













permitted within the codes up to this point.

- 2.3.2 The underpinning SI to these regulations will be replaced by a new version so that the powers within the Code of Practice and the SI are consistent and provide the necessary delegated authority for Certifying Authorities and owner/operators to operate effectively, efficiently and within a robust legal framework.

### **3 Summary and preferred option with description of implementation plan**

- 3.1 Updates to the statutory instrument (SI) are needed to resolve inconsistencies between the powers of the SI and the current Codes, and changes to the current Code of Practice are needed to update and introduce policies to the sector that aim to reduce safety risks to vessels and crew and facilitate innovation and development of the industry going forward.
- 3.2 Government intervention is the only means by which the statutory instrument and code of practice can be updated, and once implemented, these items will replace the current versions which will as vessels move the new code under their certification renewal cycles, ensure that all vessels operating in the industry operate under to uniform standard. Where all vessels operate to the same standard, this will result in an improved base level of safety standards within the industry, and ultimately a reduction in administrative burden as all vessels operate to the same codes.
- 3.3 The SI and new code of practice are planned to be implemented following public consultation in Q4 2024. This would likely mean an enforcement date of early 2025, though the point at which vessels move to the new standards will depend on their certification renewal cycles.
- 3.4 The ongoing operation and enforcement of the new operations will be the responsibility of the MCA and its delegated Certifying Authorities. Every vessel operated under the Code of Practice must undergo a compliance examination by an MCA authorised Certifying Authority prior to gaining certification, and each vessel then is subject to routine survey examinations to ensure continued compliance throughout the life cycle of its certificate.
- 3.5 There are no plans for experimentation, piloting or trialling the developments to the new SI and Code of Practice prior to implementation. The Code of Practice has been developed with a representative stakeholder group of technical experts, and is development of existing regulation as opposed to new policy for an unregulated area. The code makes use of various grandfathering provisions, and by nature of its implementation is phased in over a 5-year period. There is therefore no anticipated need or expectation to trial before full enforcement.

### **4 NPSV: monetised and non-monetised costs and benefits of each shortlist option (including administrative burden)**

#### **4.1 Option 0 - Do nothing – Retain SI 1998/2771 and the current version(s) of the Sport or Pleasure Code of Practice(s).**

- 4.1.1 Under the “Do Nothing” option, retaining the current Sport or Pleasure Code and SI would maintain the current position of regulation in industry. Vessel owner/operators would not be subject to the costs associated with the updating of standards, training and equipment achieved

through the preferred method (Option 2), however the benefits of the improved vessel and training standards implemented by the preferred method would also not be capitalised by the industry which could result in indirect costs, both monetary and risk based as a result of stagnation of safety practices through inaction.

- 4.1.2. Costs associated with the administrative burden on Certifying Authorities to survey vessels across multiple different codes of practice would likely continue to be indirectly borne by vessel owner/operators through CA fees.
- 4.1.3. Additionally, the discrepancy in powers within the SI and those needed by Certifying Authorities to perform their roles effectively and efficiently could result in costly legal challenge where a scenario occurs in which the powers are deemed inadequate for an action performed by a CA which in turn could question the legal standing of a vessel's certificate.

### **4.2 Option 1 – Retain the current SI 1998/2771 and encourage voluntary application to a replacement Sport or Pleasure Code of Practice.**

