

Maritime Standards

Guidelines for Applying for a Maritime Rule Exemption

Exemptions: Help for Applicants

These guidelines are to help boat owners, operators, and survey companies apply to Maritime New Zealand (MNZ) for an exemption from legislation. These guidelines cover exemptions to all rules (maritime and marine protection) **except** Part 32: Ships' Personnel - Qualifications. Separate guidelines are available for that Part.

What is an exemption?

An exemption is the legal permission not to comply with a particular piece of New Zealand law. It is important to understand that the Director of Maritime New Zealand can only grant an exemption from maritime/marine protection rules if it meets specific criteria (see below). Your application must provide sufficient 'technical' reasons for it to be granted **and** show that the risk to safety (or the marine environment) is not increased. Your application must state the legal criterion under which you are applying.

Legal criteria

The criteria for granting exemptions are in sections 395 (for marine protection rules) and 47 (for maritime rules). The sections are virtually identical and mean that:

1. The exemption cannot be granted if it would breach New Zealand's obligations under any international convention (such as the Collision Regulations or MARPOL).
2. At least one of the following factors for non-compliance must be true:
 - a) The requirement from which exemption is sought has been substantially complied with and further compliance is unnecessary;
or
 - b) The action taken or provision made is as effective or more effective than actual compliance;
or
 - c) The prescribed requirements are clearly unreasonable or inappropriate in this particular case;
or
 - d) Events have occurred which make the prescribed requirements unnecessary or inappropriate.
3. The exemption must not significantly increase the risk of safety (or the marine environment).

All three criteria must be met for the exemption to be granted. Your application must also clearly state under which factor you are seeking exemption – either 2a, b, c or d above.

Using the forms

You must send in any request for an exemption on the correct application form: **112A** for maritime rules (except for Part 32), or **112B** for marine protection rules, or **112C** for exemptions from Part 32. The forms set out all the details required to help MNZ make a faster, more accurate decision. The forms can be found here:

www.maritimenz.govt.nz/exemptions

On the form, identify the rule from which you are requesting an exemption and make sure you include the Part number, the paragraph, and any levels of sub-paragraph. As a double check, also enter the text for that rule.

For example:

Rule Part 40C.12(1)(a)

(1) Except as provided in rule 40C.12(2), a new ship of 15 metres or more in length overall must be fitted with a vertically continuous collision bulkhead that is —

(a) watertight up to the freeboard deck.;

This ensures that you are referring to the right rule and helps focus the application on what is required to gain an exemption to that rule.

For maritime and marine protection rules excluding Part 32, a **ship surveyor** (recognised in the field to which the application is directed) must sign the form. Any necessary supporting information from the attending surveyor should be provided in writing. If there is not enough space on the form for your application details, attach separate sheets.

Charging for exemptions

You will be invoiced once we have processed your application. A reference number and instructions explaining how to pay will be sent with the invoice.

You can pay:

- online using a credit card or debit card, or
- by internet banking or bank deposit.

This fee contributes to the basic costs of processing and considering your application. Additional charges may be made if an exemption request is approved but requires more technical and management input. These additional costs will be invoiced upon the certificate being issued. All or part of the fee may be waived by the Director or refunded in exceptional circumstances.

Refer to the MNZ website for more information about how to pay your fees: www.maritimenz.govt.nz/exemptions

International conventions

When assessing your application, MNZ will consider if exempting the vessel from the requirement would contravene any international requirements. If it does, the exemption cannot be granted.

Rules which give effect to international conventions include (but are not limited to):

- Part 22: Collision Prevention
- Part 40B: Design, Construction and Equipment – SOLAS Ships
- Part 47: Load Lines
- Part 48: Tonnage Measurement
- Part 120: MARPOL (Discharge of Oil)
- Part 123B: MARPOL Documents (Record Books and Manuals)

For example, any changes to navigation lights that do not meet the requirements of Part 22 will not comply with the Collision Regulations, and MNZ cannot grant any exemptions.

