Part 3C: Watertight and Weathertight

Proposal Summary for Consultation

This document is part of a series of documents to support consultation on changes to the existing Design, Construction, and Equipment rules (the DCE Rules). Other documents that form part of the consultation package include:

- *Invitation to Comment* - An overview of the consultation package and summary of the proposals, including information on how to have your say on the proposals.
- *Proposal summaries* - Details of the proposed changes for each of the four Rule topics being consulted on in this package: Watertight and Weathertight, Stability, Electrical, and Radio Equipment. This document is the proposal summary for Watertight and Weathertight.
- *Draft Maritime Rules* and *draft Maritime Transport Instruments (MTIs)* – a set of rules and MTIs for each of the four Rule topics.
- A template to support preparation of your submission.

These documents, and other supporting information, can be accessed at www.maritimenz.govt.nz/public/consultation/DCE-40-series-package-2/

Contents

Purpose of this document

1. Maritime New Zealand - Nō te rere moana Aotearoa (Maritime NZ) is proposing significant reform of the Maritime Rules for vessel design, construction, and equipment (the DCE Rules) for domestic commercial vessels.

2. This document provides the detailed analysis of the proposed new Watertight and Weathertight Rules and Maritime Transport Instrument (MTI). It explains our understanding of the issues and current situation (the 'status quo') under the present rules and sets out the analysis and rationale behind the proposed changes. Any potential impacts we have identified from the proposed amendments are also described. This information is intended to meet the Government's Regulatory Impact Analysis requirements.

3. This document should be read in combination with the Invitation to Comment that provides an overview of the proposed changes. It is available on our website at www.maritimenz.govt.nz/public/consultation/DCE-40-series-package-2/.

> Note: The word 'ship' is used in the Maritime Transport Act 1994 and the proposed Rules and MTIs. This term is used to refer to any kind of boat or craft and does not refer to a craft of a specific size. For the avoidance of doubt, the terms vessel, ship, and boat can be used interchangeably. This document uses the term 'vessel'.

Introduction to Watertight and Weathertight

4. The watertight and weathertight requirements help control the risks that water and weather pose to a vessel. This includes:

   - controlling the risk of water reaching buoyant spaces within the vessel
   - reducing the risk of flooding through penetration of the effective watertight envelope of a vessel
   - reducing the risk of exposing systems or spaces, necessary to the function of the vessel, to water.

Reasons change is needed

5. The existing rules for watertight and weathertight are lengthy and often repetitive across different vessel types, and in some cases do not reflect modern vessel designs and international standards. We are proposing to harmonise requirements across vessel types where practicable and update requirements to reflect modern designs and standards.

6. The new proposals draw heavily on Australia's new watertight and weathertight rules: National Standard for Commercial Vessels C2 – Watertight and Weathertight Integrity (NSCV C2). The rationale for doing this is:

   - to reduce the barriers for operators, surveyors, and naval architects working across both Australia and New Zealand – as there is regular and ongoing exchange of both personnel and vessels between our two countries

- the NSCV C2:
  - reflects current technology, standards, and best practice
  - was developed with the support of a commercial vessel technical advisory group
  - actively considered how watertight and weathertight (integrity) contributed to several serious and fatal incidents.
- some aspects of our proposals do not align with Australia due to different fleet characteristics and operating environments.

Summary of proposed changes

Grandparenting - the proposed changes will have limited application to existing vessels already in the fleet

7. "Grandparenting" would apply to existing vessels under the new watertight and weathertight rules and MTI.[1] They would be able to continue to comply with the rules that apply now but would need to meet the applicable General Requirements in the new rules.

8. The proposed changes would not apply to existing vessels in the fleet unless there is a major alteration[2] to the vessel. The rationale for this is:
   - it is difficult to modify watertight and weathertight components such as sill and coaming
   - while there are safety benefits from the proposed changes, the main driver for change is to harmonise requirements across the fleet and align with international requirements.

There are different proposals for vessels of 24 metres or more in length

9. Vessels of 24 metres or more in load line length, that are not fishing vessels, would be required to meet the International Convention on Load Lines, currently Rule Part 47.

10. Fishing vessels of 24 metres or more would be required to meet Section 1 of the Cape Town Agreement, currently Rule Part 404. Rule Part 404 is not currently in force. However, it is expected these requirements will be in force when the proposed new DCE rules and MTI comes into force.

