



## Consultation Feedback Report on amendments to EX02 and EX40 – DCVs with net reel, deck load, crane or lifting device installed

### Outline

AMSA has amended *Marine Safety (Certificates of survey) Exemption 2016 (EX02)* and *Marine Safety (Class C restricted operations) Exemption 2015 (EX40)* to clarify the circumstances when the National Regulator will consider that the use of a net reel, deck load, crane or lifting device “is likely to adversely affect the stability or watertight integrity of the vessel”.

EX02 and EX40 have now been made and are available on the [AMSA website](#). The amended exemptions will commence on 1 July 2017 and will expire on 31 May 2020.

### Consultation Feedback

Consultation on the amended EX02 and EX40 was conducted over a four week period from 20 January 2017 to 20 February 2017. Feedback was sought from the general public and key stakeholders including:

- the Domestic Commercial Vessel Advisory Committee;
- the Fishing Industry Advisory Committee;
- the Maritime Agencies Forum; and
- Accredited marine surveyors.

AMSA received 22 comments in response to the proposed amendments to EX02, fifteen of which were from accredited marine surveyors, and only one comment on the proposed change to item 2.2 of schedule 1 of EX40. These comments and AMSA’s responses are set out in **Table 1**.

#### Amendments in response consultation feedback

AMSA received feedback from a number of accredited marine surveyors that technical information regarding the stability of the vessel, including stability calculations, must be provided to the National Regulator when an application for approval is made under EX02, where the vessel has a net reel, deck load, crane or lifting device fitted, and that assessments as to the vessel’s stability should only be undertaken by an accredited marine surveyor.

One submission commented that

*calculating a vessel’s stability is a complex matter (hence why AMSA only accredits surveyors with stability who can demonstrate competence) expecting an untrained/ non-accredited person to make the assessment of their own vessel (not to mention the conflict of interest) is, I believe an unwise choice and it should be mandatory for such calculations be made by accredited persons to ensure a true and safe outcome.*

In light of this feedback, EX02 has been amended to require applications for EX02 approval where the vessel has a net reel, crane, lifting device or deck load installed to be accompanied by stability

information (for example, stability calculations) prepared by an accredited marine surveyor accredited in stability (category B).

This requirement will only apply to applications made after the revised EX02 commences and will not affect vessels with a net reel crane, lifting device or deck load currently operating under an EX02 approval.

### **Additional amendments**

#### *Class 1 human powered vessels ineligible*

AMSA has also amended items 2.3 and 2.4 of Exemption 02 to clarify that Class 1 human powered vessels and small sail vessels are ineligible for survey exemption under division 2 of Exemption 02.

Class 1 human powered vessels covered under division 5 (“existing vessels”) will continue to be eligible for exemption under Exemption 02.

#### *Exemptions for heritage vessels, aerial freestyle devices and dragon boats now in Exemption 02 and Exemption 03*

To further simplify the regulatory framework, the survey aspects of the following general exemptions have also been incorporated into Exemption 02: Marine Safety (Heritage vessels) Exemption 2013, the Marine Safety (Aerial freestyle devices) Exemption 2016, and the Marine Safety (Dragon boats) Exemption 2015.

These exemptions will be repealed once the new EX02 commences on 1 July 2017, with the operational safety elements of those exemptions being located in the revised Marine Safety (certificates of operation) Exemption 2016, which will also commence on 1 July 2017.

AMSA has also taken this opportunity to address a number of workability issues with the definition of “heritage vessel” currently in Marine Safety (Heritage vessels) Exemption 2013. From 1 July 2017, a vessel that is the following is a “heritage vessel”:

- owned and operated by a not-for-profit organisation; and
- listed on the Australian Register of Historic Vessels.

Note: the exemption for heritage vessel is not an exemption from the requirement to have a certificate of survey, but only from certain conditions on the certificate of survey.

### **More information**

AMSA will shortly be updating the Guidance Notice on non-survey vessels and will be available on the [AMSA website](#).

**TABLE 1**

Note Submitters names have been removed from submissions prior to publishing this report.

