

**Questions by the secretariat regarding TRANS/SC.3/144/Rev.1**

Germany

1. Link Mittellandkanal – Elbe – Havel, should not we delete the bottleneck from TRANS/SC.3/144/Rev.1 and TRANS/SC.3/159? Is the presentation of Rothensee and Hohenwathe locks in the Blue book correct (locks on E 70 waterway)?
2. What about the old Rothensee ship lift, is it still operable? If yes, should not we mention it in the Blue book together with the Rothensee Lock for the Mittelland-Elb Link?

Netherlands

3. Netherlands should transmit data for the Blue book concerning the new E waterway Lekkanaal (E 11-02) including the Beatrix lock dimensions.

Romania

4. Check the kilometrage for Romanian ports: Calarasi, Galati and for locks on the Danube – Black Sea Canal. In the data received from the Romanian Government there are divergent data (Calarasi, Danube 370,0 km and 94 km; Galati, Danube 150 km and 160 km, etc.)
5. Data on the Danube – Black Sea Canal are divergent; Length – 183/296 and 138.3/296 m. Beam – 16.80/23.50 and 16.80/22.80. Which data are correct?
6. New E port suggested on E 80-14 (Basarabi), should it be included into the amendments to AGN? If Basarabi is to be included into the AGN then the numbering could be as suggested by Romania, i.e. Basarabi as P 80-14-3 and Constanta as 80-14-4. If not, then Basarabi should be marked as P 80-14-02bis, since it is the port of Constanta who is now numbered in AGN as P 80-14-03.
7. Is there a reserve lock at Iron Gates II as it is indicated in the Blue book?

United Kingdom

8. Should not we include UK inland waterways as reflected in 144/Rev.1 into the amendments to AGN?

Slovakia

9. Lock chambers at Gabčíkovo, is their length 280m (as in 144/Rev.1) or 275 m (as in current publication of the Blue book)? Romanians sent a paper showing that they are 280m long and may accommodate convoys of up to 275 m. Is it correct?
10. The River Vah between Komarno and Selice was suggested to be classified as class VIc as a target value but its dimensions are 22.80/230 m which corresponds to class VIb (as indicated in 144/Rev.1). Is it OK?

## Hungary

11. There are no data for the length and width of vessels and convoys on the section of the Danube between Szob and Budapest? If there are really no restrictions for horizontal dimensions of convoys, should not this section be considered then as class VII or at least VIc and not class VIb as it stands now, similarly to the upstream Slovak section to make the whole stretch homogeneous? The same section has no indication for the height under bridges. May be there are no bridges on that section at all and no restrictions? Should not we say so then “no restrictions”?

-----