



Economic and Social Council

Distr.: General
3 October 2019

Original: English

Economic Commission for Europe

Inland Transport Committee

Working Party on Intermodal Transport and Logistics

Sixty-second session

Geneva, 30 October–1 November 2019

Item 4 (b) of the provisional agenda

Protocol on Combined Transport on Inland Waterways to the AGTC

Agreement: Amendment proposals

Differences between the Protocol on Combined Transport on Inland Waterways to the European Agreement on Important International Combined Transport Lines and Related Installations (AGTC) of 1991 and the European Agreement on Main Inland Waterways of International Importance

Note of the secretariat*

I. Mandate

1. This document was prepared at the request of the Working Party on Intermodal Transport and Logistics (WP.24) at its sixty-first session to establish the differences between the Protocol on Combined Transport on Inland Waterways to the European Agreement on Important International Combined Transport Lines and Related Installations (AGTC) of 1991 (AGTC Protocol) and the European Agreement on Main Inland Waterways of International Importance (AGN Agreement) with regard to waterways and ports included in both agreements.
2. This document refers to ECE/TRANS/SC.3/2015/3- ECE/TRANS/WP.24/2015/12 that established differences between AGTC Protocol and AGN Agreement following amendments to AGN Agreement as introduced by ECE/TRANS/SC.3/168/Add.1, ECE/TRANS/SC.3/174/Add.1, ECE/TRANS/SC.3/181/Add.1 and ECE/TRANS/SC.3/193/Add.1.
3. This document further refers to ECE/TRANS/SC.3/2017/3. The latter provides the accepted amendments to AGN Agreement and which are considered in this document to identify further differences to those specified in ECE/TRANS/SC.3/2015/3- ECE/TRANS/WP.24/2015/12 between AGTC Protocol and AGN Agreement.

* The present document was submitted after the deadline in order to reflect the most recent developments.

II. Differences presented in ECE/TRANS/SC.3/2015/3– ECE/TRANS/WP.24/2015/12

4. ECE/TRANS/SC.3/2015/3–ECE/TRANS/WP.24/2015/12 presented the following differences:

(a) Absence of the term “trunk” in AGN Agreement. The term “trunk” has been replaced with the term “main” in the introductory text of the annex concerning the numbering of inland waterways of international importance following an accepted amendment to the AGN Agreement;

(b) Availability of additional waterways suitable for combined transport in the AGN Agreement following the amendments accepted to the AGN Agreement;

(c) Availability of additional ports in the AGN Agreement following the amendments accepted to the AGN Agreement. Differently to the waterways, the information on suitability of these ports for combined transport has not been established in ECE/TRANS/SC.3/2015/3– ECE/TRANS/WP.24/2015/12. Such information can be however deduced from ECE/TRANS/SC.3/144/Rev.3 (Blue Book, the Table 3);

(d) Changes to description of ports referred both in AGN Agreement and the AGTC Protocol following the amendments accepted to the AGN Agreement.

5. WP.24, at its fifty eighth session, considered the analysis of differences provided in ECE/TRANS/SC.3/2015/3–ECE/TRANS/WP.24/2015/12 and agreed to approve the updating of the AGTC Protocol to ensure it remains in line with the AGN Agreement. Furthermore, it asked the secretariat to transmit these amendments to the depository in New York.

6. At the same time, the actual changes to be made following the accepted amendment proposals resulting from ECE/TRANS/SC.3/2015/3–ECE/TRANS/WP.24/2015/12 and adopted by WP.24 are not clearly listed. It would thus be helpful to rectify this, so as to establish a common understating of the agreed amendments.

7. To this end, the following clarification is proposed:

(a) regarding the terms “trunk” versus “main” to replace “trunk” to “main” in the text of Annex I of the AGTC Protocol concerning the numbering of inland waterways of international importance (paragraphs 3, 4 and 5);

(b) regarding additional waterways suitable to combined transport, to add only additional waterways suitable for combined transport in countries listed in the AGTC Protocol, hence to add to:

(3) Netherlands, after C-E 11 Amsterdam-Rijn-Canal the new inland waterway C-E 11-02 Lekkanaal;

and

(14) Romania, after C-E 80 Danube, the new inland waterway C-E 80-05 Danube-Bucuresti Canal.

The latter has been also added to the AGTC Protocol with a separate amendment accepted (see ECE/TRANS/WP.24/2015/7).