Opening portholes and wall ventilators

11. Other changes include allowing opening portholes below the weatherdeck and allowing wall ventilators (both subject to conditions). Existing vessels would have the option of meeting these new rules.

Glazed openings

12. On new vessels, glazed openings would need to meet specified construction standards, and some glazed openings on new vessels that operate beyond inshore limits or beyond inshore

[1] Note that it is proposed that a second-hand vessel that enters New Zealand's fleet and hold current certification issued by the Australian Maritime Safety Authority (AMSA) or a recognised classification society would be treated as an existing vessel, with some exceptions related to transition persons, safety and accessibility. Refer to the Invitation for Comment for further information.

[2] "Major alteration" means an alteration or repair to the design or construction of a vessel and its structure, systems, equipment, or fittings.

fishing limits would need to meet enhanced design pressure standards, or have deadlights or storm covers.

13. The tables in the next section provide a summary of the proposed changes, the rationale for those changes and potential impacts.

Implementation

14. The Rule Part and MTI that will implement this proposal are set out below:

    - Part 3C: Maritime (Design, Construction, and Equipment – Watertight and Weathertight) Rules [year].

    - Maritime Transport (Watertight and Weathertight) Instrument [year].

Timing / Commencement date

15. The Rules and MTI are expected to come into force in 2026. Note that this date is subject to analysis of submissions received during consultation, and Ministerial agreement to any changes subsequently made in response.

16. The proposed new requirements would only apply to new vessels or if an existing vessel undertakes a major alteration.

17. The proposed rules do not include a transition period for new vessels. For existing vessels, the requirements prior to the commencement date are grandfathered.

Products envisaged to support implementation

18. Maritime NZ will provide a short guide for the sector explaining the changes introduced by the new Radio Equipment Rules.

What do the changes mean for my vessel/ship/boat?

19. A ‘snapshot’ of the proposed watertight and weathertight changes by vessel type, length, and operating limit is included in Appendix 1 to this document.

20. In addition, we are proposing some new and altered definitions.

    - Change to new vessel definition: A second-hand vessel that enters the New Zealand fleet for the first time will generally be treated as a new vessel for the purpose of the New Zealand rules. However, a second-hand vessel that enters the New Zealand fleet and holds a certification issued by the Australian Maritime Safety Authority (AMSA) or a recognised classification society will be treated as an existing vessel, with some caveats for safety or passenger accessibility issues.

    - Skylight means an opening in a vessel's deck that is covered with translucent or transparent material and is designed to admit light with an area less than or equal to 2 metres squared.

- Glazed opening means a window, porthole, or skylight.

Please note that this document sets out the main changes that are proposed but does not include all changes that may have an impact on an operation. Therefore, we strongly recommend you also refer to the draft rule and maritime transport instrument.

Proposal 1: Aligning requirements across vessel types and with the NSCV C2

What we are proposing

To make the rules simpler and avoid repetition, the watertight and weathertight requirements would be aligned across passenger, non-passenger, and fishing vessels for new vessels.

Additionally, some minor changes are proposed to align with international best practice and Australia's NSCV C2. These changes cover all watertight and weathertight components, including the following:

- weather decks and superstructures
- watertight and weathertight doors
- hatches and coamings
- ventilators
- air pipes
- bungs, drain plugs, and docking plugs
- markings for doors, mechanisms, and valves
- glazed openings.

Sailing vessels would be subject to similar requirements to other vessels where practicable but would retain some unique requirements due to their particular design, use, and heel characteristics.

Current environment and rationale for change

The current rules are lengthy, complex, and repetitive, making them difficult to navigate and understand. Aligning new vessel requirements across vessel types and with the NSCV C2 would reduce duplication and make them easier to understand and apply, allowing for an easier transition for vessels moving between the Australian and New Zealand fleets. There are some areas where the proposals differ to the NSCV C2 to better suit New Zealand conditions, for example in Proposal 4 relating to glazing pressure testing, and storm covers and deadlights.

Impact of the proposed change

Aligning rules would mean minor changes to some aspects of watertight and weathertight components, for example sill heights and coamings. These changes could easily be incorporated for new vessels at the design stage.