- 4.2.1. Under “Option 1” costs to vessel owner/operators associated with the updating of the standards, training, and equipment under the new code would be voluntarily borne by owner/operators’ dependant on whether they choose to implement the requirements of the new Sport or Pleasure Code. This may result in a reduced cost to industry overall where owner/operators do not transition to the newer version of the Code. Where vessels do move to the new Code, though they would be subject to the costs associated with implementing the new standards, in meeting the standards they would also benefit from the simplified administrative processes, greater operating flexibility across multiple sections of the Code, and contribute to the overall improvement of safety standards within the industry which has benefits to the public, and public services, e.g. improved fire safety training may result in reduced accidents and injuries which in turn reduces burden on public health facilities.
- 4.2.2. The Costs associated with the administrative burden on CAs to survey vessels across multiple different codes of practice would likely increase, as an additional Code would now be in circulation, compounding the issues of over saturation of standards.
- 4.2.3. Additionally, where vessels are constructed, fitted, operated and maintained in accordance with the provision of the new code of practice, this may result in resale value of vessels operating to older codes decreasing as the second-hand market potentially favours vessels conforming to newer standards. This is particularly true where owner/operators are intending to purchase vessels for dual use, as the new Sport or Pleasure Code more closely aligns with the provisions of Workboat Code 3, facilitating an easier certification process for vessels that already meet the standards of the new Sport or Pleasure Code.
- 4.2.4. Under this scenario, the discrepancy in powers within the SI and those needed by Certifying Authorities to perform their roles effectively and efficiently persists and could result in costly legal challenge where a scenario occurs in which the powers are deemed inadequate for an action performed by a CA which in turn could question the legal standing of a vessel's certificate.

### **4.3 Option 2 (preferred option) – Replace SI 1998/2771 and publish and enforce a revised Sport or Pleasure Code of Practice for new and currently certified vessels (“existing vessels”)**



- 4.3.1 Under “Option 2”, the preferred option, costs associated with the implementation of updating standard, equipment and training on vessels operating under the Code will be borne by all vessel owner/operators wishing to maintain certification, over a time period dependent on a vessel’s certification renewal dates (five years) or a transitional period as may be specified within the Code. Though subject to costs outlined in this DMA, vessels would also benefit from the simplified administrative processes, greater operating flexibility across multiple sections of the Code, and contribute to the overall improvement of safety standards within the industry which has benefits to the public, and public services, e.g. improved fire safety training may result in reduced accidents and injuries which in turn reduces burden on public health facilities.
- 4.3.2 Costs associated with the administrative burden to CAs of surveying vessel under multiple different codes will lessen over a period of time as vessels transition to the new Code and older codes of practice eventually fall out of use. Vessel owner/operators will benefit from a succinct set of requirements and regulations to follow, which will reduce administrative burden for owner/operators of multiple vessels and the sector will benefit from unified standards in training which may reduce upfront costs for some personnel within industry intending to work within the workboat sector where training standards align between vessels (e.g. radar training).
- 4.3.3 Under this scenario, the discrepancy in powers within the SI and those needed by Certifying Authorities to perform their roles effectively and efficiently is resolved, which will mitigate against potential for costly legal challenge.

#### 4.4 Summary of NPSV and business impact for each option

Option	NPSV	Net direct cost to business
Do nothing	£0	£0
Option 1	£0	£0
Option 2 (preferred option)	-£17.9m	£2.1m

### 5 Costs and benefits to business calculations

- 5.1 There are 2,883 vessels on the Sport or Pleasure Code(s) as of 2023.<sup>3</sup> The MCA data gives categories for 2,854 of these vessels, with 28 of unknown categories. Assuming these unknown vessels are distributed across the categories in the same proportion of the overall vessels, the number of vessels in each category is in the list below.

Table 1: Existing vessels, 2023, by Area Category of Operation (rounded)

Area Category of Operation	Vessels
0	53
1	37
2	1550
3	339

<sup>3</sup> Data obtained from MCA database in 2023, not published.

## Sport or Pleasure Code

4	696
5	39
6	168
<i>Total</i>	<i>2,882</i>

5.2 Using average number of new vessels between 2000 and 2022, on average 86 new vessels join the Code each year. Assuming the new vessels are made up of the same proportion of Category ships as the 2022 population, Table 2 shows the estimated number of ships joining the Code each year.