(c) regarding additional ports, to add only new ports suitable for combined transport (marked in the Blue Book as ports with equipment for handling containers or for serving Ro-Ro ferries) in countries listed in the AGTC Protocol, hence to add to:

(1) France:

after C-P 02-03 Lille (Deûle, 42.0 km), new ports:

C-P 05–07 Centre and West (Schelde, 22.0 km)

C-P 05–08 Centre and West (Canal du Centre, 10.0 km)

(2) Belgium:

after C-P 01-04, Liège (Meuse, 113.7 km), new port

C-P 01-04 bis Liège (Albert Canal, 9.6 km),

after C-P 03-04 Gent (Terneuzen-Gent Kanaal, 4.6 km),

new port C-P 04-03bis Willebroek (Bruxelles-Schelde Canal, 61.3 km)

(3) Netherlands:

before the existing ports, new ports:

C-P 01-03-02 Veghel (Zuid-Willemsvaart, 24.0 km),

C-P 01-09 bis Venlo (Maas, 108.0-111.0 km),

C-P 01-09 ter Meerlo/Wanssum (Maas, 133.0 km)

C-P 01-09 quinquies Cuijk (Maas, 167.0 km)

C-P 01-10 ter Waalwijk (Bergsche Maas, 236.0 km)

after C-P 10-01 Rotterdam (Nieuwe Maas, 1002.5 km), new ports

C-P 10-02 bis Gorinchem (Merwede, 956.0 km)

C-P 11-02 Beverwijk (Noordzeekanaal, 4.5 km)

after C-P 12-01 Nijmegen (Waal, 884.6 km), new ports:

C-P 12-04 Kampen (Geldersche IJssel, 106.8 km)

C-P 70-01 ter Hengelo (Twentekanaal, 45.1 km)

C-P 70-01-02 Alphen aan den Rijn (Oude Rijn, 39.5 km)

(6) Czech Republic:

after C-P 20-17 Mělník (Elbe, 834.4 km), new port:

C-P 20-18 Týnec nad Labem (Elbe, 933.7 km)

(12) Serbia:¹

New ports:

C-P 80-01-02 Senta (Tisza, 122.0 km)

C-P 80-47 bis Bačka Palanka (Danube, 1295.0 km)

C-P 80-47 ter Novi Sad (Danube, 1253.5 km)

C-P 80-48 bis Pančevo (Danube, 1152.8 km)

(13) Bulgaria:

replace C 80-01 Vidin (Danube, 790.2 km) to

C-P 80-52 bis Vidin (Danube, 790.0 km) and after new ports:

C-P 80-53 bis Oriahovo (Danube, 678.0 km)

C-P 80-58 bis Silistra (Danube, 375.5 km)

(16) Ukraine:

before C-P 40-05 Kyiv (Dnipro, 856.0 km), new port

C-P 40-02-02 Mykolaiv sea port (Pivdenny Buh, 35.0 km);

¹ The amendment from Yugoslavia to Serbia needs to be legalized. This amendment should be legalized together with the amendment to the name of the Working Party in Articles 13, 14 and 15 from the Working Party on Combined Transport to the Working Party on Intermodal Transport and Logistics.

(d) regarding changes to the description of ports, to replace the description of ports available in AGTC Protocol, as per their description provided in the AGN Agreement, as follows:

C-P 10–09–02	Swiss Rhine Ports (Schweizerische Rheinhäfen) (Rhine, 159.38–169.95 km)
C-P 10–43	Pagny (Saône, 192.75 km)
C-P 20–15	Děčín (Elbe, 737.3 and 739.3 km)
C-P 20–16	Ústí nad Labem (Elbe, 761.5 and 764.0 km)
C-P 20–17	Mělník (Elbe, 834.4 km)
C-P 50–01–01	Perm (Kama, 2 260.0 km)
C-P 50–02–01	Moskva Northern Port (Kanal imeni Moskvi, 46.0 km)
C-P 50–02–03	Moskva Southern Port (Kanal imeni Moskvi, 0.0 km, Moskva River 151.0 km, from its confluence with Oka River)
C-P 50–03	Podporozhie (Volgo-Baltijskiy Waterway, 1 054.0 km)
C-P 50–06	Nizhniy Novgorod (Volga, 905.0 km)
C-P 50–07	Kazan (Volga, 1 311.0 km)
C-P 50–08	Ulianovsk (Volga, 1 528.0 km)
C-P 50–09	Samara (Volga, 1 738.0 km)
C-P 50–10	Saratov (Volga, 2 165.0 km)
C-P 50–11	Volgograd (Volga, 2 551.0 km)
C-P 50–12	Astrakhan, sea port (Volga, 3 051.0 km)
C-P 80–60	Braila (Danube, 168.5–172.0 km)
C-P 80–61	Galati (Danube, 76.0 Mm – 160.0 km).

