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Comments to the Draft Second Revision of the Guidelines to Resolution No. 40

Transmitted by Belgium

1. Belgium has transmitted the following comments related to the draft second revision of the Guidelines to Resolution No. 40, prepared by the Informal Working Group on Recreational Navigation (ECE/TRANS/SC.3/2022/11), as given below.

2. The scope of application envisaged by resolution No. 40 is clear and limited to following groups:
   - Their own nationals or residents, or
   - The nationals of any North American country, or
   - Any country that is not a member of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe.

Belgium has the opinion that an extension of the scope of application cannot be done through the Guidelines to resolution No. 40. In case the Working Party on the Standardization of Technical and Safety Requirements in Inland Navigation (SC.3/WP.3) agrees that the scope of application should be extended, this should be done by amending the resolution itself.

3. As referred to in paragraph 30 of the draft second revision of the Guidelines to Resolution No. 40, this extension of the scope of application could lead to issues related to the recognition of the International Certificate for Operators of Pleasure Craft (ICC), as some countries do not allow their nationals and residents to evidence their competence with a certificate issued in another country.

4. It is unclear what is envisaged when it is stated in the draft second revision of the Guidelines to Resolution No. 40 that the resolution may be applied “more widely than was envisaged”. It is necessary to have a clear view on the need for this proposed extension of the scope of application, the cases which are intended by this proposal, together with the advantages, disadvantages and risks. Belgium considers this as a fundamental question and supposes that an explanatory note from the Informal Working Group on Recreational Navigation addressing those issues could help to clarify this issue at the next session of SC.3/WP.3.