



**Economic and Social
Council**

Distr.
GENERAL

TRANS/SC.3/WP.3/2002/15
5 March 2002

ENGLISH
Original: RUSSIAN

ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE

INLAND TRANSPORT COMMITTEE

Working Party on the Standardization of Technical
and Safety Requirements in Inland Navigation
(Twenty-fourth session, 5-7 June 2002)
Agenda item 3

UPDATING THE EUROPEAN CODE FOR INLAND WATERWAYS (CEVNI)

Submitted by the secretariat of the Danube Commission

Note: The secretariat reproduces below the proposals of the Danube Commission regarding possible amendments to the European Code for Inland Waterways (CEVNI) as set out in document TRANS/SC.3/115/Rev.2. The proposals were submitted in response to a request made by the Working Party in document TRANS/SC.3/WP.3/44, paragraphs 6, 17, 19 and 20, and concern chapters 1, 4 and 6 of CEVNI.

1. The Danube Commission held a meeting on navigation issues on 6-7 November 2001 and 5-7 February 2002, devoted primarily to consideration of proposals from its member States and secretariat to bring the Basic Provisions relating to Navigation on the Danube (DFND) into line with the European Code for Inland Waterways (CEVNI) in response to the latest resolutions by the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe. The result of its efforts was to bring DFND into closer harmony with the corresponding European regulations.

2. The following DFND provisions were reformulated: 1.04; 1.08; 1.15; 1.20; 3.26; 3.40; 4.04; 4.05; 6.32; 9.08. Some were modified or replaced: 3.03; 3.07; 6.16; 6.17; 7.08; 9.03. The following are now fully consonant with the corresponding CEVNI provisions: 1.03; 1.08; 1.15; 1.20; 3.03; 3.07; 6.16; 6.17; 9.04. Additions were also made to DFND annexes 1, 6 and 7.

3. In response to the invitation from the Working Party to Governments and river commissions contained in the report of the Working Party on its twenty-second session (TRANS/SC.3/WP.3/44), the Danube Commission secretariat offers below its proposals for amendments to certain articles of CEVNI.

Article 1.07

4. As a new subparagraph 4 to this article, the Commission secretariat suggests using the corresponding provision of DFND, which reads as follows:

“4. Furthermore, the stability of vessels carrying containers shall be checked before departure in the following cases:

(a) Vessels with a beam of less than 9.5 m, loaded with more than one tier of containers;

(b) Vessels with a beam of 9.5 m or more, loaded with more than two tiers of containers;

(c) Vessels with a beam of 11 m or more, loaded with more than three tiers of containers or more than three containers across;

(d) Vessels with a beam of 15 m or more, loaded with more than three tiers of containers.”

5. It should be pointed out that subparagraph 4 of this DFND provision has long been in use, but sub-subparagraph (d) was approved by the Danube Commission at its session in April this year.

6. The addition of sub-subparagraph (d) was necessitated by the fact that Ro-Ro and non-self-propelled pontoon vessels with a beam of over 11 m for transporting containers, trailers and other large-scale cargoes have long operated on the Danube. The use of the sub-subparagraph thus worded avoids unnecessary procedures.

7. There is no provision in DFND for the use of periscope-type optical devices. For the most part, radar equipment is used. The Danube Commission feels that there is not sufficient justification for incorporating a reference to equipment such as periscopes in subparagraph 2 of this article.

Article 1.08

8. This provision has been brought into line with CEVNI, but the wording of subparagraph 2 has been improved:

“2. All vessels, except vessels in a pushed convoy other than the pusher, shall have a crew sufficient in number and sufficiently skilled to ensure the safety of those on board and safe navigation. However, non-motorized vessels in a side-by-side formation and some of the towed vessels in a rigid group are not required to have a crew **if the vessel propelling the side-by-side formation or rigid group, or keeping it safely stopped, has a crew** sufficiently large and skilled to ensure the safety of those on board and safe navigation.”

9. The new wording of this provision is due to be approved at the sixtieth session of the Danube Commission in April 2002. It is suggested that the same wording should be taken into consideration for CEVNI article 1.08.

Article 1.09

10. The wording of this article in DFND and CEVNI as currently drafted is the same. The Danube Commission secretariat believes that further discussion is needed on the new subparagraph 4 proposed by the Netherlands, which should be finalized only when work on drafting this article or amending a whole series of others to incorporate more specific language on high-speed vessels has been completed by the Danube Commission and ECE. At present it is the competent authorities in the Danube countries themselves who decide what qualifications crew members, including boatmasters, need, and how those qualifications should be documented. Qualification documents issued by the competent authorities of one country are recognized by the competent authorities of other Danube countries.

11. On the question of “high-speed vessels”, the Working Party should agree on a single term that can be adopted by both commissions and incorporated into article 1.01. The Danube Commission sees no need for a special list of high-speed vessels. One possible solution might be a footnote to the term “high-speed vessel” if the term is added to article 1.01.

12. The Danube Commission agrees that it is inappropriate to continue to use the term “scintillating light”.

13. The proposed marking for high-speed vessels - two bright yellow rapidly flashing lights - is acceptable.

14. High-speed vessels represent a particular danger to people in the waterway by accident, private, slow-moving craft and migratory animals crossing waterways. The Danube Commission

believes that a limit must be put on the visibility “dead zone” directly ahead of such vessels’ bows. For example, the stretch of water ahead of the vessel obscured from view while the vessel gathers enough speed to rise on its hydrofoils should not exceed 100 m, or 50 m while the vessel is “flying” at full speed or on an even keel. These figures are indicative and open to discussion. Tests will have to be conducted to arrive at a definite solution, and it would also be helpful to have an exchange of experiences among people skilled in the operation of such vessels.

