



## **RESOLUTION No. 92/2 ON NEW CLASSIFICATION OF INLAND WATERWAYS**

[CEMT/CM(92)6/FINAL]

The Council of Ministers meeting at Athens, on 11 and 12 June 1992,

**TAKING NOTE** of the report, [reproduced below]

## RECOMMENDS

- A) Concerning the technical aspects of infrastructures:
- 1. Governments should give consideration to the new classification of European inland waterways, as set out in Table 1, with a view to classifying their own country's inland waterways. The maps of their network should be brought into line with this classification. Under their responsibility, a document should be set out considering all the characteristics of any waterway or part of it ( waterway outline, fairway location, permissible draught, minimum height under bridges, recommended dimensions for locks and other elevators for ships...) in view of achieving the best and as complete as possible exchange of information between each inland waterway user. With the same objective, the ECE and ECMT's maps of European inland waterways are also to be reviewed. This work will be assigned to a group of experts.
- 2. In view of the completion of an homogeneous European inland waterway network, governments should also take into consideration this new classification in their modernisation and improvement programs of their network or when renewing the structures.
  - Where a regional or Class IV waterway is to be modernised, the parameters to be adopted should be at least Class Va. When modernising or creating a waterway of international importance, the parameters to be used should be at least Class Vb with a minimum draught of 2.80 metres and a minimum height under bridges of 7.00 metres where necessary for container transport. For inland waterways where a bridge clearance of 700 cm is not considered as economically reasonable, the possibility of using longer convoys (Class Vb) should be taken into account. The lengths of locks or other structures through which vessels pass must be established with reference to the maximum dimensions of pushed units.
- 3. Navigational techniques can still be considerably improved. Progress can be made as regards both the construction and equipment of vessels handling traditional bulk traffic and research on new types of vessel better able to handle other traffic that has developed over the past few decades.
  - Governments must ensure the promotion of initiatives to modernise transport equipment and the equipment used for loading, unloading and transhipment. Although coasters and fluvio-maritime vessels are not referred to in this report, they also must be taken into account, at least on waterways that have a gauge compatible with their dimensions.

- 4. Following the adaptation of the networks, their maintenance in good condition and improvements in transport equipment, the authorities must be particularly careful to ensure that inland navigation is ready for smooth integration into the Single Market of 1993, able to cater for available traffic and to adapt to the computerisation of the management, business and navigational techniques that will be developing in the next few years.
- B) Regarding inland waterways development policy:
- 1. Governments should recognise the importance of inland waterways transport and give it all the attention needed to ensure development consistent with all its potential. In this connection, attention should again be drawn to the conclusions of report CM(89)27 of 25 October 1989 concerning, in particular, the role of inland navigation in transport economics at both national and international levels.
- 2. The forthcoming entry into service of the Rhine-Main-Danube link and the opening of the East European countries to the market economy will have a favourable impact on inland waterways transport. New links will be developed and probably modify existing flows of traffic to some extent. It will be necessary to ensure that the transition is as smooth as possible so that vessels can make use of the whole of the European network with no breaks in the continuity.
- 3. Many studies of combined transport have been undertaken, but mainly in connection with rail/road links. However, inland waterways can also be incorporated effectively in such systems. Studies in this connection are moreover now on the agendas of the international bodies concerned. These studies must be supported and pursued with a view to reaching practical solutions.
- 4. There is considerable capacity available on the European network which can be used with no need for substantial investment. Everywhere competition exists between types of infrastructure, the transfer of some road and rail traffic to the waterways is often suggested as a means of reducing congestion and improving environmental conditions. A campaign to provide information and incentives to industry, shippers and potential users should be undertaken on the initiative of those governments that would find this partial transfer of traffic a response to the problems of congestion and environmental disamenities which are becoming increasingly difficult.

OF INTERNATIONAL IMPORTANCE									OF REGIONAL IMPORTANCE								water	of ind
										To East of Elbe			lbe				ways	and
VII	Vic		VIb	VIa	νъ	Va	VI	III	II	I	Ш	Π	I	2			walei ways	Classes of navigable
			ĩ			Large Rhine vessels	Johann Welker	ē/	BM-500	Gross Finow	Gustav Koenigs	Kampin <del>e-</del> Barge	Barge	3		Designation		
			140			95-110	80-85	67-70	57	41	67-80	50-55	38.5	4	L(m)	Maximum length	Type of vesse	Motor
			15.0			11.4	9,5	8.2-9.0	7.5-9.0	4.7	8.2	6.6	5.05	5	B(m)	Maximum beam	4: General characteristics	vessels and barges
			3.90			2.50-2.80	2.50	1.60-2.00	1.60	1.40	2.50	2.50	1.80-2.20	6	d(m)	Draught <u>"</u>		
						1,500- 3,000	1,000- 1,500	470-700	500-630	180	650- 1,000	400-650	250-400	7	T(t)	Tonnage		
Ĩ.														8			Type of c	
285	195-200 1⁄	270-280 1⁄	185-195 <u>1</u> /	95-110 <u>I</u> ⁄	172-185 <u>1</u> ′	95-110 1⁄	85	118-132						9	L(m)	Length	опуоу: Gene	Pushed co
33.0- 34.2 <u>1</u> /	33.0- 34.2 <u>1</u> ⁄	22.8	22.8	22.8	11.4	11.4	9.5 2	8.2-9.0						10	B(m)	Beam	ral characteristics	nvoys
2.50- 4.50	2.50- 4.50	2.50- 4.50	2.50- 4.50	2.50- 4.50	2.50- 4.50	2.50- 4.50	2.50- 2.80	1.60- 2.00						Ξ	d(m)	Draught <u>I</u>		
14,500- 27,000	9,600- 18,000	9,600- 18,000	6,400- 12,000	3,200- 6,000	3,200- 6,000	1,600- 3,000	1,250- 1,450	1,000-1,200			-			12	T(t)	Tonnage		
9.10 4'	9.10 <u>4</u> ′		7.00 or 9.10 4'	7.00 or 9.10 4/	14	5.25 or 7.00 or 9.10	5.25 or 7.00 <u>4</u> ′	4.0	3.0	3.0	4.0-5.0	4.0-5.0	4.0	13	H(m)		bridges $\underline{\hat{z}'}$	Minimum height under
														14		on maps		Graphical symbols on maps

 $z = y^{2}$ 

## CLASSIFICATION OF EUROPEAN INLAND WATERWAYS

## Notes for table

- 1. The class of a waterway is determined by the horizontal dimensions of the vessels or pushed units, especially by their width.
- 2. The draught of a inland waterway must be specified with reference to local conditions.
- 3. Characteristic tonnage for each class according to dimensions and draughts indicated.
- 4. Takes into account a security clearance of 30 cm between the highest point of the vessel or its load and the height under the bridge.
- 5. Vessels used in the Oder region and on waterways between the Oder and Elbe.
- 6. Adapted for container transport:
  - -- 5.25 metres for vessels carrying two layers of containers;
  - -- 7.00 metres for vessels carrying three layers of containers;
  - -- 9.10 metres for vessels carrying four layers of containers;
  - 50 per cent of the containers may be empty, otherwise ballast must be used.
- 7. The first figure relates to existing situations and the second to future developments or, in some cases, also existing situations.
- 8. Takes account of the dimensions of motor vessels proposed for ro-ro transport and shipments of containers; the dimensions given are approximate.
- 9. Relates to pushed units on the Danube which often consist of more than nine barges.