"Grandparenting" would apply to existing vessels. This would mean they could continue to comply with the rules that apply now, except they must meet the applicable General

Requirements in the new rules. However, existing vessels would have the option of meeting new rules that allow opening portholes and wall ventilators.

Options analysis

The following options were considered.

Option 1: (Status quo). Continue with separate rules for passenger, non-passenger, sailing, and fishing vessels.

Option 2: (Preferred option). Consolidate and harmonise rules across vessel types and align with NSCV C2 for new vessels. This allows for the grandparenting of current requirements for existing vessels.

Option 3: Consolidate and harmonise rules across vessel types and align with the NSCV C2 for all vessels. No grandparenting of current requirements for existing vessels.

How do the options compare against the status quo

The following criteria have been used to assess the options. Refer to Table 1 for an assessment against these criteria.

The changes provide flexible and adaptive regulation:	Existing vessels would not be impacted and could continue to meet watertight and weathertight requirements that applied to them prior to the new rules coming into force.
Rules are clear and easier to understand and apply:	Where practicable, aligning new vessel requirements across vessel types would make their requirements clearer and easier to understand and apply.
Maritime safety is maintained or enhanced:	Maintains safety. Grandparented requirements would have limited additional safety benefits.
Changes are practical and economically viable:	Option 2 limits changes to new vessel requirements, increasing safety without imposing additional costs. Option 3 would require costly retrofitting to existing vessels for limited safety benefit (for example, minor changes to sill heights would be costly but offer little additional safety benefit).

Table 1: Comparing options against the status quo

	1. Status Quo	2: Update and streamline rules for new vessels; grandparenting for existing vessels.	3. Update and streamline rules for new and for existing vessels; no grandparenting for existing vessels.
Provides flexible and adaptive regulation	0	+	+
Rules that are clear and easier to understand and apply	0	+	+
Maritime safety is maintained or enhanced	0	+	+
Changes are practical and economically viable	0	+	--
Overall assessment	**0**	+	+

Key for qualitative judgements:

++	Much better than doing nothing/the status quo/counterfactual
+	Better than doing nothing/the status quo/counterfactual
0	About the same as doing nothing/the status quo/counterfactual
-	Worse than doing nothing/the status quo/counterfactual
- -	Much worse than doing nothing /the status quo/counterfactual

Preferred option
Option 2 is preferred as it updates and aligns requirements for new vessels while minimising impacts on the existing fleet. Option 3 would provide a more streamlined rule set but would require costly upgrades for existing vessels for little additional safety benefit.

What are the marginal costs and benefits of the preferred option?
Cost impacts would only apply to new vessels. These are likely to be minor as they can be incorporated into vessel design. Operators of second-hand vessels entering the fleet for the first time would need to meet the new requirement or the existing vessel requirement (second hand vessels from Australia). This could result in increased costs; however, this can be factored into the vessel purchase price and decision as to the suitability of the vessel to New Zealand conditions. A second-hand vessel that enters the New Zealand fleet for the first time will generally be treated as a new vessel for the purpose of the New Zealand rules. However, a second-hand vessel that enters the New Zealand fleet and holds a current certification issued by AMSA or a recognised classification society would be treated as an existing vessel, with some caveats for safety or passenger accessibility issues.

Table 2: Marginal costs and benefits of consolidating and harmonising rules across vessel types and NSCV, compared to taking no action

Affected groups	Comment	Impact	Evidence Certainty
Additional costs of the preferred option compared to taking no action			
Non-monetised costs Vessel owners and operators and surveyors	Users of the Maritime Rules would need to adjust to the new rules	Low	High
Monetised costs Vessel owners and operators	Unlikely to be significant cost for new vessel owners as changes to requirements can be incorporated at the design stage. New second-hand vessels entering the fleet would need to meet the new requirements so could incur upgrade costs.	Low	Medium

Additional benefits of the preferred option compared to taking no action			
Vessel owners and operators	Requirements for new vessels would be aligned across NZ and Australia, and differences across vessel types reduce, making requirements easier to navigate.	Low	Medium

Question:

W 1.1 Do you agree with the proposed change to align watertight and weathertight requirements across different vessel types and with Australia's NSCV C2?

