



**ADOPTED MINUTES  
of the Joint meeting of the Inspection Bodies  
held from 24 to 26 April 2018  
in Vienna**

Present: See annex 1

Chair: MR BÜHLER, Swiss delegation

Related working documents:

- Programme (Annex 2)
- List of questions (CESNI/PT (18) 11 rev. 1)
- Presentation on the pooling of results (Annex 3)
- Various presentations (Annexes 4 to 9)

**1. Introductory speeches (Tuesday, 24 April)**

The CHAIR and representatives of the Austrian government, of the European Commission services and the secretariat of the Central Commission for the Navigation of the Rhine welcome the participants.

By way of introduction Mrs WOLSKA and MESSRS GEORGES, MARGIC, ZELJKO present various aspects of the regulatory frameworks on technical requirements for vessels in Europe (respectively European Union, Rhine, Danube and Sava) and highlight the importance of a harmonised implementation of these requirements (Presentations, see **Annexes 4, 5 and 6**).

**2. Presentations on ES-TRIN 2017/1, the database of interpretations, connectable pontoons and calculation tools (Wednesday 25 April)**

Mr BOYER gives a presentation on the requirements newly introduced in ES-TRIN 2017/1 and the database of interpretations ES-TRIN-faq) (see **Annex 7**). He emphasises that the ES-TRIN is regularly updated (every two years) and that the next edition (2019/1) could be published in 2018 for implementation in January 2020.

Mr JUMELET presents the approach to certifying connectable pontoons in the Netherlands (see **Annex 8**), points to practical proposals (see 10 points under CESNI/PT (18) 11 rev.1, NL1) and suggests developing an instruction (ESI) to determine the method of certification.

Discussions with the experts highlight the following issues:

- There is a very large number of modular or connectable pontoons in Europe (more than 10,000 units). Certification of each unit and for each shipyard (often of short duration) would result in disproportionate administrative costs. Identifying the operator may also be difficult (hired pontoons).
- A further difficulty is identifying each module and their assembly, and in determining a priori permitted configurations.
- An analogy could be made with pushed barges. Each module has a certificate with its own expiry date.
- Technical requirements for floating equipment are already laid down in Chapter 22 of the ES-TRIN. Moreover, an ESI instruction cannot derogate from the rules laid down by the regulatory frameworks (RVIR or Directive) concerning the procedure for issuing certificates.

*The CHAIR thanks the Dutch delegation for this contribution and invites it to submit a proposal for the CESNI work programme for the period 2019-2021.*

Mr BILIĆ PRCIĆ presents the tools Croatian experts have developed to simplify the calculations when inspecting vessels with a view to issuing the certificate (see **Annex 9**). For hull strength, the tool factors takes account of the minimum values in Article 3.02(1)(b) of the ES-TRIN, but this is not the only solution for meeting the requirements (attestation by a recognised classification society is an alternative solution, for example).

Mr ARNTZ highlights the similarities with a comparable tool in the Netherlands. Mr STANGL-BRACHNIK welcomes the educational nature of the tool, which explains the mathematical formulae used and he suggests certification by a central authority.

*The CHAIR thanks the Croatian delegation for his contribution, which promotes cooperation and invites it to make these tools available to the other delegations. These tools can be enhanced by the experience various other delegations have gained.*

### **3. Examination of issues in small-group sessions and pooling (Thursday 26 April)**

The joint meeting of the Inspection bodies concentrates on examining questions raised and submitted in advance by experts concerning the specific application of the technical requirements (see CESNI/PT (18) 11 rev. 1). The working method consists in switching between plenary discussions and individual consideration of the various questions in small groups (5 groups in total, no interpretation provided). Each small group examines a selection of 10 or so questions arising from document CESNI/PT (18) 11 rev. 1, to which are added discretionary questions and then presents its results for pooling on the last day. This presentation is supported by a Powerpoint slide pack prepared during the 3 small-group session working days (see **Annex 3**).

The questions are presented below in the order of the appropriate requirements in the ES-TRIN and not in the alphabetical order used in annex 2 of document CESNI/PT (18) 11 rev.1.

At the ad hoc meeting on 26 June 2018, the CESNI/PT Working Group examined the draft minutes of the joint meeting of the Inspection Bodies. Unless otherwise indicated, the interpretations and analyses prepared in Vienna have been validated by the CESNI/PT Working Group. In addition, the CESNI/PT Working Group also decided on the follow-up (e.g. addition to the ES-TRIN-faq database).

**HR1/HR2** - Scope of the hull inspection during periodical inspection and measurement by ultrasound - *ES-TRIN, 3.02(1)(b) and ESI-I-2*

**The joint meeting confirms the following interpretation:**

The ES-TRIN requires thickness measurement of the outside shell plating (bottom, bilge and side plates) to be carried out during the periodical inspection according to Article 3.02(1)(b). What other items need to be checked during the hull inspection?

The following items should be checked during hull inspection:

- Hull in general (inside and outside, all structure elements);
- Propeller shaft, propeller shaft bearings, rudder stock bearings, riverchest valves;
- Other items as deemed necessary by the inspector.