Table 2: New vessels, 2023, by Area Category of Operation (rounded)

Average new number of vessels	
Category 0	2
Category 1	1
Category 2	46
Category 3	10
Category 4	21
Category 5	1
Category 6	5
<i>Total</i>	<i>86</i>

5.3 The total number of vessels on the Code each year has been estimated by using growth assumptions based on the overall growth of non-merchant vessels. Data has been provided by the Department for Transport using IHS World Fleet, resulting in the growth estimates outlined in the table below.<sup>4</sup>

Table 3: Growth in the number of total vessels on the Code (rounded)

	Low	Central	High
% growth in the number of vessels on the Code	-3.0%	1.7%	5.9%

5.4 Within the Sport or Pleasure sector, most vessels are owner operated and many vessels are owned and operated by a different owner and/or business.

5.5 The costs to business/owner are dependent on the number of vessels operated by a business/owner, and by how many of the requirements of the Code need actioning for a

<sup>4</sup> Estimated using flag data 2018 to 2022.





## Sport or Pleasure Code

- 5.17 Component costs have been estimated using industry sites to obtain a range of cost estimates. Where applicable, the costs applied are consistent with the analysis undertaken in the Workboat Code Edition 3 de minimis assessment (DMA) produced in 2023.<sup>11</sup>
- 5.18 In some places, costs have not been monetised due to the monetisation being disproportionate due to the small and/or high levels of uncertainty around the costs involved. This is outlined in Annex 1 Table A1 and Table A2 below.
- 5.19 For most changes, it is thought that a significant proportion of vessels will already be compliant with the new requirement on a voluntary basis. There is no data on this, so high/central/low scenarios are constructed by assuming 90%, 60% and 25% of vessels in scope and with features already comply with new requirements. This means that the costs would apply to 10%, 40% and 75% of vessels in the low/central/high scenarios. This assumption is compliant with the Workboat Code 3.0 DMA.
- 5.20 For labour costs, we have used the ONS Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings (ASHE) 2022.<sup>12</sup> For managerial tasks, we have used the category managers and directors in transport and logistics (see familiarisation section above). For all other tasks, we have used marine and waterways transport operatives in the low scenario, ship and hovercraft officers in the high scenario, and used the average of these two categories in the central scenario.
- 5.21 In line with Transport Appraisal Guidance (unit 4.1 p3), labour costs are calculated by applying an uplift of 26.5% to wages, to account for overheads and non-wage costs. Labour costs are assumed to be constant in real terms. For consistency with the rest of the analysis, the 2022 ASHE figures have been uplifted to 2023 prices using a 3.8% wage growth assumption, taken from the Office for Budget Responsibility's Fiscal Sustainability Report 2020.<sup>12</sup> Table 5 summarise labour costs.

Table 5: Operative labour costs

	Scenario	Wage rate 2022 (£/hr)	Labour cost 2023 (£/hr)
Mean wage (marine and waterways transport operatives)	Low	17.17	21.28
Average of two values	Central	23.57	26.17
Mean wage (ship and hovercraft officers)	High	27.35	31.05

Table 6: Summary of all costs to businesses of the measure under low, central and high scenarios

Costs of measure	Low	Central	High
NPSV	-£3.7m	-£17.9m	-£38.4m

<sup>11</sup> See DfTDMA300.

<sup>12</sup> Table 14.5a, 2022 provisional data,

<https://www.ons.gov.uk/employmentandlabourmarket/peopleinwork/earningsandworkinghours/datasets/occupation4digitsoc2010ashtabl e14>





operating to the same standards within the sector will increase, and the number of differing standards in use will gradually reduce until older codes of practice ultimately fall out of use. The uniform set of standards that all operators adhere too will create a level playing field across operators, and an operator as a result will not gain unfair advantage or disadvantages from potential differences between older standards and newer standards of the Code

### 9 Trade implications

9.1 This policy does not have any impact to trade.

### 10 Environment: Natural capital impact and decarbonisation

- 10.1

Although this policy signposts the latest **pollution prevention standards**, **this policy does not mandate additional requirements or requirements that would not already need to be adhered to by a commercial UK registered vessels and therefore does not have an impact on environmental or decarbonisation measures.**

### 11 Other wider impacts (consider the impacts of your proposals)

#### *Competition Assessment*

11.1 As the Sport or Pleasure vessel sector is dominated by small and micro businesses (see evidence above), the market is believed to be competitive. The small costs imposed means this is not expected to change, or for there to be any decrease in supply. To the extent that having multiple codes available for vessels to certify under creates inconsistency, the proposal to migrate all vessels to the new Sports and Pleasure Code will improve competition by ensuring a “level playing field” for regulatory requirements.