Comment No.	Provision / Clause	Industry comment / submission	Response to submission
1.	Schedule 1 Division 2 item 2.1 (f)	EX02 and EX40 - There exists a calculation within the NSCV which defines whether the lifting appliance heel lever need be checked (Ref - NSCV C6A 6.5.2 Exclusions) - Maybe this can be used as a simplified initial check based only on GM. If the lifting device lever is in excess of this then a full stability assessment should be conducted as listed ... are these to be checked against NSCV criteria for lifting? To say that it is ok if the vessel will not capsize is somewhat loose. Note that the NSCV lifting criteria still allows for a cosine reduction in the lever ... depending on the vertical separation of the lift, the actual lever will increase due to the load moving away from the hook.	Thank you for your submission. We will consider including these matters in AMSA instructions to accredited marine surveyors.
2.	Schedule 1 Division 2 item 2.1 (f)	The changes in EX2 do not explain how the applicant will inform the Delegate about cranes, net reels, lifting devices and deck loads. It is up to the applicant to decide if the equipment on board affects the stability. Currently the application and approval for NS boats AMSA form 579 requires a photo of the AB Plate. In most boats the installation of net reels, cranes or deck loads is a major alteration that invalidates the information on the AB plate. With the proposed draft exemption the owner is to assess and decide whether vessel “does not have installed a net reel, crane, lifting device or deck load, the use of which is likely to adversely affect the stability or watertight integrity of the vessel”. Noting we are only looking at small < 7.5 m boats we don’t believe the owner can decide on their own. If we leave it to owners to decide there could be an increased risk National Regulator will approve survey exemptions on unsafe boats. An inspection report from an accredited surveyor should be mandatory on any boat that has been altered.	Thank you for feedback.  AMSA received significant feedback from accredited marine surveyors that technical information regarding the stability of the vessel, including stability calculations, should be provided to the National Regulator when applying for approval under EX02. EX02 has been amended to require stability calculations to be included with any applications for EX02 approval where the vessel has a net reel or deck load fitted. This requirement will only apply to applications made after the revised EX02 commences and will not affect vessels already operating under an EX02 approval. The application form for approvals under EX02 will be updated to reflect these changes.
3.	Schedule 1 Division 2 item 2.1 (f)	I am happy with the proposals.	Thank you for your feedback. Your feedback has been noted.
4.	Schedule 1 Division 2 item 2.1 (f)	Amendment 1 - High risk - remains confusing with no definition of ?deck load?. Amendment sets out ?... vessels that have <i>installed</i> a net reel, deck load?? A deck load could be assumed to be a stack of	Thank you for your feedback. The word “installed” is intended to apply to net reels, cranes, lifting devices or deck loads that will remain fixed or connected to

Comment No.	Provision / Clause	Industry comment / submission	Response to submission
		lobster pots but these are not installed on the deck? AMSA needs to clarify in the explanatory notes what is a 'deck load' and how this equates to a stack of lobster pots or fish tub not fixed to the deck.	the vessel for an extended or indefinite period of time. Examples would include where a vessel has a net reel secured to the vessel where the net reel or load will remain in situ for the duration of a fishing season. It is not intended to include vessels that occasionally carry a temporary load, or where the load is placed on the vessel. For example, a stack of lobster pots simply placed on the vessel.
5.	Schedule 1 Division 2 item 2.1 (f)	Having investigated and gone through a long and heartbreaking coronial and industrial magistrates court process for a senseless double fatality on the Spencer Gulf caused by an illegally fitted net reel on a vessel I absolutely support this clarification, and I'm confident the IIMS members working in this field will be 100% behind it too.	Thank you for your feedback. Your comment has been noted.
6.	Schedule 1 Division 2 item 2.1 (f)	<p>During discussions at the conference/workshop, it was discussed that there is a proposed change to EX02, EX03 &amp; EX40 for DCV' allowing the operator of such vessels to install a fishing net reel, additional deck load, Deck crane or other type of lifting device and the operator can make their own assessment as to what, if any adverse effects there may or may not be in regard to stability or structural strength of the vessel. I was shocked to hear that the Australian Maritime Safety Authority (AMSA) has allowed this proposal to be put forward for discussion. My reasons are as follows:</p> <p>1. During the conference on Tuesday 14th the subject of conflict of interest for surveyors &amp; designers was impressed upon us by the AMSA spokesperson and we were to avoid carrying out work on a vessel where a conflict of interest exists, whether perceived or deemed.</p> <p>It would appear that AMSA is of the opinion that the owner' or operators of vessels under EX02, EX03 &amp; EX40 do not have to be concerned with a deemed or perceived conflict of interest when it comes to <u>them</u> installing a fishing net reel, additional deck load, Deck crane or other type of lifting device and that owner / operator then make their own assessment as to what if any adverse effects there may or may not be in regard to stability or structural strength of the vessel.</p>	Thank you for your feedback. As noted above, we have amended EX02 to require technical information regarding the stability of the vessel, including stability calculations, be provided to the National Regulator when applying for approval under EX02.

