

## Industry Forum 2018 - Questions

Question	Response
Two year in-service performance records are outlined in NCHRP350 and MASH. In-service records were submitted to the Panel and the Proponent was advised that they are not required. Why does ASBAP not require in-service records?	<p>ASBAP does not currently mandate in-service performance reports.</p> <p>ASBAP will place in-service performance reports on the agenda for consideration however this item will not be considered during the MASH transition phase.</p>
Computer simulation is recognised in Europe. Why does ASBAP not accept computer simulation?	ASBAP will consider simulations against calibrated testing and justification of the simulation results. ASBAP conditions documents are based on full scale crash testing validated data.
Industry is keen to hear what the jurisdictions are thinking/planning in relation to public domain products?	This should be discussed with jurisdictions during networking.
MASH and flexibility in vehicle type in FHWA letters e.g. TL4 boxed or unboxed vehicle. Will ASBAP allow this flexibility in Australasia?	<p>This question was taken off-line and discussed by ASBAP.</p> <p>It is noted that MASH is non-descript about the requirement for a box on the Test Level 4 vehicle. ASBAP would accept testing with or without a box attachment however would require commentary on the expected working width expected with a nominal 4.3m high box attached.</p>
Will contracts be future proofed?	ASBAP has formulated its position and will be encouraging jurisdictions to choose MASH products from now as part of the harmonisation approach.
The MASH transition dates are not as hard and fast in the USA. Are the ASBAP dates flexible?	ASBAP does not plan to modify the published transition dates.
Should crash testing be redesigned to include bull bars?	There have been no other issues noted with respect to bull bars across jurisdictions. ASBAP is considering whether additional research is required. Jurisdictions should exercise their road agency risk profile.
The transition between semi-rigid and rigid barriers is not a unique issue or restricted to Australasia. Why is ASBAP not looking further at computer simulation?	The first component of the transition project is to undertake a literature review which will include reviewing international research. At present no simulation modelling is proposed as part of the project.
Will the transition consider connection to proprietary steel rail products?	The transition project is limited to reviewing the transition between public domain rigid concrete to public domain steel rail product.
Given the future of public domain products in some jurisdictions, shouldn't proprietary products be considered as part of the transition project?	Industry is welcomed to design a proprietary connection. The project intent is to provide a harmonised transition for Australasia using public domain elements.
There is a road safety journal extract which affected the purchasing of MPR products. Was ASBAP part of the project?	No.