**Consultation on implementation of Directive 2014/90/EU and equipment standards for domestic ships and vessels - Consultation Responses:**

*Please answer all questions that are relevant to you/ your organisation giving as much detail as possible.*

**Implementing Instruments – Draft Statutory Instrument and Draft Merchant Shipping Notice:**

1. Do you agree or disagree with the transposition approach proposed? Agree/Disgree. If you disagree, please state why.
2. Is it clear from the draft statutory instrument what your responsibilities are as the owner or master of a ship (if applicable)? Yes/No. If No, please provide details.
3. Is it clear from the draft statutory instrument what your responsibilities are as a manufacturer, importer or distributor of marine equipment to which approval is issued/ applied for under the recast MED (if applicable)? Yes/No. If no, please provide details.
4. Is it clear from the draft statutory instrument and/or draft MSN what your responsibilities are as a notified or nominated body (if applicable)? Yes/No. If no please provide details.
5. Do you have any comments on the draft statutory instrument or the draft Merchant Shipping Notice? Yes/No. If yes, please provide details.
6. Are you aware of any other equipment that should be included in Annex 2 of the draft MSN? If yes, please give details.
7. For the list of equipment in Annex 3 of the draft MSN, do you think the proposed standards are suitable? If no, please provide details. Additionally, are you aware of any other equipment that should be included in this list? If yes, please give details.

**Cost/benefit calculations in the Impact Assessment:**

Section 5 of the Impact Assessment details the assumed impacts of the recast MED, to manufacturers, notified bodies and the MCA.

1. Do you agree or disagree with the analysis for the impact assessment? Agree/Disagree. If you disagree please provide reasons.
2. Are there any additional costs and benefits that have not been identified in the Impact Assessment? If yes, please provide details.
3. Does the assumed number of newly flagged vessels that will no longer be bound by the recast MED, seem reasonable? If no, please provide details.
4. Are you aware of how many of these will be flagged by small and micro businesses (i.e. a business employing fewer than 250 people or a businesses employing fewer than 50 people)? If yes, please provide details.
5. We have assumed that existing ships that will no longer be bound by the recast MED, will not benefit as there is no financial gain from replacing equipment approved in accordance with the recast MED with other equipment. Is this a reasonable assumption? If no, please provide details.
6. We have assumed a number of additional regulatory costs to manufacturers of equipment approved in accordance with the recast MED, from the changes in the recast MED in comparison with the existing MED. Are the assumptions used reasonable and do you have any evidence to validate/dispute these assumptions? If yes, please provide details.
7. We have also assumed a number of additional regulatory costs to UK based notified bodies. Are the assumptions used reasonable and do you have any evidence to validate/dispute these assumptions?
8. Do you have any other comments to make on the impact assessment? Yes/No. If Yes, please provide details.

**General:**

1. Are there any further comments you would like to make on the issues raised in the consultation document? If yes, please provide details:

On Completion, this document should be saved and emailed to [consultationsdmss@mcga.gov.uk](mailto:consultationsdmss@mcga.gov.uk) or printed and posted to:

Marine Equipment Quality Assurance

Marine Technology Branch, Bay 2/27

Spring Place, 105 Commercial Road,

Southampton,

SO15 1EG