Comment No.	Provision / Clause	Industry comment / submission	Response to submission
		<p>2. Assessing the structural strength of the part of a vessel where the fishing net reel, additional deck load, Deck crane or other type of lifting device is to be located is a complex matter.</p> <p>It is my opinion that AMSA is not considering their safety obligations to the vessel owner / operator, crew &amp; general public if AMSA is of the opinion that the owner / operator is suitably qualified to carry out such assessments when they are not an accredited surveyor or designer with AMSA.</p> <p>Allowing the owner/operator to assess whether or not the deck/hull structure in way of a fishing net reel, additional deck load, Deck crane or other type of lifting device is fraught with danger.</p> <p>Please don't shoot the messenger here when I say; It is not if, but when there is a structural failure of the deck or hull on an EX02, EX03 &amp; EX40 vessel that has had a fishing net reel, additional deck load, Deck crane or other type of lifting device installed onto the vessel and approved by the owner/operator without being appropriately assessed by an accredited surveyor or designer, when the structure fails and crew are superficially injured or a fatality occurs then It might be considered to be a fair and reasonable response for the remaining family members of the injured or deceased crew to begin litigation against AMSA for allowing untrained, non - accredited persons, owners, operators to assess and approve such additions to their EX02, EX03 &amp; EX40 vessels.</p> <p>This proposal is not in the spirit of State-wide Workplace Occupational Health &amp; Safety regulations. (Although State-wide OH&amp;S regulators still haven't made up their mind whether or not a boat is a work place) Surely if a person is carrying out work at a place, it should be considered a work place?</p> <p>There is a deemed conflict of interest here.</p> <p>3. Assessing the stability of a vessel where the fishing net reel, additional deck load, Deck crane or other type of lifting device is to be located is a complex matter.</p>	

Comment No.	Provision / Clause	Industry comment / submission	Response to submission
		<p>It is my opinion that AMSA is not considering their safety obligations to the owner &amp; crew of such vessels if AMSA is of the opinion that the owner / operator is suitably qualified to carry out a stability assessment when they are not an accredited surveyor or designer with AMSA.</p> <p>Allowing the owner/operator to assess whether or not the vessel' stability have been diminished and the vessel is made unsafe by installing a fishing net reel, additional deck load, Deck crane or other type of lifting device is fraught with danger.</p> <p>Once again, please don't shoot the messenger here when I say; It is not if, but when there is a capsizing of an EX02, EX03 &amp; EX40 vessel that has had a fishing net reel, additional deck load, Deck crane or other type of lifting device installed onto the vessel and approved by the owner/operator without having the stability assessed by an accredited surveyor or designer and the vessel capsizes and crew are superficially injured or a fatality occurs then It might be considered to be a fair and reasonable response for the remaining family members of the injured or killed crew to begin litigation against AMSA for allowing untrained, non-accredited persons, owners, operators to assess and approve the stability of their own vessel after making such additions to their EX02, EX03 &amp; EX40 vessels.</p> <p>This proposal is not in the spirit of State-wide Workplace Occupational Health &amp; Safety regulations. (Although State-wide OH&amp;S regulators still haven't made up their mind whether or not a boat is a work place) Surely if a person is carrying out work at a place, it should be considered a work place?</p> <p>There is a deemed conflict of interest here.</p> <p>4.It is my opinion that allowing the operator of such vessels to install a fishing net reel, additional deck load, Deck crane or other type of lifting device and the operator can make their own assessment as to what if any adverse effects there may or may not be in regard to stability or structural strength of the vessel is fraught with danger and in the interests of safety to the master and crews of such vessels should be immediately discounted by AMSA.</p>	