[Answers: Strongly Agree; Agree; Neutral; Disagree; Strongly Disagree; No comment]

Why/why not?

Proposal 2: Wall ventilators

What we are proposing
It is proposed that wall ventilators would be allowed on vessels if: - they are fitted with a closing appliance - they have an internal baffle that rises above the edge of the exterior opening so that water entering the inlet will fall within the airbox and not flood over the baffle.
Current environment and rationale for change
The current rules only provide requirements for traditional ventilator arrangements (upright protrusions stemming generally from decks or the rooftop of structures). Modern vessels now have ventilators built into the sides of bulwarks, superstructures or deckhouses, often for aesthetic reasons or to increase deck space. Vessels with wall ventilators currently need an exemption to operate in the New Zealand fleet.
Impact of the proposed change
The proposed change provides an optional alternative to traditional ventilator arrangements that would benefit both new and existing vessels. Operators of new vessels can invest in new technology and meet the proposed rules. Existing vessels with wall ventilators that currently require exemptions to operate could meet these new requirements, eliminating the need to rely on and reapply for an exemption.
Options analysis
The following options were considered. Option 1: (Status quo). Rules do not expressly allow for ventilators in the sides of vessels. Exemptions are required for new vessels entering the fleet and existing vessels. Option 2: (Preferred option). Revise the rules to allow for the optional alternative of wall ventilation.

How do the options compare against the status quo

The following criteria have been used to assess the alternative option. Refer to Table 3 for an assessment against these criteria.

The changes provide flexible and adaptive regulation:	This proposal would provide for more flexibility in vessel design.
Rules are clear and easier to understand and apply:	This proposal would be neutral on this measure.
Maritime safety is maintained or enhanced:	Maritime safety would not be impacted as wall ventilators would need to meet all requirements that other ventilators must meet to ensure they are weathertight and watertight, including minimum height requirements.
Changes are practical and economically viable:	Changes would provide a practical benefit for new vessels and remove the need to apply for an exemption.

Table 3: Comparing options against the status quo.

	1. Status Quo	2: Update rules
Provides flexible and adaptive regulation	0	++
Rules that are clear and easier to understand and apply	0	0
Maritime safety is maintained or enhanced	0	0
Changes are practical and economically viable	0	++
Overall assessment	**0**	++

Key for qualitative judgements:

++	Much better than doing nothing/the status quo/counterfactual
+	Better than doing nothing/the status quo/counterfactual
0	About the same as doing nothing/the status quo/counterfactual
-	Worse than doing nothing/the status quo/counterfactual
- -	Much worse than doing nothing /the status quo/counterfactual

Part 3C Watertight and Weathertight: Proposal Summary

Preferred option
Option 2 is preferred. Keeping the status quo and relying on exemptions to allow for wall ventilators would be more expensive for operators and Maritime NZ in processing and monitoring the exemptions.
What are the marginal costs and benefits of the preferred option?
None. This is optional so owners and operators can choose whether to have these or continue with more traditional arrangements.

Table 4: Marginal costs and benefits of changes to ventilator rules, compared to taking no action

Affected groups	Comment	Impact	Evidence Certainty
Additional costs of the preferred option compared to taking no action			
Non-monetised costs Vessel owners and operators and surveyors	None	Low	High
Monetised costs Vessel owners and operators	None. This is optional so owners and operators can choose whether to have these or continue with more traditional arrangements.	Low	High
Additional benefits of the preferred option compared to taking no action			
Vessel owners and operators	Allows for greater use of deck space if ventilators are designed to be in sides of vessel rather than deck. Removes the need to apply for an exemption for existing vessels with wall ventilators.	Low	Medium

Question:

W 2.1 Do you agree with the proposed change to allow ventilators in the sides of vessels?

[Answers: Strongly Agree; Agree; Neutral; Disagree; Strongly Disagree; No comment]
Why/why not?

Proposal 3: Opening portholes

What we are proposing

Opening portholes would be permitted in the main hull below the weatherdeck, subject to certain conditions including that they:

- are located as high as possible towards the freeboard deck
- are not in a major fire hazard area or the forward quarter of the hull
- are fitted with hinged watertight deadlights and are securely closed when the vessel is underway
- have indicators on the bridge that indicate they are open or closed, if passengers are carried.