15. High-speed vessels operate on the Danube only in daylight. Any possibility of operation at other times must be strictly associated with the quality of the electronic and radar navigation equipment they carry on board. In that event, it could be left to the competent authorities in the country (or countries sharing a stretch of the river) concerned to decide whether high-speed vessels may operate, depending on local navigation conditions.

Article 4.05

16. There does not appear to be any need to limit the use of radar as the wording of subparagraph 1 put forward by the Netherlands would require. Vessels can use radar whenever it is convenient for them to do so. This is, indeed, what happens in practice. Subject to adoption at the April session of the Danube Commission, provision 4.05 of DFND will look like this:

“Radar

1. Vessels are considered to be navigating by radar in conditions of reduced visibility only if:

(a) They are equipped with a radar set suitable for inland navigation and a rate-of-turn indicator. These instruments must be in good working order and correspond to standard production models of the equipment approved by the competent authorities with due regard for navigation safety.

Ferry-boats not moving independently need not be fitted with a rate-of-turn indicator;

(b) They are equipped with an acoustic device for emitting the three-tone signal referred to in provision 1.01, subparagraph 24. This requirement shall not apply to small craft and ferry-boats not moving independently;

(c) There is a person on board in possession of a certificate of entitlement to navigate by radar corresponding to the recommendations of the Danube Commission, or other equivalent document.

In addition, small craft must be equipped with a radiotelephone for vessel-to-vessel communication in good working order.

2. In the case of towed convoys and side-by-side formations, paragraph 1 above shall apply only to the vessel the boatmaster is aboard.”

17. Experts from the Danube Commission countries have confirmed that acoustic devices for emitting a three-tone signal do have to be used on the Danube. Small craft should be equipped with a radiotelephone for vessel-to-vessel communication in good working order.

Article 6.16

18. A clarification in the title is recommended, to wit:

*“Article 6.16 - Harbours and tributary waterways: entering and leaving, **entering and leaving by crossing the waterway**”*

19. The second section of subparagraph 1 should be reworked as follows:

“If a vessel proceeding downstream is obliged to turn **and proceed** upstream in order to enter a harbour or tributary waterway, it shall accord priority to any vessel proceeding upstream which also wishes to enter the harbour or tributary waterway.”

[Other proposed changes to the Russian text of this paragraph do not affect the English version.]

Article 6.28

20. The Danube Commission secretariat is willing to accept the Netherlands proposal for a new paragraph (document TRANS/SC.3/WP.3/2001/14, para. 11). At the moment there is no such paragraph in provision 6.28 of DFND.

Article 6.31

21. This provision of DFND has been retained as it stands, i.e. requiring the use of the ship's bell on the Danube.

Article 6.32

22. The meeting of experts on navigation issues settled on the following wording, which is likely to be approved by the Danube Commission at its sixtieth session:

“Navigating by radar

1. Vessels are permitted to navigate by radar in conditions of reduced visibility only if a person possessing, besides a boatmaster's certificate (diploma) for navigation on the Danube of the appropriate type for the class of vessel and stretch of the river concerned, the certificate referred to in provision 4.05, subparagraph 1.1 (c), and a second person thoroughly conversant with the use of radar for navigation are in the wheelhouse at all times.

There need not be a second person constantly present in the wheelhouse if the vessel's certificate of registry or certificate indicates that the vessel is equipped for one-man radar navigation.

2. Vessels, towed and pushed convoys and side-by-side formations navigating by radar shall not be required to post a look-out in accordance with provision 6.30, paragraph 1, if the boatmaster can safely proceed on his course.

3. A vessel proceeding downstream by radar shall, as soon as echoes of vessels whose position or course could pose a danger appear on its radar screen, or when approaching a stretch where vessels not yet visible on its radar screen might be present:

(a) Emit the three-tone acoustic signal referred to in provision 4.05, subparagraph 1.1 (b), and continue to do so as often as needed. This requirement shall not apply to small craft.

(b) Reduce speed and, where necessary, stop, facing downstream, or turn.

4. A vessel proceeding upstream by radar shall, as soon as the three-tone acoustic signal referred to in subparagraph 3 (a) above is heard, or vessels whose position or course could pose a danger appear on its radar screen, or when approaching a stretch where vessels not yet visible on its radar screen might be present, shall emit the acoustic signals referred to in provision 6.33, paragraph 2, and continue to do so as many times as is necessary, and shall inform vessels proceeding downstream by radiotelephone of its class, name, direction, position (km along the river) and whether or not it is displaying the white board or white light prescribed in provision 6.04. For small craft, an indication of their class, name, direction and position (km along the river), and the side on which they are giving way, shall suffice.

All vessels proceeding downstream by radar must reply by radiotelephone, indicating their class, name, direction and position, and confirm their course or indicate the side on which they are giving way.

5. Vessels navigating by radar may overtake only after it has been agreed by radiotelephone on which side the overtaking shall take place, and provided there is sufficient channel width.

6. In the case of convoys, paragraphs 1 and 3-5 above shall apply only to the vessel the boatmaster is aboard.”

23. As regards the Ukrainian proposals on future work on the amendment of CEVNI (document TRANS/SC.3/WP.3/44, para. 19 (iii)), the Danube Commission believes that work on this topic should proceed, and the item should be kept on the agenda of Working Party SC.3/WP.3.