### 12 Risks and assumptions

12.1 The risk of non-compliance is expected to be low. The Codes of Practice are already established, and sports and pleasure vessels need to meet these standards to be certified. Compliance inspections take place every five years, but because most of the changes involve installing or changing component that are part of the vessel, the risk of failure to comply in intervening years is considered very low (and mitigated further by intermediate checks which would pick up any obvious problems).

12.2 For many measures, many vessels are already thought to be compliant on a voluntary basis as the measures are considered to be best practice.

12.3 The aspects which are deregulatory are not anticipated to have any impact on safety.

12.4 Certifying Authorities (CAs) will enforce these measures during the inspections which come on a five-year cycle. For existing vessels, the changes will come into place during the first five years of the change in guidance. New vessels will be expected to comply before they are certified. All sports and pleasure vessels will have to be compliant with the changes by



the end of the fifth year after the policy comes into effect.

- 12.5 The data held on vessels is of poor quality in sections, meaning we have had to make assumptions in our analysis, and increasing scope for some unforeseen impact of the changes. The risk of costs being much higher than anticipated has been mitigated by making fairly conservative assumptions, and the fact that calculated costs are far below the de minimis threshold means it is very highly unlikely they could exceed the threshold.

### **13 Monitoring and evaluation of preferred option**

- 13.2 There are no plans to conduct a PIR for this measure. This measure falls well below the threshold for a full impact assessment and is not a controversial measure. In addition, the monitoring of this measure formally via a PIR would be very difficult given that many vessels are already complying with this updated code making it difficult to measure the success of these changes.
- 13.3 In addition, this measures' implementation will be monitored as part of routine MCA surveying activities ensuring compliance with the new code. This along with regular stakeholder engagement between the MCA and affected parties will ensure that the measure is effective.
- 13.4 It is therefore considered proportionate to not require a PIR on this measure.

**Annex 1: Costs and Benefits Table(s)****Table A1: Costs**

Reference	Title	Categories	Change	Costing Note
3.1.3	Application	All	New text describing transitional arrangements for existing vessels.	This is an editorial change only, with no anticipated costs.
3.4.2	Equivalent Standards	All	New text, not a change brought about by this Code. Equivalent request process text, not previously stated.	This is an editorial change only, with no anticipated costs.
3.4.3	Equivalent Standards	All	New text, not a change brought about by this Code. Requirement for equivalences to be recorded on the Small Commercial Vessel code (SCV2) - this was previously unstated.	This is an editorial change only, with no anticipated costs.
3.5.3	Maintaining and Operating the Vessel	All	New text, not a change brought about by this Code. The text states requirements of ongoing maintenance and inspection regime.	This is an editorial change only, with no anticipated costs.
3.5.4	Maintaining and Operating the Vessel	All	New text, not a change brought about by this Code.	This is an editorial change only, with no anticipated costs.
3.7	Unique Identification Number	All	Unique Identification Number – requirement and guidance for CAs to follow a numbering convention when assigning UINs.	This is a small change which is disproportionate to monetise, as vessels are already certified under MGN 280.
3.8.3	Certification	All	Statement confirming that certificate validity will cease where examinations are not completed within the specified period of the Code.	This is an editorial change only, with no anticipated costs.
3.10.1	Area Category of Operation	4, 5,6	Change in definition of Area Category of Operation 5. Now restricted to 3 miles from land in favourable weather. MGN lists as 20 miles from a nominated departure point.	This does not bring requirements onto vessels that they were not already subject to, therefore no cost is anticipated.

