

#87

**COMPLETE**

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Wednesday, October 05, 2022 12:13:04 PM  
**Last Modified:** Wednesday, October 05, 2022 12:52:47 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:39:43  
**IP Address:** Privacy of natural persons

---

Page 3: Submitter information

**Q1**

Name

Withheld at request of submitter

**Q2**

Respondent skipped this question

Email address

**Q3**

No

Are you happy for MBIE to contact you if we have questions about your submission?

---

**Q4**

No

Are you making this submission on behalf of a business or organisation?

---

**Q5**

Individual

The best way/s to describe your role is:

---

**Q6**

Yes

Do you own a vehicle that you use for camping? (Either for freedom camping or other sorts of vehicle-based camping)

---

**Q7**

Privacy information

**The Privacy Act 2020 applies to submissions. Please tick this box if you do not wish your name or other personal details to be included in any information about submissions that MBIE may publish.**

---

Page 4: Chapter One: Self-containment technical requirements

**Q8**

**Don't know**

To what extent do you agree with Option 1: 'light-touch' performance-based requirements?

---

**Q9**

If you would like to say something more about your answer to Question 8, please do so here:

It was difficult to imagine without specific examples given.

---

**Q10**

**Strongly disagree**

To what extent do you agree with Option 2: prescriptive approach to setting technical requirements?

---

**Q11**

If you would like to say something more about your answer to Question 10, please do so here:

Who gets to decided what 'quality of life upgrades' are? I think this option is too overbearing.

---

---

Page 5: Chapter Two: Certification authority criteria and competency requirements for vehicle inspectors

**Q12**

**Disagree**

To what extent do you agree with Option 1: Multiple-pathway approval criteria and competency requirements?

---

**Q13**

If you would like to say something more about your answer to Question 12, please do so here:

Is this the option most closely aligned to what is already in place when applying for a self-containment certificate?

---

**Q14**

**Strongly disagree**

To what extent do you agree with Option 2: more rigorous and prescriptive certification approval criteria?

---

**Q15**

If you would like to say something more about your answer to Question 14, please do so here:

Sounds heavy-handed, and adding unnecessary and unwanted financial burden to the process.

---

**Q16**

**Strongly disagree**

To what extent do you agree with Option 3: Third-party review of certification authority systems?

---

**Q17**

If you would like to say something more about your answer to Question 16, please do so here:

A very unnecessary and administrative-heavy approach to something that is already working well.

---

Page 6: Competency requirements for vehicle inspectors

**Q18**

**Agree**

To what extent do you agree with Option 1: requiring vehicle inspectors to be knowledgeable?

---

**Q19**

If you would like to say something more about your answer to Question 18, please do so here:

Seems sensible.

---

**Q20**

**Disagree**

To what extent do you agree with Option 2: requiring vehicle inspectors to have a relevant trade qualification?

---

**Q21**

If you would like to say something more about your answer to Question 20, please do so here:

I think experience and common sense from inspectors is effective enough.

---

**Q22**

**Disagree**

To what extent do you agree with Option 3: requiring vehicle inspectors to be assessed as "fit and proper"?

---

**Q23**

If you would like to say something more about your answer to Question 22, please do so here:

Added expenses and administration to the system is not a good thing.

---

Page 7: Deeming plumbers as certification authorities and vehicle inspectors

**Q24**

**Strongly disagree**

To what extent do you agree that certifying plumbers should be deemed as certification authorities and vehicle inspectors under the new regulations?

---

**Q25**

If you would like to say something more about your answer to Question 24, please do so here:

I think that there are many people who are not plumbers can still be qualified to attend to most if not all required regulations for certification - as it stands now.

---

Page 8: Chapter Three: Self-containment documentation

**Q26**

**Neither agree nor disagree**

To what extent do you agree with Option 1: continue to record the details of a vehicle's self-containment facilities the on the self-containment certificate?

---

**Q27**

If you would like to say something more about your answer to Question 26, please do so here:

I imagine that "if it isn't broke, don't fix it" applies here.

---

**Q28**

**Neither agree nor disagree**

To what extent do you agree with Option 2: a simplified self-containment certificate?

---

**Q29**

**Respondent skipped this question**

If you would like to say something more about your answer to Question 28, please do so here:

---

Page 9: Self-containment warrant

**Q30**

**Strongly disagree**

To what extent do you agree with the option for the self-containment warrant?

---

**Q31**

If you would like to say something more about your answer to Question 30, please do so here:

What is the point of changing it? Seems like a waste of current resources. The blue sticker would probably stand out better than a green one, anyway.

---

**Q32**

**Respondent skipped this question**

Please list any additional information that you think should be collected on the warrant.

---

**Q33**

**Respondent skipped this question**

Please list any information you think is proposed to be collected on the warrant that does not need to be.

---

Page 10: Generic Identifiers

**Q34**

**Strongly agree**

To what extent do you agree with Option 1: not having a generic identifier?

---

**Q35**

If you would like to say something more about your answer to Question 34, please do so here:

The sticker itself should be enough.