A harmonised procedure and reporting form concerning the above mentioned items for the inspection bodies are called for.

Furthermore, the companies involved in ultrasonic thickness measurement (UTM) of the outside shell plating have to be experts within the meaning of instruction ESI-I-2 and possess special knowledge of inland navigation vessels.

**Other remarks:**

MESSRS BIERINGER, WERNICKE and ARNTZ are in favour of documenting the vessel's limiting conditions of operation (in particular loading conditions) arising from the general strength and stability requirement depending on the vessel's use (Articles 3.02(1) and (3)). Mr BROERE suggests to examine the consequences on the distribution of liability between the shipowner and expert.

**Next steps validated by the CESNI/PT Working Group:**

- Add a database entry (ES-TRIN-faq). A mandate is given to the Croatian delegation to submit a revised proposal.
- Invite the Croatian delegation to make a proposal for the work programme 2019-2021 (see CESNI/PT (18) 52 – Com. HR).
- Examine the desirability of documenting the limiting conditions of operation (strength and stability) when the model certificate is revised.

\*\*

**HR9** - Dry-dock inspection – *Directive (EU) 2016/1629, Annex V, 2.03(2), RVIR 2.03(2) and ES-TRIN, 3.02(1)(b)*

**The joint meeting confirms the following interpretation:**

What practices are followed by the Inspection bodies for the dry-dock inspection during the periodical inspection? Can a dry-dock inspection be dispensed with?

- The dry-dock inspection for the initial inspection of the vessel by the inspection body, barring exceptions (for example classification certificate). Where there is a periodical or special inspection, the inspection body may require a dry-dock inspection.
- It is recommended that this dry-dock inspection is carried out at regular intervals. Indeed, it is not confined to measuring hull thickness but also enables any damage to be checked and, amongst others, the general state of the cooler inlet, the rudder, propeller and weld seams.
- Proof of a dry-dock inspection carried out during the year preceding the periodical inspection can be accepted as proof instead of a dry-dock inspection during the periodical inspection itself.

**Next steps validated by the CESNI/PT Working Group:**

- At this stage, the Working Group is not in a position to agree on an entry to the database (ES-TRIN-faq). These issues will have to be addressed together with the Croatian delegation's proposals for the work programme. A discussion on principles is necessary within the one-year time limit.

**Other remarks:**

This interpretation calls for an examination of the consequences for the period of validity of the certificate.

\*\*

**DE7 – Installations needed for vessel safety – ES-TRIN, 3.03(2), 10.02(1)**

Mr BLECHER reports on the analysis by small group IV. The proposed answer in document CESNI/PT (18) 11 rev. 1. is deemed to be correct. The wheelhouse emergency power supply needs to be added to the list of examples. According to Article 3.03(2) of the ES-TRIN, the “anchor gear” and “steering apparatus” are excluded from the list of equipment required for the vessel's safety or operation. An amendment of the ES-TRIN appears appropriate.

MESSRS PAULI and WERNICKE report on the discussions within another small group that does not share this conclusion. They call for recognition of three levels of vessel operation:

- Full operation: correct functioning of all on-board equipment, including ancillary functions such as electricity in the cabins or air conditioning systems.
- Safe operation (or safe navigation): correct functioning of statutorily required on-board equipment and compliance with manoeuvrability and speed requirements (13 km/h).
- Operation in an emergency: correct functioning of the equipment required to reach a safe berth and steerage way under vessel's own power (6.5 km/h).

Mr BIRKLHUBER recalls the existence of a list of electrical equipment to be powered by the emergency electrical power source on passenger vessels (Article 19.10(4)).

**The joint meeting was unable to find a common interpretation to the following question:**

What installations are needed to satisfy the criteria associated with the following terms: “safe navigation” and “installations needed for vessel safety or operation”?

**Next steps validated by the CESNI/PT Working Group:**

- The French and German delegations are invited to submit an interpretative document concerning a common definition of the 3 levels of exploitation, in relation to questions DE7 and FR3.

\*\*

**FR3** – Equipment forward of the plane of the collision bulkhead and aft of the aft-peak bulkhead – *ES-TRIN, 3.03(2)*

**The joint meeting confirms the following interpretation:**

What equipment is being referred to in Article 3.03(2)? What equipment is accepted?

Controls for equipment for safety purposes, such as:

- quick-closing valves,
- ventilator power supply,
- permanent fire-fighting installation,

must not be located forward of the plane of the collision bulkhead.

The following equipment can be accepted:

- bow rudder but not bow thruster
- coupling winches,
- mooring bollards (potentially also used for an emergency tow),
- navigation lights, illumination of the steering range,
- intercom installation,
- radar antenna.

**Other remarks:**

The question of radar antennas is already dealt with in the database of interpretations. By analogy, it would be useful to clarify the applicability of this rule to equipment installed on a voluntary basis (i.e. their installation is not statutorily required).