## Sport or Pleasure Code

3.10.2	Area Category of Operation	All	New text - area of operation guidance.	This is a clarification with no expected cost.
3.9.1	Area Category of Operation	All	Statement to clarify that vessels moving from one area category of operation to one that is more onerous, are required to comply with the requirements of that higher area category of operation.	This is a clarification with no expected cost.
Table 4.3.1	Examination Regime	All	Vessels now assigned into a grouping by area category of operation and maximum number of passengers.	This is an administrative change with no cost.
4.6.6.2.2	In-Water Intermediate Examinations	All	Requirements for use of certified diving operatives, companies, and experienced authorised persons for in-water examinations.	This is a clarification with no expected cost.
4.6.6.2	In-Water Intermediate Examinations	All	Guidance for owner/operators on what the diving company should do with their findings in order that it may satisfy the requirements of the inspection under the Code.	This is not monetised as it reflects existing industry guidance.
4.8.1	Emergency Examinations	All	Requirement for vessel owner/managing agent to report any unintentional incident that affects the safety of the vessel to the certifying authority before the vessel undergoes a further voyage.	This is a small change which is disproportionate to monetise.
4.8.2	Emergency Examinations	All	In receipt of a report under 4.8.1, certifying authority to determine whether the vessel is required to undergo examination and communicate the decision to the person that made the report.	This is a small change which is disproportionate to monetise.

## Sport or Pleasure Code

4.8.3	Emergency Examinations	All	Option for vessel/owner operator to report incidents to certifying authority if they differ from the those listed in 4.8.4.	This is an editorial change only, with no anticipated costs.
4.8.4	Emergency Examinations	All	List of "Incidents" that owner/operators/managing agents are required to report.	This is an editorial change only, with no anticipated costs.
4.8.5	Emergency Examinations	All	Notification that in the event of an incident as per 4.8.4 - the vessel's certificate is invalid until a report has been submitted to the Certifying Authority and action taken as per 4.8.2.	This is an editorial change only, with no anticipated costs.
4.8.6	Emergency Examinations	All	Statement clarifying that submission of a report does not alleviate the owner/operator of responsibility to safely operate the vessel or its seaworthiness.	This is an editorial change only, with no anticipated costs.
4.8.7	Emergency Examinations	All	Clarification that it is the responsibility of the vessel owner/managing agent to inform any bareboat charterer to declare such an incident to the vessel/owner operator who will then follow the requirements of the section.	This is a small change which is disproportionate to monetise.
4.13.1	Vessels Other than UK Vessels Operating in UK Waters	All	Statement confirming that the Code applies to non-UK vessels operating from UK ports whilst in UK Waters. Any certificate issued should state "applicable within UK territorial waters only".	This is a clarification with no expected cost.
4.14.1	Letters/Statements of Compliance for Non-UK Vessels	All	Statement that vessels that are non-UK flagged and are not operating from UK ports or waters do not need to operate to the Code.	This is a clarification with no expected cost.

## Sport or Pleasure Code

5.1.3	General Requirements	0-1	Requirement that vessels operating in Area Category of Operation 0 or 1 have a permanent accommodation space.	This will apply to new vessels only, for Area Categories 0 and 1. It is unlikely that many of these vessels do not already have an accommodation space if operating in this way, so costs are expected to be minimal.
5.1.5	General Requirements	All	Provision for vessels without substantial enclosures to be limited to area category of operation 4 and 6, though 3 and 5 if following 5.5.2.6 and 5.5.3.4 may be accepted.	The scenarios where this would apply to vessels are unlikely to occur and so this is disproportionate to cost.
5.5.2.2.2	Recesses	2, 5-6	Increases in effective drainage areas required for sailing vessels. This requirement now extends to vessels operating in Category 5 and 6 where previously it didn't apply. Additionally, there is a requirement uplift for vessels operating in area Category 2 from 10cm <sup>2</sup> to 20cm <sup>2</sup> .	This may require vessels with drainage specifications not meeting those listed to either increase drainage areas or demonstrate compliance with 5.3.2.3.
5.5.2.4	Recesses	All	Vessels provided with lockers which give access to the interior of the hull are now no longer considered to be a vessel with a watertight weather deck.	This requirement provides a clarification in code but does not have a costing implication or wider impact in its application..