Comment No.	Provision / Clause	Industry comment / submission	Response to submission
		<p>5. I am very surprised and shocked that highly trained surveyors and naval architects within AMSA have allowed this particular proposal to get any legs and be put out for discussion. The risks are obvious, the conflict of interest is obvious &amp; it is not in the best interest of safety which I was led to believe AMSA is responsible for.</p> <p>6. Surely, any person in AMSA exercising a reasonable standard of care &amp; skill of an ordinary person skilled in the profession of safety, marine surveying, naval architecture or stability would have conducted their own internal audit/assessment of this proposal and been alerted to the dangers of such a proposal, not to mention the conflict of interest.</p> <p>7. I do not support the proposal.</p>	
7.	Schedule 1 Division 2 item 2.1 (f)	<p>I'm not usually one to jump up on a soap box but the current proposed changes to EX02 and 38 have been causing me quite a bit of consternation. In short the following has been proposed to be added to the document; "For paragraph (f), a net reel, crane, lifting device or deck load installed on the vessel adversely affects the stability or watertight integrity of the vessel if it is capable of: (a) generating a heeling moment that may endanger or capsize the vessel; or (b) creating a loading condition that exceeds the maximum loading for the vessel. Note A marine surveyor accredited in stability approval may assist with the calculation of the heeling moment or maximum loading for the vessel. The heeling moment may be calculated using the lesser of: (a) the force the device or load is able to generate; and (b) the breaking strain of any weak links or safety reliefs."</p> <p>While all accredited surveyors are of course highly skilled, upstanding members of our society my fear is that this paragraph is very much open to interpretation. It could for example be argued that as long as the heeling arm is less than the maximum righting arm (GZ) then it isn't going to capsize the vessel. The result of this, which I already had reports of in similar situations, may be that operators hunt around until they find a surveyor willing to sign off on their vessel. This risk could be easily eliminated (and I've already posted this as feedback to the proposal) by simply stating something along the lines of :</p> <p>"A marine surveyor accredited in stability approval may must assist with the calculation of the heeling moment or maximum loading for the</p>	<p>Thank you for your feedback. As noted above, we have amended EX02 and EX40 to require technical information regarding the stability of the vessel, including stability calculations, be provided to the National Regulator when applying for approval under EX02.</p> <p>We will consider including guidance on how to calculate the heeling moment or maximum loading in our instructions to accredited marine surveyors.</p>