You are asked on the form to verify that, to your knowledge, the requested exemption does not breach New Zealand's obligations under any international convention.

Reasons for non-compliance

You must supply a sufficient answer to one of the non-compliance questions. Some typical examples of each are given.

- a) In what way has the requirement from which you are seeking exemption been substantially complied with, and why is further compliance unnecessary?

Examples might include:

- *The recognised make of the equipment product specified in the rule is not available but an alternative that meets the same standard is proposed.*
- *The layout of the vessel means that a vent cannot be located in the position specified but it is fitted very close by.*

- b) What action has been taken or provision made that is as effective as or more effective than that required?

Examples might include:

- *The rule requires a CO₂ flooding system but an AFFF system is fitted which meets the performance requirements and uses a more effective extinguishing agent.*
- *The collision bulkhead is located further aft than the rule permits but as the vessel has a planing hull this is more effective in meeting the rule's objectives.*

- c) Why, in this particular case, are the requirements prescribed in the rules clearly unreasonable or inappropriate?

Examples might include:

- *Portable fire extinguishers of the specified size are no longer available so smaller units with an equivalent aggregate volume will be installed.*
- *The requirement is technically impossible; the required spacing of structural members in the engine room means the engine cannot be physically installed in the space.*
- *The vessel is operating in an area designated as inshore limits but is to all intents and purposes enclosed limits. Inshore limits requirements for design are clearly unnecessary if the operation is restricted to this area.*

- d) What events have occurred which make the prescribed requirements unnecessary or inappropriate?

Examples might include:

- *The vessel is an historic one and requirements in respect of handrails would alter the appearance. However...*
- *The specified standard for marine aluminium has been superseded and the vessel is constructed with material of a newer specification which is of a higher standard.*
- *GRP fuel tanks are now available which are of an equivalent standard and performance to the steel or aluminium required by the rule.*

The assessment of risk to safety or harm to the marine environment

You must explain how, in this particular case, the risk to safety is not significantly increased. You should do this by taking into account the purpose of the rule and explaining any action taken or provision made to reduce risk. Risk can be defined as **likelihood** multiplied by **consequence**. If either one of these components increases, then – for the risk to remain the same – the other must be reduced.

For example, if – as the result of granting an exemption – the likelihood of a hazardous situation or incident occurring is expected to increase, then the potential consequences or outcome of that incident needs to be reduced to keep the level of risk the same, and vice versa.

Factors Maritime New Zealand considers

When assessing an exemption, MNZ considers both risk factors – the **likelihood** and the potential **consequences**:

- How does the requirement of the rule relate to safety (risk of what; risk to whom)?
- What affects the likelihood of the hazardous situation or incident occurring?

- Can its occurrence be made less likely, eg, by limiting exposure by changing hours of operation, the time the vessel spends in a particular area, the duration of the operation to which the exemption will apply etc?
- Is that situation or incident so unlikely that it won't need further mitigation if the rule requirement is relaxed?
- What factors affect the potential consequences of the hazardous situation or incident (eg, distance from shore, time of day, sea temperature, etc)?
- To what extent are these factors within the control of the vessel operator?
- Can any potential consequences be further reduced by other means?
- Are the potential consequences minor enough not to require further mitigation if the rule requirement is relaxed?

Measures to mitigate or lessen the severity of any hazards can be specific to the vessel or the way it is operated, or can be external, such as the characteristics of the location where it operates, eg, on a fixed route within a harbour. These may be imposed as conditions on the exemption.

If you propose alternatives, additional measures or mitigating circumstances in your application, you should show that you have taken into account the factors that affect your vessel and/or operation. You may include, where relevant:

Alternative equipment or arrangements specific to vessel

- Have you made alternative arrangements or implemented different equipment (and how is it to be used)?
- Is the alternative equally or more effective in meeting the requirement and intent of the rule?
- What operating limitations or other constraints are associated with these arrangements or this equipment?
- Are there any knock-on effects of this alternative (eg, reduced crewing, increased weight of vessel, restrictions to access, etc)?