Current environment and rationale for change

The current rules do not allow for opening portholes on passenger and non-passenger vessels. Opening portholes are allowed on fishing vessels if located 1000 millimetres or more above the design waterline. Post-2010 sailing vessels less than 24 metres in length are also able to have opening portholes under a class exemption (EXA-717).

Allowing opening portholes could improve the quality of below deck spaces, including accommodation areas of moored vessels, by allowing fresh air into the space. Opinions from industry on the benefits are mixed. Some operators consider opening portholes inconvenient (more risks to manage) and prefer to keep them permanently shut.

This proposal aligns with Australia's NSCV C2.

Impact of the proposed change

We anticipate that the option of opening portholes would have a positive impact provided safety risks are mitigated, such as ensuring they are closed at appropriate times to prevent water egress.

Options analysis

The following options were considered

Option 1: (Status quo). Opening portholes continue to be prohibited on passenger and non-passenger vessels.

Option 2: (Preferred option). Opening portholes on all vessel types, subject to conditions.

How does the option compare against the status quo

The following criteria have been used to assess the alternative option. Refer to Table 5 for an assessment against these criteria.

The changes provide flexible and adaptive regulation:	This proposal would provide flexibility for operators to improve quality of vessel airflow below deck, including accommodation spaces, without jeopardising the watertight and weathertight integrity. The regulation would also be optional, vessel owners can choose to install opening portholes.
Rules are clear and easier to understand and apply:	The proposal would only allow opening portholes under clearly specified conditions, which would provide clear expectations for operators. It also aligns with the NSCV C2.
Maritime safety is maintained or enhanced:	Opening portholes could pose an increased risk to maritime safety, which would be mitigated through the conditions that are proposed. It would be up to individual operators to decide whether to install opening portholes.
Changes are practical and economically viable:	Opening portholes would be optional so are neutral on this criterion.

Table 5: Comparing options against the status quo. Changes to allow opening portholes

	1. Status Quo	2: Proposed rule changes
Provides flexible and adaptive regulation	0	+
Rules that are clear and easier to understand and apply	0	+
Maritime safety is maintained or enhanced	0	0
Changes are practical and economically viable	0	0
Overall assessment	**0**	+

Key for qualitative judgements:

++	Much better than doing nothing/the status quo/counterfactual
+	Better than doing nothing/the status quo/counterfactual
0	About the same as doing nothing/the status quo/counterfactual
-	Worse than doing nothing/the status quo/counterfactual
- -	Much worse than doing nothing /the status quo/counterfactual

Part 3C Watertight and Weathertight: Proposal Summary

Preferred option
Option 2 (Rule change to enable opening portholes) is the preferred option as it would provide a benefit to maritime operators while also maintaining maritime safety.
What are the marginal costs and benefits of the preferred option?
There are no additional costs for owners and operators as opening portlights are optional and not a requirement.

Table 6: Marginal costs and benefits of allowing opening portholes, compared to taking no action

Affected groups	Comment	Impact	Evidence Certainty
Additional costs of the preferred option compared to taking no action			
Non-monetised costs Vessel owners and operators and surveyors	None	Low	High
Monetised costs Vessel owners and operators	There are no additional costs for owners and operators as opening portlights are optional and not a requirement.	Low	Medium
Additional benefits of the preferred option compared to taking no action			
Vessel owners and operators	Opening portholes may improve the quality of below deck spaces, including accommodation	Low to medium – will only be an impact on new vessels if these are included in their design	Medium

Part 3C Watertight and Weathertight: Proposal Summary

Question:

W 3.1 Do you agree with the proposed changes to allow opening portholes to be fitted to new vessels provided certain conditions are met including that they:

- are located as high as possible towards the freeboard deck;
- are not in a major fire hazard area or the forward quarter of the hull;
- are fitted with hinged watertight deadlights and are securely closed when the vessel is underway;
- have indicators on the bridge that indicate they are open or closed, if passengers are carried?

[Answers: Strongly Agree; Agree; Neutral; Disagree; Strongly Disagree; No comment]

Why/why not?

Proposal 4: Glazed Openings

What we are proposing

There are two main changes proposed: a set of new standards, and a change to the design rating for glazed openings.