**Next steps validated by the CESNI/PT Working Group:**

-

- The French delegation could submit the following task for inclusion in the 2019-2021 work programme: Amendment of the ES-TRIN to add a list of the equipment required for the safety and operation of the vessel.

\*\*

**NL5** – Monitoring and indicating equipment – *ES-TRIN, 7.03(8)*

**The joint meeting confirms the following interpretation:**

- Article 7.03 does not require monitoring equipment but only gives requirements for monitoring equipment if installed.
- The mandatory requirement to install monitoring equipment comes from other provisions, such as Articles 7.04 and 7.05 (main engines, steering system, navigation lights).
- The general requirements for electrical power supply are laid down in Article 10.02.
- The list of equipment proposed by the Dutch delegation needs to be examined in light of Article 10.02 of the ES-TRIN.

**Next steps validated by the CESNI/PT Working Group:**

- A mandate is given to the Dutch delegation to submit a revised proposal to be considered by the Working Group.

\*\*

**NL2** – Requirements for installation and performance tests for Inland AIS equipment – *ES-TRIN, 7.06(3), Annex 5, Section IV, Article 2(1) and (7)*

**The joint meeting confirms the following interpretation:**

Given the different terms employed in the ES-TRIN, Annex 5, Section IV, Article 2(1) and (7), is there any need to distinguish between the responsibilities concerning installation/repair/replacement on the one hand and the operating test on the other hand?

- No distinction between responsibilities is required.
- The approving installation company which installed the equipment (radar equipment, rate-of-turn indicator, AIS equipment) can also carry out the installation check and operating test.
- Instruction ESI-I-2 gives an overview of the various requirements for the checks carried out by the experts and specialists.

**Next steps validated by the CESNI/PT Working Group:**

- Correct the terminology in ES-TRIN Annex 5, Section IV, Article 2 to ensure consistency, in the four languages, between (1) and (7). The Secretariat is invited to submit a working document for decision by the Working Group.
- Inform the RIS Working Group or other competent bodies. The mandate is given to the Secretariat.

\*\*

**DE3** – Elevating wheelhouses – *ES-TRIN, 7.12(3) 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence*

**The joint meeting confirms the following interpretation:**

How are the emergency exits from the wheelhouse and the remainder of the escape route to the deck to be designed?

- New requirements for elevating wheel houses were introduced with ES-TRIN 2017/1. Only vessels built before 1985 and operated beyond the Rhine enjoy transitional provisions. For other vessels, it shall be possible to enter and leave the wheelhouse safely, whatever its position.
- This possibility must be assessed by the inspection body on a case-by-case basis. Indeed, wheelhouses are not standard items of equipment.
- A roof hatch is not sufficient. It must be possible to reach the deck safely.

**Other remarks:**

- According to Article 7.12(12) of the ES-TRIN, proof of adequate strength and stability shall be provided by calculations. The CESNI/PT Working Group could clarify the criteria for adequate strength and stability.
- International and national police regulations need to be amended (Article 1.10) to take account of the attestation of inspection of elevating wheelhouses<sup>1</sup>.

**Next steps validated by the CESNI/PT Working Group:**

- Add a database entry (ES-TRIN-faq). A mandate is given to the German delegation to elaborate a revised proposal.

\*\*

---

<sup>1</sup> Note from the Secretariat: This work has been commenced for the Rhine Police Regulations (RPR) See RP (18) 6 = RP/G (18) 8 = RV/G (18) 3.

**AT1** – Fuel tanks, pipes and accessories – *ES-TRIN, 8.05(9)*

**The joint meeting confirms the following interpretation:**

Do filling level indicators based on pressure measurement satisfy the requirements of Article 8.05(9) or does there have to be a glass gauge in all circumstances?

Each fuel tank is to be fitted with a suitable capacity-gauging device providing reliable information right up to the maximum filling level. Measurement technology is not important.

The same answer goes for the tanks referred to in Articles 8.06(7) and 8.07(7).

\*\*

**BE7** – Bilge pumping and drainage systems – *ES-TRIN, 8.08*

**The joint meeting confirms the following interpretation:**

Dry cargo vessels carrying dangerous goods according to the ADN and whose holds are fitted with a bilge pumping system having an automatic actuating mechanism in the event of any leakage could discharge substances dangerous for the environment overboard.

The boatmaster shall be responsible for ensuring that no dangerous goods can be discharged into the environment.

**Next steps validated by the CESNI/PT Working Group:**

- Pass the question to the ADN Safety committee and relevant bodies of the CDNI to check whether any additions to the requirements are needed.

\*\*

**CH2** – Ballast pumps for the hold – *ES-TRIN, 8.08*

MESSRS BRAUN and BIERINGER spell out the risks to stability caused by the use of these high-performance pumps (free surface effect). This is especially true when these high-performance pumps are used to fill a dry hold (not designed to accommodate liquids) rather than dedicated ballast tanks.

Mr BLESSINGER recalls the importance of proper preparation of the journey, including in terms of ballast or loading on the return journey to clear works<sup>2</sup>.