---

**Q36**

**Strongly disagree**

To what extent do you agree with Option 2: having another generic identifier?

---

**Q37**

If you would like to say something more about your answer to Question 36, please do so here:

They work well as is.

---

Page 11: Chapter Four: Infringement fees

**Q38**

**Neither agree nor disagree**

To what extent do you agree with Option 1: a tiered approach infringement fee to a maximum of \$800?

---

**Q39**

If you would like to say something more about your answer to Question 38, please do so here:

Obviously the lower an infringement fee, the better.

---

**Q40**

**Neither agree nor disagree**

To what extent do you agree with Option 2: a tiered approach infringement fee to a maximum of \$1000?

---

**Q41**

If you would like to say something more about your answer to Question 40, please do so here:

How effective would such a fee level actually be to deterring against infringements? Have such things been effective in the past?

---

Page 12: Chapter Five: Exclusions from regulatory requirements

**Q42**

**Strongly disagree**

To what extent do you agree with Option 1: no exclusions from regulatory requirements?

---

**Q43**

If you would like to say something more about your answer to Question 42, please do so here:

It is really an unworkable option for many vehicle owners.

---

**Q44**

**Strongly agree**

To what extent do you agree with Option 2: excluding smaller freedom-camping vehicles from the requirement to have a fixed toilet?

---

**Q45**

If you would like to say something more about your answer to Question 44, please do so here:

I agree that they should have the right to be excluded, BUT it is also unfair that only some vehicles should be made to have a fixed toilet. I don't agree that ANY vehicle should be made to have a fixed toilet.

---

**Q46**

**Strongly agree**

To what extent do you agree with Option 3: excluding vintage vehicles from the requirement to be certified as self-contained?(A vintage vehicle is one that is at least 40 years old)

---

**Q47**

If you would like to say something more about your answer to Question 46, please do so here:

Again, I agree that they should have the right to be excluded, BUT it is also unfair that only some vehicles should be made to have a fixed toilet. I don't agree that ANY vehicle should be made to have a fixed toilet.

---

**Q48**

**Yes**

Are there other types of vehicles that should be excluded?

---

**Q49**

Please explain your answer to Question 48: (for example, what other types of vehicles? What regulatory requirements do you suggest the vehicles be excluded from? Why should these vehicles be excluded from the identified regulatory requirements?):

Not vehicles, but I am thinking of equipment such as tents - what is the difference between camping in a vehicle which has a portable toilet, and camping in a tent with no required or expected toilet? It doesn't make sense to me, if you are legislating because you feel it would force people to be 'cleaner' in their toileting habits.

---

Page 13: Chapter Six: Fees and levies

**Q50**

**Strongly disagree**

To what extent do you agree with Option 1: levy of \$91.40?

---

**Q51**

If you would like to say something more about your answer to Question 50, please do so here:

It is ridiculous to impose a fee for something that isn't necessary in the first place. Regardless of the set price, it would put even more undue pressure on those who are already struggling financially; and potentially some would risk a fine by camping without a certificate.

---

**Q52**

**Strongly disagree**

To what extent do you agree with Option 2: levy of \$101?

---

**Q53**

If you would like to say something more about your answer to Question 52, please do so here:

See above answer.

---

**Q54**

**Strongly disagree**

To what extent do you agree with Option 3: levy of \$120?

---

**Q55**

If you would like to say something more about your answer to Question 54, please do so here:

Very, very strongly disagree with such a high levy (or any levy).

---

---

Page 14: Certification Authority Application Fee

**Q56**

**Strongly disagree**

To what extent do you agree with Option 1: a set fee of \$431.25?

---

**Q57**

If you would like to say something more about your answer to Question 56, please do so here:

Is this a fee that anyone applying for certification would be expected to pay? If so, that is horrendous.

---

**Q58**

**Strongly disagree**

To what extent do you agree with Option 2: a scalable fee?

---

**Q59**

If you would like to say something more about your answer to Question 58, please do so here:

Seems like these charges are just another way of collecting fees for no good reason. Putting undue financial pressure on people is just plain mean.

---

Page 15: Waivers and refunds

**Q60**

**Strongly disagree**

To what extent do you agree with the proposal for granting waivers and refunds?

---

**Q61**

If you would like to say something more about your answer to Question 60, please do so here:

I strongly disagree with the above circumstances listed as reasons to waiver or refund as I imagine it would be very difficult to get such applications approved; and many disputes could arise from such systems.

---

Page 16: General comments

**Q62**

Are there any other comments you would like to make about the proposed freedom camping regulations?

Yes, I believe they are heavy-handed, overly controlling, potentially very expensive, and unnecessary.

---

Page 17: Confidential information

**Q63**

**Respondent skipped this question**

Please tick the box below if you would like any of your answers to be kept confidential

---

**Q64**

**Respondent skipped this question**

If you have ticked yes to Question 63, please tell us which specific questions are to be kept confidential. Please clearly indicate which questions you consider should be withheld, together with the reasons for withholding the information and the grounds under the Official Information Act 1982 you believe apply. We will take such objections into account and will consult with submitters when responding to requests under the Official Information Act 1982.

---