The first change is a set of new standards that would apply to all new vessels of less than 24 metres in length operating in all areas. The new standards for glazed openings would provide greater certainty for vessel owners about what is required, rather than leaving the discretion to surveyors.

The second change is that glazed openings on new vessels operating beyond either inshore or inshore fishing limits must have been tested to 1.5 times their rated design pressure or have deadlights or storm covers fitted. This would only apply to those fitted to spaces above the weather deck that either:

- enclose openings with direct access below deck
- are considered buoyant in stability calculations.

Current environment and rationale for change

Decisions on specific vessel design and construction for glazed openings are currently left up to the surveyor to determine as there are no standards to apply, and the rules are silent.

The current rules do not require design pressure testing for storm covers or deadlights to be fitted. What is acceptable is left to the surveyor's determination. There should be clearer requirements for vessels operating beyond inshore limits or inshore fishing limits to ensure that glazing is of adequate strength, or adequately protected, to withstand the anticipated weather and sea conditions.

Impact of the proposed change

The impact of the change is likely to be minor as it would only apply to new vessels (or if a major alteration is made to an existing vessel) and can be factored into vessel design. Grandparenting would apply to existing vessels, including second-hand vessels new to New Zealand from Australia.

Options analysis

Three options were considered.

Option 1: (Status quo). Continue with surveyor determining design, construction, and required glazing strength of glazed openings.

Option 2: Require new vessels operating beyond inshore or inshore fishing limits to have design pressure of 1.5 applied to their glazed openings or have deadlights or storm covers fitted and be subject to new standards for construction and design.

Option 3: Require all vessels that operate beyond inshore or inshore fishing limits to have design strength of 1.5 applied to their glazed openings or have deadlights or storm covers fitted and be subject to new standards for construction and design.

How do the options compare against the status quo

The following criteria have been used to assess the alternative option. Refer to Table 7 for an assessment against these criteria.

The changes provide flexible and adaptive regulation:	Options 2 and 3 would provide slightly less flexibility than the status quo (which relied on surveyor discretion to determine what is appropriate).
Rules are clear and easier to understand and apply:	Options 2 and 3 would provide more clarity and surety about glazing strength, design and construction requirements for glazed openings.
Maritime safety is maintained or enhanced:	Both Options 2 and 3 would enhance maritime safety by ensuring glazed openings are protected from the elements.
Changes are practical and economically viable:	Option 3 would not be practical for many vessels (cost to replace existing glazed openings or add storm covers and deadlights would be prohibitive compared to benefits). Option 2 would be more practical and less costly, as it only applies the new standards to new vessels.

Table 7: Comparing options against the status quo.

	1. Status Quo	2: Requirements for some glazed openings on NEW vessels	3: Requirements for some glazed openings on ALL vessels
Provides flexible and adaptive regulation	0	-	-
Rules that are clear and easier to understand and apply	0	+	+
Maritime safety is maintained or enhanced	0	+	+
Changes are practical and economically viable	0	+	-
Overall assessment	**0**	**+**	**+**

Key for qualitative judgements:

++	Much better than doing nothing/the status quo/counterfactual
+	Better than doing nothing/the status quo/counterfactual
0	About the same as doing nothing/the status quo/counterfactual
-	Worse than doing nothing/the status quo/counterfactual
- -	Much worse than doing nothing /the status quo/counterfactual

Preferred option
Option 2 (rule changes that only apply to new vessels) would strike the best balance between providing clear requirements for new vessels while not adversely impacting existing vessel arrangements.

What are the marginal costs and benefits of the preferred option?

Cost impacts would only apply to new vessels. These are likely to be minor as they can be incorporated into vessel design. Operators of second-hand vessels entering the fleet for the first time would need to meet the new requirement or the existing vessel requirement (second hand vessels from Australia). This could result in increased costs; however, this can be factored into the vessel purchase price and decision as to the suitability of the vessel to New Zealand conditions.

A second-hand vessel that enters the New Zealand fleet for the first time will generally be treated as a new vessel for the purpose of the New Zealand rules. However, a second-hand vessel that enters the New Zealand fleet and holds a current certification issued by AMSA or a recognised classification society would be treated as an existing vessel, with some caveats for safety or passenger accessibility issues.