**The joint meeting confirms the following interpretation:**

- The use of high-performance ballast pumps may pose a risk to the vessel's stability.
- When these pumps are installed they need to be taken into account when calculating the vessel's stability. It could be helpful to consider providing instructions on how to calculate stability.

\*\*

---

<sup>2</sup> Note from the Secretariat: in May 2017, the CCNR published a guide to stability when carrying containers in inland navigation. See <https://www.ccr-zkr.org/13021000-fr.html>

**HR3** – Scope of the survey of anchor equipment during periodical inspection – *ES-TRIN, 13.01 and ESI-II-9*

Mr VAN HEES reports on the analysis by small group I. If the weight of the anchor is less than the calculated value, the anchor must be replaced. 12 % could be an appropriate figure for the maximum acceptable reduction in the average diameter of the chain. However, the German experts reserved judgement in order to consult the content of a national DIN standard<sup>3</sup>.

Mr BIERINGER points to the risks associated with a reduction in the average diameter if the chain has been rigorously sized with the breaking load in mind (with no safety margin). He suggests examining classification societies' practices in this field. Mr BROERE disagrees with the addition of a safety margin. He explains that each chain is subjected to a load test corresponding to a proposal of the working load in relation to the breaking load. Mr STANGL-BRACHNIK calls for a distinction to be made between breaking load and working load.

**The joint meeting was unable to find a common interpretation to the following question:**

What is the maximum acceptable reduction in the average diameter of the chain? 12 % What is the maximum permissible reduction in the anchor's weight? 10 %

**Other remarks:**

An exchange of views on the current practice of Inspection Bodies is desirable, with regard to weighing the anchor and measuring the thickness of the chain.

**Next steps validated by the CESNI/PT Working Group:**

- Continue analysing the problem within the CESNI/PT Working Group with a view to agreeing a common interpretation. A mandate is given to the Croatian delegation to prepare a working document.

\*\*

**GERC2** – Permanently installed firefighting systems for protecting accommodation spaces, wheelhouses and passenger spaces – *ES-TRIN, 13.04(5)*

**The joint meeting confirms the following interpretation:**

Article 13.04(5) is worded as follows: "Systems spraying smaller quantities of water shall have a type-approval pursuant to IMO Resolution A.800 (19) or another Standard recognised by one of the Member States." To which elements does the type approval relate? How is the system's compliance with the requirements in IMO resolution A.800 (19) ensured?

- The type approval only relates to the nozzles. It is confirmed by operating tests against typical fires.
- The permanently installed firefighting system's conformity is checked in three stages: type approval of the nozzles, the prior approval of the system's capacity and the inspection of the system once it is on board.
- An amendment of the ES-TRIN is desirable to ensure accurate requirements.

**Next steps validated by the CESNI/PT Working Group:**

- Prepare an amendment to clarify the wording of Article 13.04(5) of the ES-TRIN (while retaining the reference to IMO Resolution A.800 (19) or another standard recognised by one of the Member States). GERC is given a mandate to prepare a working document.

\*\*

---

<sup>3</sup> Note from the Secretariat: The Secretariat consulted the German delegation after the meeting to provide the following clarification. The relevant standard is DIN 685 Part 5. The criteria is that a chain has to be replaced if one of the chain links have reached 0,9 d (d = original diameter of the steel wire the chain links were made of)



**CH1** – Permanently installed firefighting systems for protecting objects – *ES-TRIN, 13.06*

**The joint meeting confirms the following interpretation:**

- Nowadays, permanently installed firefighting systems for protecting objects are only permitted on the basis of a recommendation (RVIR 2.19 or EU Directive).
- However it is desirable to authorise these systems for the following situations:
  - deck equipment (enclosed engines, cranes, ...),
  - electrical service rooms, distribution switchboards or batteries,
  - paint lockers,
  - apparatus on floating equipment,
  - similar enclosed spaces (cabinet, chest, ...).
- A list of the objects in question needs to be drawn up.
- The minimum requirements of Article 13.05 could be used by analogy for these systems, subject to modifications for electrical fires.
- This topic could be added to the CESNI work programme.

**Other remarks:**

Mr WERNICKE points out that the draft of ES-TRIN 2019/1 envisages the use of permanently installed firefighting systems for protecting objects in the context of a transitional provision for Article 19.07. This gives an indication of the “object” in question.

**Next steps validated by the CESNI/PT Working Group:**

- Invite a delegation to make a proposal for the work programme 2019-2021 (see CESNI/PT (18) 39 – Com. CH).

\*\*

**HR6** – Ship's boats according to European Standard EN 1914 : 2016 – *ES-TRIN, 13.07(2) and Chapter 22*

**The joint meeting confirms the following interpretation:**

For floating equipment, given the space constraints on board, is it possible to consider “working boats” to be “ship's boats” when it comes to the requirements for the launching of ship's boats? Working boat is understood as a small boat which is commonly used for transport from the shore to the floating equipment.