Additional mitigation measures

- What other mitigating measures are you proposing?
- Are these practical, workable, reasonably foolproof, and readily enforced?

External factors

- What external factors may reduce the risks (eg, the characteristics of the harbour, the presence of other traffic, etc)?
- Are these constant or will they change during the period the exemption is in force?

Further considerations

MNZ may also consider:

- The intent of the rule and what objective is achieved by complying with it.
- Other exemptions already in place for this vessel. Although your application may be acceptable in itself, the cumulative effect of all exemptions may make it unacceptable.
- The decisions made previously for other vessels in similar circumstances.
- Minimum standards of safety which cannot be relaxed.
- The implications, if any, of declining the request.

Conditions

If an exemption is granted, MNZ may apply conditions to mitigate risk. For example, limitations may be put on operating areas, number of passengers, or hours of operation, MNZ will also put an expiry date on the exemption to limit its period of validity.

Example

This example shows some of the issues MNZ may consider when assessing an application:

An exemption from the requirement to carry a rescue boat is sought for a passenger vessel operating on a short cross-harbour route. The rule in question is Part 40A.

How does the requirement of the rule relate to safety?

The main purpose of the rescue boat is to help recover a person in the water as a result of a man overboard (MOB) from the vessel. The risk being managed is that of an MOB incident. The risk is to the passengers. The rationale behind the rule is that a large vessel is not sufficiently manoeuvrable to rapidly respond if a person falls overboard and it can also be difficult to retrieve someone from the water. So a small, easily launched and highly manoeuvrable rescue craft is needed for this purpose.

What factors affect the likelihood?

The likelihood of a MOB occurring depends on the opportunities for such an incident. For example: Are people able to wander around the deck during the passage? How high is the bulwark or handrails? Could crew slip during certain operations on exposed decks? What sea conditions are likely to be encountered?

Can this likelihood be further reduced?

Mitigation measures might include restricting passenger access to open decks or having no open decks, increasing handrail heights, not allowing any children on open decks during passage etc.

Is the situation or potential incident sufficiently improbable so as not to require further mitigation?

You might argue that there is little opportunity for passengers to be on open decks because of the vessel's design, so the likelihood of someone falling overboard is extremely low. The effectiveness of any mitigating measures need to be closely examined. In reality, on this type of passenger vessel there will be open areas and some people will always want to be outside. Smoking will not be permitted in any inside areas, so in practice may be very difficult to restrict passengers' movements outside.

What factors affect the potential consequences of the hazardous incident?

The vessel operates within a relatively confined and sheltered harbour and is never more than 0.5 miles from the shore. The harbour is always busy, with plenty of small craft on the water at most times and the vessel only operates between 7.30am and 6pm. However, there are strong tidal currents and anyone falling overboard may quickly be carried up or down the harbour, away from the vessel's normal route and potentially out into open waters. The harbour is in a southern location and survival times in the water during winter without protection will be quite short. In the winter, the first and last trips of the day will be during darkness.

During the summer, the vessel also operates one return service a day on a longer route to a different location, outside the main harbour. So, some of the factors affecting the potential consequences of an MOB may change.

To what extent are these factors within the control of the operator?

The operator can control the hours of operation but has limited control over any of other mitigating factors on which they base their case. In particular any mitigation due to other vessels being readily available to assist cannot be relied upon.

Can these consequences be further reduced?

The consequence is a person falling in the water. Their chances of survival are affected by the time in the water and the water temperature (recovery time is critical) and their ability to stay afloat unaided. The only practicable mitigation measures are ones that reduce recovery time and ease of recovery. For example, an additional deckhand.

Are the potential consequences minor enough not to require further mitigation?

No. Any MOB situation is serious and requires a rapid response.