



**Economic and Social  
Council**

Distr.  
GENERAL

TRANS/SC.3/WP.3/2004/16  
26 March 2004

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-eighth session, 8-10 June 2004,  
agenda item 4)

**RADAR INSTALLATIONS AND RATE-OF-TURN INDICATORS**

**Transmitted by the Governments of Belarus  
and the Russian Federation**

Note: Reproduced below are the proposals of Belarus and the Russian Federation regarding draft annex 10 to the European Code for Inland Waterways (CEVNI), “General technical specifications applicable to radar equipment”, as set out in document TRANS/SC.3/2003/5.

## **BELARUS**

1. It is proposed that, in paragraph 1.1, the maximum range of detection of shore 60 m high (with the antenna at a height of 10 m) be changed from 37,000 m to 32,000 m, which would be consistent with the regulations of the Russian River Register.
2. The proposal of Ukraine concerning the installation of the antenna 7 m above water level (instead of 10 m, as indicated in the document) could be incorporated into a footnote as a possible alternative.
3. Ukraine's proposal as set out in footnote 7 of document TRANS/SC.3/2003/5 for the effective diameter of screen indicators to depend on a vessel's gross register tonnage is acceptable; this would help to avoid excessive expenditure on the acquisition of apparatus with outsize screens.

## **RUSSIAN FEDERATION**

### **Comment on footnote 1 of TRANS/SC.3/2003/5**

4. For vessels operated on large lakes, reservoirs and in coastal waters, it makes sense to maintain the maximum range of radar detection at a maximum range scale corresponding to 32,000 m.
5. For vessels operated on rivers, the comment of Germany summarized in footnote 1 may be endorsed.

### **Footnote 2**

6. The proposal of Ukraine seems acceptable. It is suggested that the specification be supplemented by the following provision: **“Where the antenna is installed 7 m above water level, the maximum range of detection required of an antenna installed at a height of 10 m should be ensured”**.

### **Footnote 3**

7. It is proposed that the text of the document be left unchanged.

### **Footnote 4**

8. The angular resolution is directly related to the size of the antenna (width of directional pattern). It is quite difficult and sometimes impossible to install large antennas on vessels with a small displacement while observing all safety requirements, but the lack of a radar installation on vessels with a small displacement would substantially reduce the safety of shipping.

### **Footnote 5**

9. It is proposed that the existing wording of the document be retained.

**Footnote 6**

10. The accuracy of measurement of bearings and the angular resolution are interrelated values; enhancing the former means increasing the size of the antenna and the angular resolution of the radar screen monitor. It would be reasonable to leave the text as it stands.

**Footnote 7**

11. Effective diameter of screen. The proposal of Ukraine can be accepted.

**Footnote 8**

12. The set of range scales is not an important parameter in determining radar effectiveness, provided that all technical specifications are met. It is suggested that the proposal of Germany be followed and that it should be left to the competent national authorities to define range scales.

**Footnote 10**

13. Since the present requirements also apply, inter alia, to vessels operated in marine coastal areas, it would be expedient to maintain the transmission frequencies indicated in TRANS/SC.3/2003/5.

**Footnote 11**

14. The minimum antenna speed indicated in TRANS/SC.3/2003/5 - “**18 revolutions per minute**” - can be accepted.

**Footnote 12**

15. The proposals of Ukraine can be accepted.

-----