

Distr.: Restricted  
11 February 2013

English only

---

## **Working Party on Inland Water Transport**

### **Working Party on the Standardization of Technical and Safety Requirements in Inland Navigation**

#### **Forty-second session**

Geneva, 13–15 February 2013

Item 3 (a) of the provisional agenda

#### **Inland waterway infrastructure: European Agreement on Main Inland Waterways of International Importance (AGN)**

### **Revision of Annex IV to the AGN**

**Transmitted by Belgium, Bulgaria, Hungary, the Russian Federation and Switzerland**

#### **Belgium**

Concerning paragraph 3 (a) of AGN, Belgium would like to comment as follows on the draft annex IV:

- The annex should provide a framework and reflect the general requirements (procedures, technical measures, etc.) for an adequate protection of inland waterway infrastructure, rather than detailed technical requirements.
- Attention should be paid to the fact that not all inland ports are situated on a well outlined geographical area. A number of transshipment areas can be grouped and regarded as an inland port (cfr. TEN-T network inland ports).
- The term ‘port’ used in the annex IV should be well defined and restricted, keeping the aforementioned in mind.
- The IMO-guidelines for seaports should in this respect not be used as a model for the requirements for inland ports.
- The guidelines should focus principally on port security and provisions of general character for the network and not on individual infrastructures such as bridges and locks.

#### **Bulgaria**

Bulgaria supports the adoption of a new annex IV to AGN. Bulgaria has undertaken steps towards strengthening transport security in its national legislation.

## **Hungary**

General remarks:

- Hungary is concerned that the draft annex IV to AGN is difficult to understand in respect of inland waterways and contains too general provisions, therefore causing enforcement difficulties.
- Hungary agrees that the future Annex IV should not impose on Contracting Parties to the AGN any rigid and strict requirements of a technical nature, taking into account that the operation of the Schengen Information System also reduces the risk of terrorism.

Remarks related to specific paragraphs:

- Concerning paragraph 4, Hungary considers it worth carrying out a risk analysis before the introduction of the proposed measures.
- Concerning paragraph 6, Hungary considers it worth classifying ports according to their significance, and based on the classification differentiate between security assessment carried out the state and security assessment carried out by the port operator.

## **Russian Federation**

The Russian Federation would like to advise that the issue of security on inland water transport in the Russian Federation is regulated by the Federal Law No. 16-Φ3 of 9 February 2007 «Concerning Transport Security». The Russian Federation believes the draft annex IV should be supplemented with the standards from the Law «Concerning Transport Security».

## **Switzerland**

Switzerland regards the protection of inland navigation networks as a high priority issue. However, Switzerland believes that the future annex IV should not impose rigid prescriptions of technical nature on Contracting Parties. It should rather contain framework provisions of general nature.

---