



**Economic and Social  
Council**

Distr.  
GENERAL

TRANS/SC.3/2000/8/Add.1  
9 August 2000

ENGLISH  
Original: RUSSIAN

---

**ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE**  
INLAND TRANSPORT COMMITTEE  
Working Party on Inland Water Transport  
(Forty-fourth session, 17-19 October 2000,  
agenda item 5)

**EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION ON MEASURES AIMED AT PROMOTING  
TRANSPORT BY INLAND WATERWAYS**

**Annex I**

**Submitted by the Government of Ukraine**

1. The delegation of Ukraine supports the idea that the Inland Transport Committee of the Economic Commission for Europe (ECE) should adopt a resolution on the promotion of inland water transport, the draft of which is contained in document TRANS/SC.3/1999/14.
2. At the same time, it suggests the following modifications to the draft resolution.
3. The joint Programme of Action, annexed to the Vienna Declaration adopted by the Regional Conference on Transport and the Environment in November 1997, forms an inalienable part of the Vienna Declaration. Accordingly, the preambular part of the resolution should cite both documents when recalling the Vienna Declaration, as follows (at the end of the recital): "... (Vienna, 12-14 November 1997, documents ECE/RCTE/CONF.2/Final and ECE/RCTE/CONF.3/Final)".
4. Given the particular importance of cooperation between the Danube Commission and the relevant European countries in the framework of the transport infrastructure needs assessment (TINA) programme to create and develop pan-European transport corridor VII (river Danube), the preamble to the resolution should contain a reference to the document which

may have been adopted on the issue by the time the resolution is considered by the Inland Transport Committee at a forthcoming session. This document will most likely be a memorandum of understanding, prepared with the participation of the TINA secretariat, on the development of pan-European transport corridor VII (river Danube), which will be submitted for signature by the ministries of transport of the Danube States and other relevant countries.

5. The wording of the preambular recital beginning with the words “*Being aware at the same time* of the important [...]” should be further clarified.

6. We believe that the following wording would be more consistent and precise at the beginning of that recital: “*Being aware at the same time* of the important obstacles encountered by inland navigation operators in international traffic caused by differences in the infrastructure and technical parameters of waterways, the legal and administrative regulation and organization of traffic and the fact that there is still no unique regime of navigation on the E waterway [...]” (continue as in the original).

7. In point 1 of the article beginning with the word “*Requests*”, the phrase “lead to the establishment of a unique technical and safety regime of navigation throughout the E waterways network” should be replaced by the following wording, which would appear to be more correct: “lead to the standardization of the technical and safety requirements for navigation throughout the E waterways network”.

8. The amendment of the annex to resolution 17, revised, and the European Code for Inland Waterways (CEVNI) has, for some considerable time, been the focus of attention by Working Party SC.3/WP.3. The review and improvement of the two documents in question form an inseparable exercise, at least for the foreseeable future. For that reason, the beginning of point 1 (“to accelerate its work on the revisions of the Recommendations [...]”) does not reflect reality. The text should rather refer to improving the system for reviewing documents under consideration, as the Ukrainian delegation has already pointed out during sessions of Working Party SC.3/WP.3.

9. Accordingly, we suggest the following opening for point 1: “to consider the possibility of improving its work to review the Recommendation [...]”.

10. Ukraine supports the view expressed by the representative of the Netherlands at the forty-third session of Working Party SC.3 to the effect that point 2 of the article “Invites” is superfluous, since Working Party SC.3 does not have to monitor the self-evident process of implementation of the European Agreement on Main Inland Waterways of International Importance (AGN) by the States parties to the Agreement.

11. The “Blue book” contains a list of all the bottlenecks and missing links which European Governments considered it necessary to identify. Accordingly, we do not understand the need for point 3 of the article “Requests”.

12. If all that is meant is a transcription of the list of bottlenecks and missing links from the “Blue book”, the exercise would appear to be unnecessary.

13. The only worthwhile exercise is to analyse this list so as to assess how consistent it is with the task of developing in Europe a unified network of inland waterways, which should be reflected in the draft resolution. We therefore suggest that the following text be inserted in the middle of point 3: “[...] with a view to assessing the extent to which this inventory is consistent with the task of developing in Europe a unified network of inland waterways and drawing the attention of Governments [...]”.

14. The end of point 4 of this section of the resolution could be reworded thus: “[...] to all inland navigation operators from States concerned with the arrangements”, provided the words “originating from” do not have some other meaning (which?).

15. Point 1 of the article “Invites” is too mandatory in force vis-à-vis Governments. A more acceptable wording would be: “whose States have not yet become parties to the AGN Agreement as well as to the Protocol on Combined Transport on Inland Waterways to the AGTC Agreement to consider the possibility of acceding to the AGN Agreement and to the Protocol”.

16. Since the taking of steps aimed at the implementation of the provisions of the Agreement is a self-evident obligation of its States parties, point 2 of the article “Invites” is redundant. In this respect, the position of the delegation of the Netherlands at the forty-third session of Working Party SC.3 (document TRANS/SC.3/151, para. 18), could be accepted.

17. By the time the resolution in question is adopted at a session of the Inland Transport Committee, there may no longer be any need to include point 3, on the restoration of navigation on the Yugoslav section of the Danube, or it might be necessary to reword the point in accordance with the actual situation at the time the resolution is adopted.

18. Vessel-owners often encounter problems not only with frontier controls, but also with other types of control (such as phytosanitary, etc.) in international traffic on inland waterways. Accordingly, we suggest the following rewording in point 4 of the article “Invites”: “[...] the frontier control and other types of control [...]”.

19. The implication of the last sentence of the draft resolution is that Working Party SC.3 is responsible for monitoring implementation of the resolution. We have already given our views on this interpretation of the functions of Working Party SC.3 (see paragraph 6 above). Accordingly, we suggest the following wording for the last sentence of the resolution: “*Asks* the Working Party on Inland Water Transport to report to the Inland Transport Committee on progress in implementing the resolution”.

20. In this context, an indication could be given of the frequency of such reports to the Inland Transport Committee - whether yearly, once every two years, etc. This should be subject to approval at the forty-fourth session of Working Party SC.3.

-----