Comment No.	Provision / Clause	Industry comment / submission	Response to submission
		<p>vessel. This moment should not be greater than the worst of Passenger, wind or turning moments as defined by NSCV Section C6A and that the change in vessel trim in the case of a reel operating over the bow or stern shall not be greater than 10 degrees or a 50% reduction in freeboard. The heeling moment may be calculated using the lesser of: (a) the force the device or load is able to generate; and (b) the breaking strain of any weak links or safety reliefs."</p> <p>Adding clear limits that fall within those already defined within the code eliminates ambiguity, protects the safety of the operator and reduces liability worn by the surveyor. Can I encourage people to post here but more importantly here if they agree.</p>	
8.	Various	<p>EX 02 Division 1 No issues</p> <p>Division 2 2.1, (d) Class 3 cannot carry passengers, this should be removed (e) Does not apply to Class 3 vessels, this should be removed (i) (1) These are Class 2 vessels (2) Class 4 vessels</p> <p>Division 5 These vessels should be picked up under the "grandfathering provisions" and therefore would be already catered for.</p> <p>Division 6 6.6 These vessels are covered elsewhere however as &lt;24 metre, but does this then mean all unpowered barges are picked up, including &gt;24m which are surveyed at the moment. Some of these barges in the aquaculture industry are very complex and should be surveyed regardless of length, particularly in the aquaculture industry where they have special stability problems and complex machinery and pumping issues</p> <p>EX 40 These are now serious vessels &lt;12m in length which can operate offshore, up to 15 nm in some places, vessels which require stability books, complex fire fighting and navigation. MAST feels that this Restricted C may have gone too far from where it started which was basically small low complexity vessels. It is possible that AMSA could</p>	<p>Thank you for your feedback. AMSA sought feedback on the proposed amendments to item 2.1 (f) of schedule 1 of EX02 and item 1.1 and 2.2 of schedule 1 of EX40. We will take your feedback on board for possible future consideration.</p> <p>Thank you for your comments in regards to EX40. AMSA sought feedback on the proposed changes to item 1.1 and 2.2 of schedule 1 of EX40 rather than the operation of EX40 generally. We note however</p>

Comment No.	Provision / Clause	Industry comment / submission	Response to submission
		<p>have an a vessel working offshore up to 15nm with 6 crew with a high powered inboard diesel engine, complex fire fighting and navigation equipment with NO certificate of survey and NO requirement for inspection at any time and it is possible no CofO therefore no SMS. What is more there would be no initial survey so you would rely upon the owner determining, or not, through complex standards to determine whether or not it would be exempt from a CofS??</p> <p>Division 3 3.1 refers to “V sheet marine distress signal” and “first aid kit in accordance with workplace health and safety requirements” neither of which are in NSCV?</p> <p>Division 2 2.2 refers to some dangers including “some species of sharks”</p>	<p>that vessels operating under EX40 are required to have a certificate of operation and are required to undergo an initial and periodic inspection. Furthermore, these vessels can carry only three persons, and are only able to operate in very limited waters. For example, a maximum of 3nm offshore for vessels ≥ 5.5m to 12m operating on waters around Tasmania. All DCVs are required to have a safety management system independent to any certification requirements.</p>
9.	Schedule 1 Division 5	I have a 6.4m commercial boat with a net reel under grandfathering clause. My concern is the need to put this boat under survey as stability is not a problem. I believe survey is not needed if the net reel is fitted in the middle of the boat and winches along the centreline.	Thank you for your submission. Your comments are noted. We also note that vessels entitled to operate under division 5 of schedule 1 of EX 02 will not be affected by this change, provided that the vessel hasn't been modified post 1 July 2013.
10.	Schedule 1 Division 2 item 2.1 (f)	The wording should be changed to state that the operator MUST supply documented stability information for the addition of the crane	Thank you for your feedback. As noted above, we have amended EX02 to require technical information regarding the stability of the vessel, including stability calculations, be provided to the National Regulator when applying for approval under EX02.
11.	Schedule 1 Division 2 item 2.1 (f)	Modification to risk description with regards to net reels etc still too vague and open to interpretation. I suggest changing it so that increased risk is defined by a heeling moment in excess of the worst of either Passenger crowding, Turning or wind heeling moments as defined by section C6A	Thank you for your feedback. We will consider providing further guidance on how to calculate the heeling moment or maximum loading in our instructions to accredited marine surveyors, as necessary.
12.	Schedule 1 Division 2 item 2.1 (f)	Good common sense approach.	Thank you for your feedback. Your comment has been noted.
13.	Schedule 1 Division 2 item 2.1 (f)	I have some concerns regarding the proposed changes set out in Consultation on proposed amendments to EX02. Ex03 and Ex40 – DCV's with net reel, deck load, crane or lifting device. The explanation in the document indicates that operators can make their own assessments of adverse effect from installed deck equipment on the vessels stability? Calculating a vessel's stability is a complex matter (hence why AMSA only accredits surveyors with stability who can	Thank you for your feedback. As noted above, we have amended EX02 to require technical information regarding the stability of the vessel, including stability calculations, be provided to the National Regulator when applying for approval under EX02.