- A definition is to be found in Article 1.01(1.26) of the ES-TRIN: “ship's boat”: a boat for use in transport, rescue, salvage and work duties”
- For floating equipment, in the context of a shipyard, “working boats” can be considered to be “ship's boats” provided that the “working boats” correspond to the requirements of the “ship's boats”.
- The ship's boat does not necessarily need to be stored on deck but can be towed.
- Alteration of the English version of Article 13.07(2) of the ES-TRIN is desirable to ensure alignment with other language versions (“shall carry” to be replaced by “shall be equipped with”).

**Next steps validated by the CESNI/PT Working Group:**

- Add a database entry (ES-TRIN-faq).
- Validate the editorial correction of the English version for the draft of ES-TRIN 2019/1.

\*\*

**NL4** – Ladders, steps and similar devices – *ES-TRIN, 14.07*

**The joint meeting confirms the following interpretation:**

Can it be inferred from Article 14.07 that there should always be two handrails?

- According to European standard EN 13056 two handrails are only necessary if the stair has more than 3 steps and a width of more than 900 mm.
- The application of the EN is not mandatory, but it represents the state-of-the-art and it is mentioned in Chapter 19 of the ES-TRIN.

**Next steps validated by the CESNI/PT Working Group:**

- A mandate is given to the German delegation to prepare a working document, highlighting the requirements for work stations (EN 790) and accommodations (EN13056). The CESNI/PT Working Group could validate a common interpretation.

\*\*

**DE2** – Protection against noise and vibrations – *ES-TRIN, 14.09(1)*

**The joint meeting confirms the following interpretation:**

- Overall, clarification of the implementation of Article 14.09(1) by the CESNI/PT Working Group is desirable.
- In general there do not seem to be any health issues arising from vibrations in inland navigation vessels.
- Broadly speaking, the inspection bodies are not responsible for enforcing Directive 2002/44/EC.
- The terminology differs according to language version (employee / crew members) and alignment is desirable.

**Next steps validated by the CESNI/PT Working Group:**

- Correct the terminology and clarify the implementation of Article 14.09(1). A mandate is given to the Secretariat to prepare a working document.
- The German delegation will submit a proposal for the CESNI working programme with regard to noise and vibrations.

\*\*

**HR7, HR8** – Cranes – *ES-TRIN, 14.12 and 32.05*

**The joint meeting confirms the following interpretation:**

- The requirements of Article 14.12 are not applicable to davits, which are used solely for the purpose of lowering ship's boats.
- These davits must comply with the requirements of Article 13.07(2), especially in terms of the time in which ship's boats must be lowered. These requirements are sufficient and no addition is required.
- The desirability of a definition of "davit" could be examined by the CESNI/PT Working Group.
- The transitional provision for the crane manufacturer's plate has been corrected in the draft of ES-TRIN 2017/1. This answers the Croatian question.

**Next steps validated by the CESNI/PT Working Group:**

The Working Group notes that "davits" are not "cranes". A clarification of ES-TRIN is desirable. A mandate is given to the Belgian delegation to submit a proposal.

\*\*

**BE6** – Minimum prescribed (forward) speed according to Article 5.06 – *ES-TRIN, ESI-II-3*

Mr BLECHER reports on the analysis by small group IV. The terminology needs to be checked for the terms “minimum speed”<sup>4</sup>. If the minimum speed is not maintained at 70 % of the loading condition, then the vessel’s loading capacity needs to be adjusted. Fundamentally, the relevance of the 70 % limit could be discussed.

Mr ROLAND points to the difficulty that small vessels ( less than 40m) have in achieving this minimum speed of 13 km/h.

MESSRS KUCHAR and BIRKLHUBER recall the situation of convoys operating on the lower Danube for which a speed of between 6 and 8 km/h is considered sufficient. Mr WERNICKE points out that these derogations can be entered under item 15 of the model certificate. Mr BIERINGER draws attention to the possibilities and limitations of the regulatory frameworks (for example, Member States are able to invoke derogations on their own territory when operating in zones 3 and 4). There are discrepancies between the regulations and actual practice.

**The joint meeting was unable to find a common interpretation to the question from the Belgian delegation.**

**Next steps validated by the CESNI/PT Working Group:**

- Continue analysing the problem and evaluate the need to amend the ES-TRIN or regulatory frameworks. A mandate is given to the Belgian delegation to prepare a working document.

\*\*

**FR1** – Steerageway under vessel's own power – *ES-TRIN, 13.05 (2)(a), 19.07(1), 28.04(1)(a), ESI-II-11*

**The joint meeting confirms the following interpretation:**

When there has been a propulsion system failure (for example loss of a propeller) but at least one other propulsion system is capable of enabling the craft to make steerageway under its own power the following questions arise:

- Is the inland navigation vessel certificate still valid?
- Is the craft capable of continuing its journey as normal or should it make for the nearest berth?

As a reminder, on the first page of the certificate, it says: “The craft may be used for navigation by virtue of this inland navigation vessel certificate only while in the condition herein described.”

The craft may continue on its journey as normal if this craft still complies with the statutory requirements (for example: minimum speed; manoeuvrability; second independent propulsion system, if applicable) and the alternative configuration is entered on the certificate (under item 52).