Table 8: Marginal costs and benefits of option 2

Affected groups	Comment	Impact	Evidence Certainty
Additional costs of the preferred option compared to taking no action			
Non-monetised costs Vessel owners and operators and surveyors	Users of the Maritime Rules will need to adjust to the new rules	Low	High
Monetised costs Vessel owners and operators	Changes to pressure testing will be able to be factored in at the design stage at relatively low additional cost (if any). New to New Zealand second-hand vessels would need to factor into the vessel purchase price and decision to purchase, the suitability of the vessel to New Zealand conditions, including any upgrades required to meet the new standards.	Low	High

Additional benefits of the preferred option compared to taking no action			
Vessel owners and operators	Provides greater certainty to vessel owners and operators of new vessels, while not imposing unreasonable costs on existing vessels or new second-hand vessels.	Low	Medium

Questions:

W 4.1 Do you agree with the proposal for glazed openings on new vessels operating beyond inshore limits or inshore fishing limits to be tested to 1.5 times their design pressure rating, or have deadlights or storm covers fitted?

[Answers: Strongly Agree; Agree; Neutral; Disagree; Strongly Disagree; No comment]

Why/why not?

W4.2 Do you agree with the proposal for glazed openings on new vessels operating beyond inshore limits or inshore fishing limits to be subject to new rules, rather than the discretion of a surveyor?

[Answers: Strongly Agree; Agree; Neutral; Disagree; Strongly Disagree; No comment]

Why/why not?

W4.3 Do you agree with only applying this proposal to new vessels?

[Answers: Strongly Agree; Agree; Neutral; Disagree; Strongly Disagree; No comment]

Why/why not?

How to have your say

The deadline for providing comment on these proposals is ***5pm on Friday, 11 July 2025***.

21. This document is part of a package of documents on the proposed changes to the design, construction, and equipment rules. Information on this consultation will be available on Maritime NZ's website and through Maritime NZ's SeaChange newsletter.

22. Subject to interest, Maritime NZ will hold online information sessions on the proposals during the week of ***3 to 6 June and 23 to 27 June***. Please contact us at the email address provided below if you would like to attend a session or if you would like us to contact you to discuss any of the proposals.

23. We welcome any feedback you would like to provide. Submissions can be made by completing the submission form on our website www.maritimenz.govt.nz/public/consultation/DCE-40-series-package-2/ or in any other written form and:

    - emailed to us at 40.series@maritimenz.govt.nz; or
    - posted to the Regulatory Reform Projects Team, Maritime NZ, PO Box 25620, Wellington 6140.

24. This document includes questions to help you focus your feedback. Answering the questions is optional.

Submissions are public information

25. Please let us know if your comments are commercially sensitive or if for some reason you consider they should not be disclosed. If your submission is subject to an Official Information Act (OIA) request, Maritime NZ will consider your confidentiality request in accordance with the grounds for withholding information set out in the OIA.

26. In addition, if you are an individual (that is, your comments are made personally and not on behalf of a company or an organisation), please let us know if you have reasons that your identity should not be disclosed.

27. We will acknowledge all submissions that we receive.

Questions

28. The following questions have been included to help focus your feedback. Answering the questions is optional. All feedback is welcome.

Proposal 1: Consolidating rules across vessel types and aligning with the NSCV C2

W 1.1 Do you agree with the proposed change to align watertight and weathertight requirements across different vessel types and with Australia's NSCV C2?

[Answers: Strongly Agree; Agree; Neutral; Disagree; Strongly Disagree; No comment]

Why/why not?

Proposal 2: Changes to ventilators

W 2.1 Do you agree with the proposed change to allow for ventilators in the sides of vessels (wall ventilators)?

[Answers: Strongly Agree; Agree; Neutral; Disagree; Strongly Disagree; No comment]

Why/why not?

Proposal 3: Changes to portholes

W 3.1 Do you agree with the proposed changes to allow opening portholes to be fitted to new vessels provided certain conditions are met including that they:

- are located as high as possible towards the freeboard deck;
- are not in a major fire hazard area or the forward quarter of the hull;
- are fitted with hinged watertight deadlights and are securely closed when the vessel is underway;
- have indicators on the bridge that indicate they are open or closed, if passengers are carried?

[Answers: Strongly Agree; Agree; Neutral; Disagree; Strongly Disagree; No comment]

Why/why not?