Comment No.	Provision / Clause	Industry comment / submission	Response to submission
		demonstrate competence) expecting an untrained/ non-accredited person to make the assessment of their own vessel (not to mention the conflict of interest) is, I believe an unwise choice and it should be mandatory for such calculations be made by accredited persons to ensure a true and safe outcome.	
14.		In NSAMS Section 4 - Survey of vessels, the definition of high risk barges & high risk class 2 will need to be modified as well or will barges that are equipped with a crane or davit exceeding 3 tonnes capacity will still be subjected to full survey?	Thank you for your question. NSAMS Section 4 generally doesn't apply to vessels operating under EX02.
15.	Schedule 1 Division 2 item 2.1 (f)	There appears to be no definition of what may be regarded as may endanger or capsize the vessel. Shouldn't the requirement point to the relevant chapter in the NSCV Part 6B & 6C?	Thank you for your question. We will consider including guidance on this point in our instructions to accredited marine surveyors.
16.	Schedule 1 Division 2 item 2.1 (f)	Good changes introduce clarity in area	Thank you for your feedback. Your comment has been noted.
17.	Schedule 1 Division 2 item 2.1 (f)	Modification to risk description with regards to net reels etc still too vague and open to interpretation. I suggest changing it so that increased risk is defined by a heeling moment in excess of the worst of either Passenger crowding, Turning or wind heeling moments as defined by section C6A	Thank you for your question. We will consider including guidance on this point in our instructions to accredited marine surveyors.
18.	Schedule 1 Division 2 item 2.1 (g)	Division 2, item 2.1 (G) The word "primarily" needs to be clarified. This wording suggests that the vessel can be used on occasion for towing. Division 2, item 2.1 (I)(iii) Does the addition of unpowered barges in this item indicate that unpowered barges will have a separate standard. An explanation of the exclusion of barges in this section is required.	Thank you for your feedback. AMSA sought feedback on the proposed amendments to item 2.1 (f) of schedule 1 of EX02 and item 1.1 and 2.2 of schedule 1 of EX40. Please note that AMSA is proposing a new general exemption, the Marine Safety (Unpowered Barges) Exemption 2017, which will provide an alternative set of standards for unpowered barges, ahead of broader changes to MO503 in July 2018.
19.	Various	Why would old vessels be exempt from survey. They may not be seaworthy. Surely if new vessels require a certificate of survey old ones do too and not just commercial vessels, recreational boats that use the ocean should be in survey also.	<p>Thank you for your feedback. AMSA sought feedback on the proposed amendments to item 2.1 (f) of schedule 1 of EX02 and item 1.1 and 2.2 of schedule 1 of EX40.</p> <p>We also note that vessels entitled to operate under division 5 of schedule 1 of EX 02 will not be affected by this change, provided that the vessel hasn't been modified post 1 July 2013. This has been the case since the commencement of the National Law.</p>