In the absence of any mention in the certificate of the alternative configuration capable of complying with the statutory requirements, only emergency operation is permitted and the craft must make for the nearest berth.

“Steerageway under vessel's own power” referred to in ESI-II-11 is insufficient to permit “normal operation.”

**Other remarks:**

These comments apply in general cases. For example, a merchant vessel which is equipped voluntarily with two redundant propulsion systems. Particular attention is required for passenger vessels, especially given the requirements in Article 19.10.

---

<sup>4</sup> Note from the Secretariat: The 4 language versions have been aligned in ES-TRIN 2017/1 (minimum speed).

**Next steps validated by the CESNI/PT Working Group:**

- Verify the practice of the different Inspection Bodies and controlling authorities before a database entry is added (ES-TRIN-faq). Feedback regarding the practice will shortly be put on the agenda of a CESNI/PT meeting.
- Take account of the outcome from question FR1 when addressing question DE7, in particular the common definition of the 3 levels of operation.

\*\*

**EBU/ESO1 – Installation of doubler plates to the hull – ES-TRIN, ESI-II-2**

**The joint meeting confirms the following interpretation:**

- Doubler plates are generally to be avoided.
- Doubler plates may only be fitted in the context of ESI-II-2.
- The experts in charge of the hull inspections must be provided with the appropriate information. If appropriate, the inspection bodies could take additional action at national level, in particular to the attention of shipyards and operators.

**Next steps validated by the CESNI/PT Working Group:**

- The CESNI/PT Working Group invites the States to provide effective information on the implementation of instruction ESI-II-2.

\*\*

**DE9 – Emergency exits– ES-TRIN, 3.03(4), 3.04(6), 14.06(2), 15.02(4), 19.06(3), (6) and (7)**

**The joint meeting confirms the following interpretation:**

- The minimum size of emergency exits aboard vessels is defined as 0,36 m<sup>2</sup>, with the shortest side of the opening being a minimum of 0,5 m.
- These requirements are always appropriate from an ergonomic point of view. As a reminder, these are the same dimensions used in the ADN, including when the crew member is wearing personal protective equipment.
- Because of the different types of emergency exit, it is not possible to specify any requirement for the direction of opening or closing mechanisms. However, it is at the inspection bodies' discretion to require reasonable conditions such that an emergency exit can be used with complete safety.

**Next steps validated by the CESNI/PT Working Group:**

- The CESNI/PT Working Group does not validate the analysis above. In particular, the French delegation is of the opinion that the emergency exit must open in the direction of evacuation of persons. If necessary, the German delegation could prepare a working document.

\*\*

**FR4 – Tugs equipment – ES-TRIN, 13.01(1)**

**The joint meeting confirms the following interpretation:**

In the French version of Article 13.01(1), the requirement also applies to tugs, which is not the case in the other languages (German, Dutch, English). Contrary to the French delegation's proposal, it is proposed that the French version be aligned with the other languages (deletion of the words "ainsi que les remorqueurs" (as well as tugs).

**Next steps validated by the CESNI/PT Working Group:**

- Validate the editorial correction of the French version for the draft of ES-TRIN 2019/1.

\*\*

**NL3** – Gas barbecues – *ES-TRIN, Definitions 1.01(3.7), (3.8) and (3.11), 17.02, 19.01(2)(e), 19.15(8)*,

**The joint meeting confirms the following interpretation:**

Given the conditions of Article 19.15(8), is it possible to use gas barbecues aboard passenger vessels less than 45 m in length?

The use of **permanently installed** gas barbecues is permitted, but given that they are also liquefied gas installations, they therefore need to be tested by an expert. Mobile gas appliances are prohibited.

**Next steps validated by the CESNI/PT Working Group:**

- Add a database entry (ES-TRIN-faq). A mandate is given to the Secretariat.

\*\*

**FR7** – Passenger rooms and areas – *ES-TRIN, 19.06(1)(b)*

**The joint meeting confirms the following interpretation:**

From a technical standpoint, the gas-tight integrity of the partition required between passenger rooms and engine rooms (or boiler rooms) precludes any openings in this partition. This partition must have the same characteristics as those prescribed in Article 3.03.

However recent experience shows that a significant number of vessels has been built with gas-tight(?) doors in the engine-room bulkhead directly adjoining passenger areas.

Examination by the CESNI/PT Working Group is required because strict application of the requirement could cause vessels various compliance problems. At the same time equal treatment with new vessels is desirable (level playing field).

**Other remarks:**

At the Wroclaw meeting (see RV/G (12)m 59 =JWG (12)m 61, point B4), a common interpretation was arrived at for a practical method of checking the gas tightness of engine rooms with respect to accommodation: "The following measures are to be taken:

- Openings capable of being shut must be as gas-tight as possible.
- Visible apertures are to be shut.
- Expanding foam or resin is to be used to seal cable entries.
- Visual inspections are acceptable. "

**Next steps validated by the CESNI/PT Working Group:**

- Continue analysing the problem, clarify implementations that the existing fleet and evaluate the need to amend the ES-TRIN. A mandate is given to the French delegation to prepare a working document.

