



**Economic and Social
Council**

Distr.
GENERAL

TRANS/SC.3/WP.3/2005/5/Add.1
24 March 2005

ENGLISH
Original: RUSSIAN

ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE

INLAND TRANSPORT COMMITTEE

Working Party on Inland Water Transport

Working Party on the Standardization of Technical
and Safety Requirements in Inland Navigation
(Twenty-ninth session, 7-9 June 2005, agenda item 4)

**FURTHER UPDATING OF THE EUROPEAN CODE FOR
INLAND WATERWAYS (CEVNI)**

Addendum 1

Transmitted by the Government of the Russian Federation

* * *

Chapter 1

1. With regard to whether high-speed vessels in the displacement position should continue to be considered as such, especially in relation to other vessels in terms of chapter 6 of CEVNI, we believe that, although this is a topical issue, we should take our time in considering it. More in-depth consideration is required.
2. In our view, the term “high-speed vessel” should, in any case, be retained in CEVNI, while any provisions concerning high-speed vessels in the displacement position should be incorporated not into the definition but into the text of the relevant article.
3. We think that article 1.01 may be supplemented with the new term “safe speed”, as is currently the case with the Danube Commission regulations.

Chapter 6

4. With regard to the editorial suggestions of the Danube Commission regarding article 6.02, paragraph 2, and article 6.01 bis, which appear in paragraph 7 of TRANS/SC.3/WP.3/56, we think that we can agree with these suggestions if, in principle, everyone agrees that small-size craft passing through a channel would be able to react in some way to the movement of a high-speed vessel.

5. In the Russian Federation, a high-speed vessel is not required to give way to small-size craft. The Rules governing inland navigation in the Russian Federation contain provisions which strictly define the movement of small-size craft: “Small-size craft shall remain outside the limits of the channel or of the prescribed traffic lanes. Where waterway conditions make this impossible, they may proceed along the channel within 10 m of its right-hand edge; in doing so, they shall not hamper other vessels’ movement or manoeuvring in the channel and shall let them pass in good time without the exchange of sound or visual signals. Small-size craft may not require other vessels to give way to them.”

6. We can agree with the amendments to the text of article 6.07, proposed by the Danube Commission, with regard to the procedure to be followed when meeting in narrow channels (see TRANS/SC.3/WP.3/2004/15, para. 6) and the introduction of a new sign A.4.1 (see TRANS/SC.3/WP.3/2004/15, para. 9), as well as the proposals of Ukraine regarding reformulation of the titles of articles 6.30 and 6.32 of CEVNI (see TRANS/SC.3/WP.3/2004/14/Add.1, paras. 27 and 29).

Addenda 4 and 5

7. With regard to the issue of developing uniform requirements for navigation lights of sea and river vessels (see TRANS/SC.3/WP.3/56, para. 18), please note that, at present, the requirements of classification societies of the Russian Federation for sea and river vessels differ. While supporting the desire to standardize technical requirements for sea and river vessels, we think that, in the framework of Working Group SC.3/WP.3, this issue should be considered purely as one that needs to be studied. Experts are currently studying document TRANS/SC.3/2004/18.
