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Note: The Inland Transport Committee of the Economic Commission for Europe, at its sixty-fourth session, adopted the plan of action for the implementation of decisions taken by the Pan-European Conference on Inland Water Transport, held in Rotterdam on 5 and 6 September 2001. The plan includes action to prepare, with the help of volunteer Governments concerned, proposals on the development of specific sea routes in the context of the AGN Agreement (such as: River Don-Sea of Azov-Black Sea-Dnieper-Danube; or Guadalquivir-coastal route E60-River Douro-River Gironde-River Loire-River Seine (E80), etc. These projects would have to set conditions and requirements concerning both the sea-river routes themselves (their equipment with necessary aids to navigation, obligatory use of river information services, etc.) and vessels which can be used on those routes.

We provide below a working paper prepared by experts from the Russian Federation covering various aspects of the above issue, relating to the route Don-Sea of Azov-Black Sea-Dnieper-Danube, which could serve as the basis for the initial consideration of this issue by the working group.
II. RIVER SECTIONS OF THE ROUTE

A. Lower Don, Volga-Don canal, river Volga (E90)

5. This section of inland waterways forms part of the combined deep-water network of the European part of Russia, and is navigable by all types of vessels (river-sea). Except in two sectors, a depth of 4.00 metres is ensured throughout its length.

6. There are depth limitations on the lower Don between the town of Kalach and the town of Azov, because of the reduced depth at the sill of Kochetov lock (3.60 metres), and also on the Volga, over the sector Gorodets-Nizhny Novgorod, because of the insufficient depth (3.50 metres) in the lower pond of Gorodets lock.

7. The plan dimensions of locks on the lower Don and the Volga-Don canal are 145 m x 17-18 m and, on the Volga, 290 m x 30 m.

8. Where boatmasters of river-sea vessels hold only maritime qualifications, the vessel is only allowed to proceed along the inland waterways of the Russian Federation under the guidance of river transport specialists with the necessary qualifications, or a pilot.

B. Dnieper (E40)

9. On the sea section of the Dnieper, from its mouth to the port of Kherson (28 kilometres), the maximum draught of vehicles is 8.00 metres. Over most of its length, the Dnieper is a regulated river. On the section Kherson-Kiev, there is a guaranteed depth of 3.65 metres. Locks on that section of the Dnieper measure 270 m x 18 m.

10. The procedure under which sea vessels and river-sea vessels whose boatmasters hold only maritime qualifications may sail on the Dnieper is similar to that which applies on the inland waterways of the Russian Federation.

C. Danube (E80)

11. The Danube is an international river open to navigation by the vessels of all countries. There are three routes into the Danube from the sea.

Via the Chilia arm (E80-09)

12. For almost its entire length, the Chilia arm forms the frontier between Ukraine and Romania. With an 18-kilometre section situated entirely within Ukrainian territory, comprising the Prorva sea canal and the Prorva and Ochakiv arms, the Chilia arm has been navigable for the last 40 years by vessels with a draught of up to 5 metres entering from the sea.
36. In the light of the above, where the route in question, i.e., Don-Sea of Azov-Black Sea-Dnieper-Danube, is concerned, this is clearly open to navigation by vessels in the classes “M-SP”, “M-pr” and “O-pr” during the following periods of the year, bearing in mind that the restrictions applicable to the Black Sea are more rigorous:

- Class “M-SP”: 20-mile coastal zone throughout the year;
- Class “M-pr”: 10-mile coastal zone around the Crimean peninsula from the Kerch strait to 45°N; 20-mile coastal zone in the north-eastern area of the Black Sea north of 45°N (March-November);
- Class “O-pr”: 5-mile coastal zone from the port of Odessa to the Danube breach (Prorva arm) (March-October); and 5-mile coastal zone from the port of Odessa to the port of Skadovsk (March-November).

37. Vessels in navigation class II-SP of the Russian maritime register are less restricted and are able to proceed up to 100 miles from shelter points, and vessels in class III-SP - up to 50 miles.

IV. EXISTING TYPES OF VESSELS

38. Of the vessels currently operated by the Russian river fleet, cargo vessels of the types “Sibirsky”, “Volgo-Balt”, “Amur”, “STK”, “Omsky”, “Volgoneft” and “Lenanef” belong to classes “M-SP” and “M-pr” of the Russian river register (see table 1 below).

39. Some vessels with Russian maritime register classes are also operated in combined river-sea navigation, namely, those of the types “Sormovsky”, “Baltisky”, “Morskoy”, “Volga”, “Ladoga” and “Volgo-Don”.

40. The following table sets out the main specifications for vehicles in the river-sea navigation class of the Russian river register and the Ukrainian navigation register:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vessel specifications</th>
<th>Sibirsky</th>
<th>Volgo-</th>
<th>Slavutich</th>
<th>Amur</th>
<th>STK</th>
<th>Volgoneft</th>
<th>Lenanef</th>
<th>Volgo-Don</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Displacement (tons)</td>
<td>5 536/6 141*</td>
<td>4 420</td>
<td>4 533</td>
<td>5 013.0</td>
<td>2 700.0</td>
<td>6 984.3</td>
<td>3 680.4</td>
<td>6 517/6 923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cargo capacity (tons)</td>
<td>3 245/3 850</td>
<td>2 900</td>
<td>3 120</td>
<td>2 900</td>
<td>1 314.0</td>
<td>4 620.0</td>
<td>2 100.0</td>
<td>4 544/4 950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length (m)</td>
<td>129.5</td>
<td>114.0</td>
<td>108.1</td>
<td>115.8</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>137.8</td>
<td>122.8</td>
<td>138.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vessel specifications</th>
<th>Sibirsky</th>
<th>Volgo-Balt</th>
<th>Slavutich</th>
<th>Amur</th>
<th>STK</th>
<th>Volgoneft</th>
<th>Lenaneft</th>
<th>Volgo-Don</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beam (m)</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draught at maximum load (m)</td>
<td>3.2/3.55</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.33/3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed fully laden (knots)</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* In sea water.

41. In its report on the standardization of ships and inland waterways for river-sea navigation (document TRANS/SC.3/WP.3/1999/21), the Permanent International Association of Navigational Congresses (PIANC) recommended the following classes of vessels:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>River-sea class</th>
<th>Maximum permissible dimensions of vessels</th>
<th>Air clearance (m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Length (m)</td>
<td>Beam (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

42. In fact, the Russian and Ukrainian vessel types listed above correspond fairly closely to those suggested by PIANC, although a draught of 4.5 metres is unacceptable for the inland waterways along the route in question.

43. At the same time, most of the river-sea vessels operated in the Russian Federation and Ukraine do not fully comply with all the height and draught limitations on certain waterways along the route of the future waterway ring around Europe.

44. Accordingly, there is a need to develop new types of river-sea vessels with dimensions that meet the requirements for navigation both along the combined deep-water network of the European part of Russia and the Dnieper, and along the Rhine-Main-Danube route.

V. TECHNICAL ASPECTS

45. Existing and new types of river-sea vessels, operating along coastal routes, could be exempted from a number of excessively stringent requirements of the International Convention on Safety of Life at Sea (SOLAS) which are not always justified, since river-sea vessels are already subject to a number of restrictions relating to navigational areas, wave height, etc.