\*\*

**DE1** – Passenger areas / life-saving appliances – *ES-TRIN, 19.06(8)(f), 19.09(8)*

**The joint meeting was unable to find a common interpretation to the question from the Belgian delegation.** Is the stowing of all life-saving appliances restricted to the evacuation areas, or can they be stored ready to hand throughout the entire vessel?

**The joint meeting made the following proposals:**

- The CESNI/PT/Pax Working Group could clarify the type of life-saving appliances referred to in the various Articles of the ES-TRIN, as well as the requirements in terms of where they are located on board.
- The rules applicable to seagoing vessels are to be taken into account to evaluate whether similar configurations are possible in the inland navigation sector. In particular, avoid lifejackets being stowed in cabins (which are no longer accessible in the event of flooding).
- Particular attention is to be paid to the information provided to the crew and passengers before embarking on a journey. This question could also be referred to the CESNI/QP Working Group.

**Other remarks:**

When adopting the technical requirements for passenger vessels in the RVIR, the matter of individual and collective life-saving equipment involved political decisions. Alternative means were put in place (independent propulsion systems and gangway for reaching the bank).

**Next steps validated by the CESNI/PT Working Group:**

- Instruct the CESNI/PT/Pax Working Group to address the question of the type and location of life-saving equipment.
- Refer to question concerning the information provided to the crew and passengers before embarking on a journey to CESNI/QP.

\*\*

**FR5 – Passenger rooms and areas – ES-TRIN, 19.06(10)**

**The joint meeting was unable to find a common interpretation to the question from the Belgian delegation.** How does Article 19.06(10) apply to vessels that do not have any free space on the deck or when the superstructure is enclosed or built as an extension of the hull walls?

The rules concerning the width of the various types of exit seem clear but strict application of the rules can sometimes result in situations that may be considered dangerous. The CESNI/PT/Pax Working Group could analyse this matter in more detail.

**Next steps validated by the CESNI/PT Working Group:**

- Invite delegations to report specific examples to illustrate the difficulties encountered.
- Instruct the CESNI/PT/Pax Working Group to address the question of exit widths.

\*\*

**DE4, FR6 – Toilets for use by persons with reduced mobility – ES-TRIN, 19.06(17)**

**The joint meeting confirms the following interpretation:**

- Instruction ESI-III-2 explains how to take account of the specific needs of persons with reduced mobility. In particular, it refers to Directive 2009/45/EC and UNECE resolution no. 69.
- The requirement refers to “a Member State standard or requirement for use by persons with reduced mobility”.
- There is no known international standard in this field. The absence of a harmonised solution is not very satisfactory to the profession or classification societies, which operate internationally.
- Standard DIN 18040-2 is typically applied in Germany. It is very desirable to collate working practices in other Member States to have an international perspective and evaluate the possibility of a harmonised solution.

- The ES-TRIN envisages no derogations for the requirement for toilets aboard day trip vessels, including very short trips. A solution is possible at national level (e.g. derogation for a local geographical area).

**Next steps validated by the CESNI/PT Working Group:**

- Invite delegations to continue exchanging information on the standards used in the design of toilets for persons with reduced mobility at the national level.
- Examine the appropriateness of derogations for day trip vessels in justified cases (by analogy with Article 10.06(3)).
- Give a mandate to CESNI/PT/Pax to address the issue.

\*\*

**HR4, HR5** – insulation resistances and the earthing of electrical systems – *ES-TRIN, 19.10(9)*

**The joint meeting confirms the following interpretation:**

The insulation resistances and the earthing of electrical systems shall be tested during periodical inspections". This requirement is valid only for passenger vessels according to ES-TRIN. Is it desirable to extend this requirement to other types of vessel? What is the acceptance criterion for the minimum measured value of insulation resistance in kΩ or MΩ between all insulated circuits and earth?

At this stage there is no desire to extend this requirement to other types of vessel. The inspection body or experts can always request a check of the insulation resistances and earthing of the electrical systems in individual cases.

International standard CEI 60364-6 : 2016 or the classification societies' rules can be used as the acceptance criterion for minimum measured value of insulation resistance.

**Next steps validated by the CESNI/PT Working Group:**

- Add a database entry (ES-TRIN-faq). A mandate is given to the Secretariat.

\*\*

**NL6** – Code for fire test procedures (FTP Code) – *ES-TRIN, 19.11(1)(b), (c) and (d), (bb)*

**The joint meeting confirms the following interpretation:**

How can the use of a Member State's equivalent fire protection requirements be checked?

- If an inland navigation vessel certificate has been issued under the equivalent requirements of another Member State, the owner of the vessel must be able to provide confirmation by this Member States' inspection body.
- International standard EN ISO 1182 : 2010<sup>5</sup> shall be deemed equivalent to application of Article 19.11(1)(b), (c) and (d), (bb) (please note: this standard only defines the method and not the acceptance criteria).