8. WP.24 should consider this clarification, and further adjust it as deemed necessary.

III. Additional differences

9. The analysis of ECE/TRANS/SC.3/2017/3 shows additional differences marked in italics in the table below. The table also gives suggestions as to the necessary alignments:

<i>AGN Agreement after the amendment presented in ECE/TRANS/SC.3/2017/3</i>		<i>AGTC Protocol</i>	
E 80–08	River Drava up to <i>Nemetin Port</i>	C-E 80-08	Drava (from the mouth to <i>Osijek</i>) Necessary alignment: to replace Osijek with Nemetin Port
E 80–09	Danube- <i>Kiliiske Mouth</i>	C-E 80-09	Danube- <i>Kilia arm</i> Necessary alignment: to replace Kilia arm with Kiliiske Mouth (English only) and with Bras de Kiliiske (French only)
P 40–09	<i>Dnipro</i> (Dnipro, 393.0 km)	C-P 40-09	<i>Dnipropetrovsk</i> (Dnipro, 393.0 km) Necessary alignment: to replace Dnipropetrovsk with Dnipro
P 50–02	Podporozhie (Volgo-Baltijskiy Waterway, 1,054.0 km) ³	C-P 50-02	<i>Sankt-Peterburg river port (Neva, 1385.0 km)</i> ^{2l}
P 50–03	Cherepovets (Volgo-Baltijskiy Waterway, 540.0 km) ³	C-P 50–03	Podporozhie (Volgo-Baltijskiy Waterway, 1 054.0 km) ^{2l}

AGN Agreement after the amendment presented in
ECE/TRANS/SC.3/2017/3

AGTC Protocol

<i>P 50-04</i>	Yaroslavl (Volga, 520.0 km) ³	<i>C-P 50-04</i>	Cherepovets (Volgo-Baltiyskiy Waterway, 540.0 km) ^{2/}
<i>P 50-05</i>	Nizhniy Novgorod (Volga, 905.0 km) ³	<i>C-P 50-05</i>	Yaroslavl (Volga, 520.0 km) ^{2/}
<i>P 50-06</i>	Kazan (Volga, 1,311.0 km) ³	<i>C-P 50-06</i>	Nizhniy Novgorod (Volga, 905.0 km) ^{2/}
<i>P 50-07</i>	Ulianovsk (Volga, 1,528.0 km) ³	<i>C-P 50-07</i>	Kazan (Volga, 1 311.0 km) ^{2/}
<i>P 50-08</i>	Samara (Volga, 1,738.0 km) ³	<i>C-P 50-08</i>	Ulianovsk (Volga, 1 528.0 km) ^{2/}
<i>P 50-09</i>	Saratov (Volga, 2,165.0 km) ³	<i>C-P 50-09</i>	Samara (Volga, 1 738.0 km) ^{2/}
<i>P 50-10</i>	Volgograd (Volga, 2,551.0 km) ³	<i>C-P 50-10</i>	Saratov (Volga, 2 165.0 km) ^{2/}
<i>P 50-11</i>	Astrakhan sea port (Volga, 3,051.0 km)	<i>C-P 50-11</i>	Volgograd (Volga, 2 551.0 km) ^{2/}
		<i>C-P 50-12</i>	Astrakhan, sea port (Volga, 3 051.0 km) ^{2/}

Necessary alignment: to remove C-P 50-02 Sankt-Peterburg river port (Neva, 1385.0 km) and to renumber C-P 50 03 to C-P 50-12 to C-P 50 02 to C-P 50-11

Note: amended descriptions for ports C-P 50-03 and C-P 50-06 to C-P 50-12 have been used (see item II above)

<i>P 50-02-02</i>	Moskva Southern Port (Kanal imeni Moskvyy, 0.0 km, Moskva River 151.0 km from its confluence with Oka River) ³	<i>C-P 50-02-02</i>	<i>Moskva Western Port (Kanal imeni Moskvyy, 32.0 km)²</i>
		<i>C-P 50-02-03</i>	Moskva Southern Port (Kanal imeni Moskvvi, 0.0 km, Moskva River 151.0 km, from its confluence with Oka River)
			Necessary alignment: to remove C-P 50-02-02 and to renumber C-P 50-02-03 as C-P 50-02-02
<i>P 80-09-02</i>	Kilia (Danube-Kiliiske Mouth, 47.0 km)	<i>C-P 80-09-02</i>	Kilia (Danube-Kilia Arm, 47.0 km)
			Necessary alignment: to replace Kilia Arm to Kiliiske Mouth (English only) and to Bras de Kiliiske (French only)
<i>P 80-09-03</i>	Ust-Dunaisk (Danube-Kiliiske Mouth, 1.0 km) ⁴	<i>C-P 80-09-03</i>	Oust-Dunajsk (Danube-Kilia Arm, 1.0 km)

⁴Navigation in the harbour basin is prohibited

Necessary alignment: to replace Kilia Arm to Kiliiske Mouth (English only) and to Bras de Kiliiske (French only) and add the footnote

10. In order to remove the existing differences between the AGN Agreement and the AGTC Protocol with regard to Annexes I and II, and as per the Article 14 of the AGTC Protocol, any of the Contacting Parties to the Protocol should submit to the WP.24 an amendment proposal to this end.