

Distr.: Restricted
12 October 2011
English
Original: Russian

Working Party on Inland Water Transport

Fifty-fifth session

Geneva, 12–14 October 2011

Item 7 (b) of the provisional agenda

Standardization of technical and safety requirements in inland navigation:

Recommendations on Harmonized Europe-Wide Technical

Requirements for Inland Navigation Vessels (Resolution No. 61)

Comments on the amendments to Resolution No. 61

Submitted by the Russian Federation

Note by the secretariat

Presented below is the response to the comments of Ukraine, contained in Informal document No. 3, submitted by the Russian Federation and prepared in consultation with the members of the Group of Volunteers on Resolution No.61.

1. Regarding Definition No. 1, "Craft", the amendment may be accepted for Russian text. In English text the amendment does not need to be introduced, if we use the general approach already applied in the definitions when agreeing English and Russian versions. So here we can consider the amendment for Russian version only.
2. Concerning Definitions Nos. 5, 6 and 7 ("Motor vessel", "Motor tanker" and "Motor cargo vessel"), the proposed amendments do not make any changes in the meaning of these definitions but change the way of their presentation. Regarding this fact the Group of Volunteers on Resolution No. 61 considers that way of presentation of these terms in Resolution No. 61 does not interfere with their meaning, either in the form used in the Directive or as proposed in the paper. As the purpose of introducing these amendments to the Resolution is harmonization with the definitions used in the Directive, it could be reasonable to maintain the style applied in the Directive. Other important matter is the reasonability of using the same definitions in a number of UNECE documents. As an example, the submitted document refers to the definition of tanker used in ADN. This matter, in particular, was discussed at 5th meeting of the Group. The Group expressed the opinion that such approach may not be reasonable in some cases when the purposes of the documents are different, and this fact is realized through the definitions. Therefore, we consider that this proposal should not be retained.

3. Concerning the term “small craft”, it is not generally used in the Resolution except the definition of high-speed vessel and section 10-2.1 as regards the length of gangways on small vessels. As far as the scope of application of Resolution No. 61 covers vessels having a length of 20 m and over, it seems non-reasonable to add this definition to the Resolution as the definition of small craft in CEVNI is sufficient for this purpose.

4. Concerning definition of "Recreational craft", the proposal, in fact, is to assign the minimal length of 20 m in the existing definition. Chapter 21 has the definition of recreational craft already. At the same time the scope of application of the Resolution includes vessels having a length of 20 m and over. Furthermore, the definition of pleasure craft used in Resolution No. 13 aligns with that proposed by the Group of Volunteers:

“1. b) the term "pleasure craft" means any sailing craft or motorized craft used for purposes of recreation and not financial gain”.

The Definition used in Directive 94/25/EC does not align with the provisions of Chapter 21 since it reads as follows:

“3. (a) ‘recreational craft’: any boat of any type intended for sports and leisure purposes of hull length from 2,5 m to 24 m, measured according to the harmonized standard, regardless of the means of propulsion; the fact that the same boat could be used for charter or for recreational boating training shall not prevent it being covered by this Directive when it is placed on the Community market for recreational purposes;”

5. Concerning Definition No. 67 "Freeboard", the Group has the opinion to follow the simple definition of the Directive:

~~Freeboard (f)”: is the vertical distance measured amidships between the upper edge of the deck line as defined in paragraph 4 4.1.1 and the maximum draught level the distance between the plane of maximum draught and a parallel plane passing through the lowest point of the gunwale or, in the absence of a gunwale, the lowest point of the upper edge of the craft’s side.~~

If the Working Party decides to consider other variants, the following proposal submitted by the Russian Federation could be used (using the existing text of Resolution No. 61):

~~“Freeboard (F)”: is the vertical distance measured amidships between the upper edge of the deck line as defined in paragraph 4 4.1.1 and the maximum draught level the distance between the plane of maximum draught and a parallel plane passing through the lowest point of the gunwale or, in the absence of a gunwale, the lowest point of the upper edge of the ship’s side~~ **where the outward projection of the upper surface of the freeboard deck intersects the external surface of the gunwale at the midsection.**

6. Definition No. 132 introduces the term “collective life-saving appliances”. When assigning the norms of supplying a vessel with collective life-saving appliances the total number of them can include also ship’s boats which comply with the requirements set for lifeboats, so the Group deems it necessary to leave the existing definition as it is. Moreover, this definition is a part to the actual text of the Resolution, and no proposals have been made earlier for amending it.