Sport or Pleasure Code

5.7.3.3	Boats with a Buoyant Collar, Inflatable Boats and Rigid Inflatable Boats	5	Boats with buoyant collar or a rigid inflatable boat (RIB) shall only be considered for Category 5 nighttime operation if fitted with a substantial enclosure.	Vessels built for nighttime operations would be suitably equipped for this purpose. The intent of this requirement is to stop individuals using RIBs that are not designed to operate at night, or in categories where a substantial enclosure is required due to sea conditions and safety. It is very unlikely that vessel builds will be commissioned to include substantial enclosures where they previously did not. This is designed to prevent existing vessels certified to Category 6 upgrading to Category 5 or Category 4 upgrading to Category 3. Any vessel looking to operate in this way would already be buying a suitably equip vessel.
6.2.1.1	Accessways giving access to any compartment must be weathertight. Under MGN 280 it was previously accessways giving access to spaces below the weather deck only.	All	Accessways that give access to any interior compartment of the vessel will now need to be weatherproofed. This will incur a cost although variable depending on the method used to provide weathertightness (e.g. a coaming) if they are not already. In practice this is highly likely to be occurring to prevent ingress of water.	This is disproportionate to monetise.
5.7.3.5	Boats with a Buoyant Collar, Inflatable Boats and Rigid Inflatable Boats in Area Category of Operation 4, 5 or 6;	4,6	Inflatable boats only considered for operation in Area Category 4 or 6. Under MGN 280, inflatable boats were suitable for Area Category 5, however Area Category 5 under MGN 280 is restricted to daylight only and within 20 miles from nominated departure point, Category 4 under the new Code provides the same operational limit.	This requirement provides a clarification in code but does not have a costing implication or wider impact in its application.

## Sport or Pleasure Code

6.2.5.1.2	Hatchways Open at Sea	All	Hatchways that are required to be opened at sea for lengthy periods must be aft facing.	This could theoretically necessitate minor changes to practice (procedures needing hatchways to be left open will need to be done from the back of the vessel). Any impacts would be hard to monetise and as impacts are expected to be very small it is not proportionate to attempt quantification.
6.3.5	Skylights, Windows, Portlight and Side Skuttles	All	Windows shall not be fitted in an engine space boundary unless otherwise permitted by the Code.	This is to maintain integrity of the boundary in terms of fire protection properties. This is considered to current industry best practice and is not anticipated to have an impact to existing vessels or those seeking certification as a new vessel.
6.3.9.2	Skylights, Windows, Portlight and Side Skuttles	All	Windows capable of being opened and located below the weather deck shall be marked "Not to be opened at Sea".	Windows that are not marked will need to be marked accordingly with stickers, signage, or engraved glass. These are dependent on each vessel's number of openable windows. The stickers are estimated to cost £0.75 each. The costing analysis assumes 4 windows are to be marked.
6.4.1.2	Valves and Associated Piping	All	Restriction on materials used with melting points below 1000°C.	This is writing into code best practice, as the outcomes of industry equivalence requests over the years. No impact is expected.
6.4.1.3	Valves and Associated Piping	All	Plastic/non-metallic piping, valves or other similar fittings only to be used where consideration to the use of the pipe has been given. Same provision exists in MGN 280 however this provides further guidance.	This is writing into code best practice, as the outcomes of industry equivalence requests over the years. No impact is expected. Grandfathering arrangements have been made for existing vessels.
6.4.1.4	Valves and Associated Piping	All	Plastic pipes not to be used in machinery spaces except in outlined scenarios.	This is a small change which is disproportionate to monetise. Existing vessels transitioning into this Code are exempted from requirement.

