Minutes of the 19th Meeting of the CEVNI Expert Group


2. The meeting was attended by Mr. R. Vorderwinkler (Austria), Ms. N. Dofferhoff-Heldens (Netherlands), Ms. V. Ivanova (Russian Federation), Mr. G. Pauli, Mr. R. Wisselmann (Central Commission for the Navigation of the Rhine, hereafter CCNR), Mr. Petar Margic (Danube Commission, hereafter DC), Ms. P. Brückner (Moselle Commission, hereafter MC), Mr. Ž. Milkovic (International Sava River Basin Commission, hereafter Sava Commission or SC), Mr. M. Magold, Ms. V. Blanchard, Ms. M. Novikov (UNECE).

3. The following items were discussed:

   I. Adoption of the minutes of the eighteenth meeting (CEVNI EG/2012/8)

   II. General exchange of information

   III. Consideration of the draft Chapter 10 (CEVNI EG/2013/2)

   IV. Discussion on the amendments necessary to align CEVNI with RPNR (Informal document SC.3/WP.3 (2013) No. 4)

   V. Next meeting

4. The following items of the provisional agenda were not discussed due to lack of time:

   VI. Consideration of pending amendment proposals (CEVNI EG/2013/3, CEVNI EG/2013/4, ECE/TRANS/SC.3/WP.3/2013/2/Add.1, CEVNI EG/2013/5, CEVNI EG/2013/6)

   VII. Other business

5. The Group decided to carry the outstanding items over to the next session of the CEVNI Expert Group.

I. Minutes of the eighteenth meeting

6. The CEVNI Expert Group considered the minutes of its eighteenth meeting on 9 October 2012, as contained in document CEVNI EG/2012/8 and in the annex to the report of the fifty-sixth session of SC.3 (ECE/TRANS/SC.3/193), and adopted them.

II. General exchange of information

7. The participants exchanged information on their latest CEVNI-related activities. The following elements were highlighted:

   (a) Ms. Ivanova advised that the revision of rules of the road in the Russian Federation was in progress. It is expected that the revised rules would be published at the end of 2013.
(b) Ms. Dofferhoff-Heldens informed the Group that a revised version of the translation of CEVNI into Dutch was expected in the coming weeks. An initial comparison revealed that chapter 6 of the Dutch police regulations was different to the one of CEVNI.

(c) Ms. Brückner informed the Group that the comparison of Mosel, Rhine police regulations and CEVNI regulations had been completed. The next step would be to identify the required changes in the Mosel police regulations to align them with CEVNI. The delegations of the Mosel Commission will be asked to decide whether to amend the Mosel police regulations and adopt CEVNI as a common core instrument or to keep the Mosel regulations different from CEVNI. It is expected that the MC may report on a decision by its delegations during the June session of the CEVNI Expert Group.

(d) Mr. Pauli informed the Group that much of the current work of CCNR was concentrating on article 4.07 of the Police Regulations for the Navigation on the Rhine (PRNR). CCNR would like to introduce an obligation to use Inland AIS. Discussions are still under way and it is expected that by autumn 2013 a final version of article 4.07 of PRNR would be available.

(e) Mr. Milkovic informed the Group that the CEVNI Expert Group proposals were adopted by the SC experts. He reminded the Group that CEVNI was applied in full by the SC and that local rules were contained in chapter 11.

(f) Mr. Vorderwinkler informed the Group that national rules were implemented in Austria, which are almost fully identical to CEVNI. He advised that he would be able to report on national rules contained in chapter 9 at the next meeting.

(g) Mr. Margic informed the Group that the DC was working on collating local rules. It is expected that this work would be finalized by the end of 2013.

III. Consideration of the draft Chapter 10

8. The Expert Group considered the consolidated draft text of chapter 10 prepared by the secretariat based on the amendment proposal by CCNR and comments from Austria, Bulgaria, the Russian Federation, Serbia and Slovakia, reproduced in CEVNI EG/2013/2, and agreed as follows:

A. Amendments to chapter 1

9. Delete proposed subparagraph (g) in order to list only the basic required documents, with a possibility to add more under chapter 9.

B. Amendments to article 10.01

10. Amend title of article 10.01 to read “Meaning of certain terms”.
11. Amend the title of para. 1 to read “General terms”.
12. Amend the title of para. 2 to read “Terms related to the cargo”.
13. Ask the secretariat to identify which definitions listed in article 10.01 are not used in the rest of chapter 10 with a view to deleting them.

C. Amendments to article 10.04

14. The Group asked the secretariat to contact Serbia to ask it to clarify its amendment proposals to article 10.04, para. 3, as the Group felt that the way the proposal was formulated was not sufficient to enable an informed decision.
D. Amendment to article 10.05

15. *Delete* proposed new para. (d) as the description of the categories of vessels was not exhaustive. Moreover, an exhaustive description would make the text too extensive. The Group decided not to mention any passenger vessel categories in this article as a general prohibition to discharge waste is already stated in article 10.4, para. 1.

E. Amendments to article 10.06

16. *Replace* the words “conforming to the model” *with* “contained” in para. 1.

17. *Delete* the words “a competent official of the” in para. 2.

F. Amendments to article 10.07

18. The group asked the secretariat to rephrase para. 1.

19. The group asked the secretariat to propose a different wording for para. 2, subparagraph (a), which would make it clear that the two vessels should be secured together tightly to avoid any movement during bunkering.

20. The Group asked Austria to provide a draft annex 11 referred to in para. 3.

21. *Delete* “and phone connection between the vessel and filling station” from para. 3, subparagraph (a).

22. *Delete* the second sentence from para. 3, subparagraph (a’).

23. The group asked the secretariat to check and propose a new wording for “venting” or “evacuation of air”.

24. The group decided to revert to considering chapter 10 from article 10.07, para. 4 onward at its next meeting.

IV. Discussion on the amendments necessary to align CEVNI with RPNR

25. Mr. Pauli informed that the material submitted for the consideration of the forty-second session of SC.3/WP.3 in Informal document SC.3/WP.3 No. 4 (2013) was the result of the work of the CCNR working group on RPNR over a two-year period, including a number of extraordinary meetings necessary to complete the work. The group compared each article of CEVNI with RPNR and identified provisions which should be changed in each instrument in order to align them.

26. Mr. Pauli advised that inconsistencies had been identified between the English and French versions of CEVNI 4. As French was a working language of CCNR, DC and MC, the Group felt that it was of the utmost importance to ascertain that the French version of CEVNI is equivalent to the English.

27. The Group asked the secretariat to draft amendment proposals to CEVNI in English, French and Russian based on the tables prepared by CCNR, and submit them for consideration of the CEVNI Expert Group at its twentieth meeting in June 2013. CCNR would be ready to comment on its proposals during CEVNI Expert Group meetings.

28. Finally, the Group felt that if CEVNI 5 could become a core instrument, national/regional rules being appended to it, a mechanism should be found to update the four language versions simultaneously, including the German version finalized by a joint CCNR/UNECE working group, and to ensure continued consistency between CEVNI and the related navigation rules on regional basins.
V. Next meeting

29. The CEVNI Expert Group agreed on the following preliminary date for its next meeting:

        24-25 June 2013  Twentieth meeting of the CEVNI Expert Group.