Comment No.	Provision / Clause	Industry comment / submission	Response to submission
20.	Schedule 1 Division 2 item 2.1 (f)	<p>During discussions at a recent AMSA conference/workshop, it was discussed that there is a proposed change to EX02, EX03 &amp; EX40 for DCV' allowing the operator of such vessels to install a fishing net reel, additional deck load, Deck crane or other type of lifting device and the operator can make their own assessment as to what, if any adverse effects there may or may not be in regard to stability or structural strength of the vessel. This is because the word "MUST" has been replaced with the word "MAY". I do not agree with the proposed changes for the following reasons; 1. Assessing the structural strength of a part of a vessel &amp; or the stability of a vessel where a fishing net reel, additional deck load, Deck crane or other type of lifting device is to be located is a complex matter. 2. Safety of the crew &amp; other persons should be of paramount importance &amp; AMSA must not forget it's safety obligations to the vessel owner / operator, crew &amp; the general public. 3. Allowing the owner/operator to carry out their own assessment as to whether or not the stability of a vessel has not been diminished or their own deck/hull structure in way of a fishing net reel, additional deck load, Deck crane or other type of lifting device is sufficiently strong enough, is fraught with danger. 4. If/when there is a structural failure of a deck or hull on an EX02, EX03 &amp; EX40 vessel, or a capsize of such a vessel that has had a fishing net reel, additional deck load, Deck crane or other type of lifting device installed onto the vessel and approved by the owner/operator without being appropriately assessed by an accredited surveyor or designer, when the structure of a vessel fails or the vessel capsizes, crew or other persons may well be injured or a fatality could occur. AMSA should not be allowing untrained, non - accredited persons, owners, operators to assess and approve their own additions to their own EX02, EX03 &amp; EX40 vessels. 5. This proposal is not in the spirit of Statewide Workplace Occupational Health &amp; Safety regulations. (Although State wide OH&amp;S regulators still haven't made up their minds whether or not a boat is a work place) Surely if a person is carrying out work at a place, it should be considered a work place? 6. Although State wide OH&amp;S regulations are not the realm of the commonwealth and AMSA, if the proposed changes are approved by AMSA, then AMSA will be offering an instrument to owner / operators to operate in conflict with OH&amp;S regulation/s. 7. There is a deemed conflict of interest when owner/operators are making their own assessment as to whether or not a fishing net reel, additional deck load, Deck crane or other type of lifting device is to approved. 8. I am very surprised and shocked that</p>	<p>Thank you for your feedback. As noted above, we have amended EX02 to require technical information regarding the stability of the vessel, including stability calculations, be provided to the National Regulator when applying for approval under EX02.</p>

Comment No.	Provision / Clause	Industry comment / submission	Response to submission
		<p>highly trained surveyors and naval architects within AMSA have allowed this particular proposal to get any legs and be put out for discussion. The risks are obvious, the conflict of interest is obvious &amp; it is not in the best interest of safety which, I was led to believe AMSA is responsible for. 9. Surely, any person in AMSA exercising a reasonable standard of care &amp; skill of an ordinary person skilled in the profession of safety, marine surveying, naval architecture or stability would have conducted their own internal audit/risk assessment of this proposal and been alerted to the dangers of such a proposal being approved, not to mention the conflict of interest. I do not support the proposed changes.</p>	
21.	Schedule 1, Division 2.1 Note	<p>In the interests of crew &amp; vessel safety the calculation and check of the heeling moment and the determination of whether that heeling moment may endanger or capsize the vessel should be documented and checked in the same way any stability analysis for a vessel in survey would be checked and approved under the National Law.</p>	<p>Thank you for your feedback. As noted above, we have amended EX02 to require technical information regarding the stability of the vessel, including stability calculations, be provided to the National Regulator when applying for approval under EX02.</p>
22.	Various	<p>It is pleasing to note that AMSA is finally going to set a lower limit below which powered vessels don't need a survey certificate.</p> <p>Schedule at Div. 6 still requires existing unpowered barges and ferries-in-chains to be subject to any 30 June 2013 requirements which leads to a lack of National consistency.</p> <p>Some MSQ staff have noted concerns with the self-assessment aspect of the application rather than having an accredited person oversee the application. This may be something that needs to be monitored for increased risk aspects in the future. This includes consideration with respect to whether the vessel is new or existing and being modified</p> <p>Feedback to Ex 40 4.1 (2)(ii) Waives inspections until 1 January <b>2016</b> – a typo?</p>	<p>Thank you for your feedback. Your comments are noted.</p> <p>AMSA sought feedback on the proposed amendments to item 2.1 (f) of schedule 1 of EX02 and item 1.1 and 2.2 of schedule 1 of EX40. Please note that AMSA is proposing a new general exemption, the Marine Safety (Unpowered Barges) Exemption 2017, which will provide an alternative set of standards for unpowered barges, ahead of broader changes to MO503 in July 2018.</p> <p>As noted above, we have amended EX02 to require technical information regarding the stability of the vessel, including stability calculations, be provided to the National Regulator when applying for approval under EX02.</p> <p>This is a transitional provision and is now redundant. For that reason, we have removed this subsection.</p>