Proposal 4: Changes to protection for glazed openings

W 4.1 Do you agree with the proposal for glazed openings on new vessels operating beyond inshore limits or inshore fishing limits to be tested to 1.5 times their design pressure rating, or have deadlights or storm covers fitted?

[Answers: Strongly Agree; Agree; Neutral; Disagree; Strongly Disagree; No comment]

Why/why not?

W 4.2 Do you agree with the proposal for glazed openings on new vessels operating beyond inshore limits or inshore fishing limits to be subject to the new rules, rather than the discretion of a surveyor?

[Answers: Strongly Agree; Agree; Neutral; Disagree; Strongly Disagree; No comment]

Why/why not?

W 4.3 Do you agree with only applying this proposal to new vessels?

[Answers: Strongly Agree; Agree; Neutral; Disagree; Strongly Disagree; No comment]

Why/why not?

Appendix 1: ‘Snapshot’ of the proposed Watertight and Weathertight Rule changes

Part 3C Watertight and Weathertight Rules				
Application	Part 3C would not apply to— SOLAS Vessels; Cape Town fishing vessels; Novel Vessels; Hovercraft; or Commercial Jet Boat Operations under Part 82 Fishing vessels of 24m or more in load line length. These would need to meet Part 404: Design, Construction, and Equipment - New Zealand Cape Town Vessels and Foreign Cape Town Vessels. Vessels of 24m or more load line length (that are not fishing vessels). These would need to meet the weathertight and watertight requirements specified in Part 47: Load lines (this would become Part 2C).			
Existing vessels	In most cases where the rules introduce changes, an existing vessel would have the option to comply with new rules or the rules that applied before.			

Item	Detail	Rule	New or existing vessels?	Vessel type	Vessel size	Operating area	When rule will apply
Ventilator requirements would include more detail. **Ventilators in the sides of a vessel (wall ventilators) would be allowed**	Ventilators in Positions 1 and 2* would need to be of adequate strength; face aft or inboard or otherwise be protected from the elements; have coamings high enough to prevent downflooding; and meet minimum height requirements. A ventilator would generally require a weathertight closing appliance unless it meets height and downflooding requirements and includes a baffle and a means to drain water. Wall ventilators would be allowed, if they are fitted with an internal baffle that rises above the upper edge of the exterior opening, so that water entering the inlet will fall within the air box and does not flood over the baffle. * Positions 1 and 2 are defined. In broad terms they refer to exposed freeboard decks, raised quarterdecks or exposed decks lower than 3 standard heights of superstructure above the freeboard deck.	Rules C5.2 MTI Section 5	New	All vessel types	Vessels of less than 24m in length	All operating limits	When rules take effect
Glazed openings on new vessels would need to be constructed to a specified standard	The design and construction of a porthole, window or skylight would need to comply with a standard that is appropriate to the type and operation of the vessel. The options include classification society rules and a range of ISO standards.	Rule C7.2 MTI 7.2(2)	New	All vessel types	Vessels of less than 24m in length	All operating limits	When rules take effect

Item	Detail	Rule	New or existing vessels?	Vessel type	Vessel size	Operating area	When rule will apply
Some glazed openings would need to meet enhanced glazing standards or have additional protection	Glazed openings would need a safety factor of 1.5 applied to their design pressure (or have deadlights or storm covers) if located on a deckhouse or superstructure with direct access leading below deck; or a deckhouse or superstructure that is considered buoyant, based on the stability calculations prescribed in the new Part 3B: Maritime (Design, Construction, and Equipment – Stability, Drainage, Freeboard, and Subdivision) Rules.	Rule C7.2 MTI 7.2(4)	New	All vessel types	Vessels of less than 24m in length	Beyond inshore limits Beyond inshore fishing limits	When rules take effect
Opening portholes would be allowed	Opening portholes would be allowed below the weatherdeck subject to conditions: located as close as possible to the freeboard deck; not in high-risk areas; minimum distance above the deepest loaded waterline; hinged watertight deadlights would need to be fitted; control measures would be required to ensure the portholes are not opened while vessel is underway.	Rule C7.2 MTI 7.2(6)-(8)	New and existing	All vessel types	Vessels of less than 24m in length	All operating limits	When rules take effect