






# SAFC

South Australian Freight Council

Level 1, 296 St Vincent Street  
PORT ADELAIDE SA 5015

0415 210 849   
admin@safreightcouncil.com.au   
www.safreightcouncil.com.au 

11<sup>th</sup> December 2023

National Transport Commission  
Level 3  
600 Bourke St  
Melbourne  
Vic 3000

Via Email: [mmccarthy@ntc.gov.au](mailto:mmccarthy@ntc.gov.au)

SAFC Submission to the National Transport Commission C-Ris

The South Australian Freight Council is the multi-modal advocacy body for SA. We provide a voice for freight and infrastructure issues across all modes – Sea, Air, Road and Rail. Supported by the SA state government, our membership consists of providers, users and facilitators of freight across all 4 modes.

SAFC remains supportive of the National Transport Commission, and we appreciate the opportunity to work alongside the Commission for the benefit of our Industry and State.

We offer the following observations of the Current Focus areas and Questions.

### **Fatigue Management**

Record Keeping – Record Keeping is an important part of heavy vehicle fatigue management. While it is necessary to retain the legal requirement for operators to keep meaningful records, removing unnecessary administrative records and duplication of information be helpful. Accordingly, SAFC would be supportive of implementation of both 1a and 1b.

Scope of Fatigue regulated vehicles – SAFC recognise that safety is of paramount importance and is particularly pertinent to the current debate surrounding the social license of freight, particularly road freight in metropolitan areas. It is important to note that fatigue management is only one aspect of safety management, however extending requirements to all HVs >12 - including those drivers doing local work, would be appropriate (Option 2b). It will be important to ensure that the additional cost of compliance levied on local operators be balanced against the benefits of including these in the more rigorous reporting standards. It would be expected that a reasonable percentage of 'local work' would ultimately be classed as 'lower risk'.

Some aspects of 2b would need to be quantified and clarified – such as what constitutes "lower-risk" operations, exactly how a 'lite' reporting requirement would work, how to incorporate some allowances for the drivers to return home after their shift, how to account for 'wait time' etc.

### **Enforcement**

There is merit to each of the offered options regarding enforcement. The aim is to further embed an industry culture of compliance due to the safety benefits, ultimately this can be created as, or more effectively, through cooperation over overt financial penalties.

Re: 3c – assuming some administrative errors are 'trifling' implies that the recording of this information is not of value. Where information is not relevant the need to collect (and thereby enforce) should be removed completely. Where the

administrative error is 'trifling' in that the error (or non-reporting) is inconsequential, these fines should be open for review. Linked to this could be a 'warning' system (3e) where operators are given an opportunity to correct their administrative offences relating to work diaries and the opportunity for some formal education in lieu of fines.

The overarching aim should be for full compliance each and every time and where willful or persistent misconduct exists the ultimate threat of expiation should remain, however where the behaviour can be rectified through other means this would be a preferable option.

### **Access**

Mass - SAFC would support option 4b – with the aim that not only does it simplify the current rules it also provides opportunity to support the industry in transition to a more carbon neutral environment by providing additional incentive for operators to move to Euro VI vehicles.

Height and length – as a general rule SAFC is well disposed towards increases in mass, height and length limits. When considering the moving of general access to 4.6m, issues relating to the stability of the vehicle would need to be considered. With regard to the length the issue is more to do with swept path concerns.

### **Audit**

Once of the concerns that members frequently raise with SAFC is the frustration over the lack of regulatory consistency from jurisdiction to jurisdiction. This often leads to inefficiencies and thereby costs ultimately borne by the consumer. While generally well disposed to having the requirements included in the regulations (option 7a) and the confidence and clarity this could bring (assuming no greater impediment in terms of costs) – we have seen where having embedded regulations have a negative effect in innovation where the regulations are too ponderous and slow to change. With that in mind it is debatable whether the benefits of embedding the requirements in the regulations would outweigh the potential costs.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback to the review. Should you have further questions regarding SAFC's response please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely

Jonathan Wilson  
CEO  
SAFC