## Sport or Pleasure Code

6.4.2.1	Sea Inlets and Discharges	All	Discharge lines below the weather deck to have a non-return valve, , unless installed with other means to prevent backflooding.	This will only apply to vessels without non-return valves already fitted. The cost of a non-return valve is between £15 to £20.
6.4.2.5	Sea Inlets and Discharges	All	Observation glasses fitted in sea water systems below the deepest anticipated waterlines shall be protected to minimise the risk of mechanical damage or failure.	This is a small change which is disproportionate to monetise.
6.5.3	Ventilators and Exhausts	All	This requirement introduces minimum criteria for consideration by the Certifying Authority as part of the approval process for vessels fitted with ventilators in hull side for machinery spaces where they do not satisfy the requirements of 6.4.2.1 and 6.3.2.2.	This is a small change which is disproportionate to monetise.
7.1.7	General Requirements	All	Provisions should be made to ensure that a self-contained wheelhouse has the ability to drain quickly in the event of wheelhouse window failure.	This is not proportionate to monetise as it impacts only a small number of vessels.
7.2.3.1	Requirements for Rigid Inflatable Boats, Inflatable Boats or Boats with a Buoyant Collar	All	Requirement for the draining ability of RIBs, inflatable boats or boats with a buoyant collar to be demonstrated. In practice, this is no change from the existing certifying authority survey process.	No costs are anticipated as a result of this measure.
8.2.2	Diesel Propulsion Systems	All	Requirement for Engine International Air Pollution Prevention (EIAPP) Certification for vessels with engines constructed after 1st January 2000, greater than 130 kW.	This is a clarification with no expected cost.
8.3.1	Hybrid Propulsion Systems	All	Requirement that vessels fitted with battery hybrid propulsion systems use one power source as a primary power with the other source used as secondary power source, boost or in an emergency.	There is no cost associated with this measure, as the no existing vessel is utilising this technology and new vessels can adapt the design without additional costs.



## Sport or Pleasure Code

8.3.2	Hybrid Propulsion Systems	All	Hybrid propulsion systems to be designed, where practicable, so that it is not vulnerable to a single point of failure, so that the system is capable of providing power following failure of either the engine or electric motor.	There is no cost associated with this measure, as no existing vessel is utilising this technology and new vessels can adapt the design without additional costs.
8.3.3	Hybrid Propulsion Systems	All	Batteries used as power sources for propulsion may share a boundary with fuel tank(s) or accommodation spaces, where the boundary is steel or other equivalent material. y.	There is no cost associated with this measure, as the no existing vessel is utilising this technology and new vessels can adapt the design without additional costs.
8.6.3	Petrol Propulsion Systems	All	Fuel tank requirements for vessels with outboards.	There are no costs associated with this as this writes into code best practice. This is reflective of the position in existing codes of practice.
8.7.2	Alternative Propulsion Systems and Fuel Types	All	Requirement to demonstrate that vessels with alternative propulsion systems and fuel types have been installed in accordance with UK authorised classification society standards.	There are no costs associated with this, as existing vessels will be exempt ("grandfathered") into the requirement and there is no cost to change the installation for new vessels.
8.9.1	Manual Shutting Down of Machinery	All	All vessels shall have a means to manually override and shut down propulsion machinery in the event of emergency, risk to persons or mechanical failure.	There are no costs associated with this as it is already widely adopted as industry practice. The writing into Code makes this a requirement.
8.9.2.1	Automatic Shutting Down of Machinery	All	Inflatable boats, RIBs, boats fitted with a buoyant collar, or any vessels where there is a risk of the helmsperson falling overboard shall carry a spare kill cord and have a system that is capable of override or a spring-loaded throttle to return to idle in lieu of meeting the requirement.	There are no costs associated with this as it is already widely adapted as industry practice.











































































