System are suitably qualified or experienced to do so. | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Scope** | Vehicle maintenance may be done internally or outsourced. In either case, operators must provide evidence of the qualifications of the maintenance provider. In the case of internal staff completing repairs evidence of mechanical qualifications or letter of assessed suitable experience need to be retained by the operator.  Where professional workshops are used a letter of authority from the business stating suitably qualified persons are used to conduct the repairs should obtained from the repairer. | **How Does Operator’s System Meet /Not Meet the Criterion – Auditor to complete.** |
| **Possible Evidence** | * Trade Certificates * Mechanic/Contractor’s Record * Maintenance Agreement /Contract (e.g. between operator and garage) * Training Records * Letters of reference or assessment | **Evidence Sighted By Auditor:** |
| **Notes** | Vehicle maintenance may be done internally or outsourced. In either case, operators must provide evidence of the qualifications of the maintenance provider. In the case of internal staff completing repairs evidence of mechanical qualifications or letter of assessed suitable experience need to be retained by the operator.  Where professional workshops are used a letter of authority from the business stating suitably qualified persons are used to conduct the repairs should be obtained from the repairer.  While other “routine” servicing of the vehicle (e.g. oil changes, etc) may be undertaken by a person other than a mechanic, the Auditor should be satisfied that the person has sufficient competence achieved through experience, training or other qualifications. | **Audit Result (Code):** |

| Criterion 8.6 | Vehicles supplied by a third party require a statement of compliance. | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Scope** | For a vehicle supplied by another party, the accredited operator must have a statement of compliance for the vehicle that demonstrates the suspension is maintained to the appropriate standard. | **How Does Operator’s System Meet /Not Meet the Criterion – Auditor to complete.** |
| **Possible Evidence** |  | **Evidence Sighted By Auditor:** |
| **Notes** | For vehicles supplied by another party that are nominated under the maintenance management module a statement of compliance is not required.  For operators that are supplied many different trailers a statement of compliance from the owner of the trailers that identifies that any trailer supplied will be maintained as per the standards is acceptable. | **Audit Result (Code):** |