**Other remarks:**

No agreement was reached on the provision by CESNI of a list of "equivalent Member State regulations" to reduce the administrative workload. Indeed, CESNI could instead promote a harmonised international solution.

---

<sup>5</sup> Reaction to fire testing for products -- non-combustibility test

**Next steps validated by the CESNI/PT Working Group:**

- The German and French delegations wish to examine further before proposing an addition to the database (ES-TRIN-faq). The issue was postponed to a future meeting of the CESNI/PT Working Group.

\*\*

**DE5** – Platform, accessible from each side of the vessel, directly above the line of flotation or comparable installation – *ES-TRIN, 19.15(4) and (5)*

**The joint meeting confirms the following interpretation:**

What “comparable installations” under Article 19.15(4) and (5) have been accepted to date?

The rescue platform is a substitute for the use of a dinghy. In terms of saving people, the installation must satisfy the same prerequisites, i.e. catching hold of, securing and rescuing persons floating in the water (possibly including unconscious individuals). That being so, installations that require cooperation on the part of the person being rescued cannot be deemed appropriate installations.

Rescue systems satisfying these requirements (for example: Jason’s cradle) can be accepted as comparable installations if they are correctly installed.



**Next steps validated by the CESNI/PT Working Group:**

- Add a database entry (ES-TRIN-faq). A mandate is given to the Secretariat.
- invite CESNI/PT experts to submit proposals for other rescue systems.

\*\*

**GERC1** – Independent propulsion system – *ES-TRIN, 30.06*

**The joint meeting confirms the following interpretation:**

How is the automatic shutdown referred to in Article 30.06 to be understood?

The automatic shutdown of the propulsion system only relates to the propulsion system running on LNG. To continue to make steerageway under its own power, the vessel must possess another propulsion system (e.g.: bow thruster) not running on LNG or another independent propulsion system running on LNG.

**Next steps validated by the CESNI/PT Working Group:**

- Add a database entry (ES-TRIN-faq). A mandate is given to the Secretariat.

\*\*



**BE3, BE4, EBU/ESO2** – Applicability of transitional provisions to craft which are already in service – *ES-TRIN, 32.01 and 33.01*

Mr VAN HEES reports on the analysis by small group I. The discussion was on the question whether a vessel can make use of transitional provisions once a certificate has expired (not having been valid continuously). The position expressed by the European Commission in 2012 and confirmed by the Joint Working Group (see JWG (14)m 91, point 7.1) was recalled: the vessel can no longer benefit from transitional provisions if the certificate has expired. This implies that Member States have a responsibility to implement the legislation, including the appropriate resources to ensure timely vessel inspection. The German members of the group expressed reservations about this interpretation. Furthermore, the various language versions of the regulatory frameworks require detailed examination.

Mr BLECHER reports on the analysis by small group IV. The provisions for the Rhine vessel inspection certificate are not identical with those for the EU certificate.

Mr VERMEULEN reports on rulings in the Netherlands.

**The joint meeting notes that it is not competent to decide on how to answer the Belgian delegation's questions** and wants the CESNI/PT Working Group to consider this matter in detail.

**Next steps validated by the CESNI/PT Working Group:**

- Continue analysing the problem within the CESNI/PT Working Group with a view to agreeing a common interpretation. If necessary, the Committee could arbitrate on this fundamental issue.
- The German delegation submitted an analysis with document CESNI/PT (18) 56. The Belgian delegation is in favour of an inclusion in the work programme (CESNI/PT (18) 42).

\*\*

**BE1** – Transitional provisions for recreational craft – *ES-TRIN, 32.02 ad Chapter 26*

**The joint meeting confirms the following interpretation:**

The provisions of Article 26.01 shall apply to recreational craft built before 1.1.1995 only for N.R.C. Hence, these craft navigating on Zone R waterways must comply with the Rhine Vessel Inspection Regulations in force on 31 December 1994. Although the RVIR 1976 contains no specific provision for recreational craft, these requirements had been defined by administrative instruction no. 42 subsequently superseded by recommendation no. 27.

A similar question arises for application of Article 33.02 to recreational craft.

**Next steps validated by the CESNI/PT Working Group:**

- Examine the possibility of including this topic in the CESNI work programme (see CESNI (18) 21 – Com. EBA).
- Continue analysing the problem within the CESNI/PT Working Group, including for Article 33.02.
- Make the contents of administrative instruction no.42 and recommendation no. 27 available to all CESNI inspection bodies. A mandate is given to the Secretariat.

\*\*

**DE6** – Vessels excluded from the scope of Directive 82/714/EEC – *Directive (EU) 2016/1629, Article 29*

**The joint meeting confirms the following interpretation:**

- The provisions of Article 29 of Directive 2016/1629 (and/or Article 8 of Directive 2006/87, respectively) are not new and have been known since 2006.
- If an inspection under Article 29 of the Directive is not carried out before 30 December 2018, then the derogating provisions of Article 29 cannot be used. The transitional provisions of Chapters 32 and 33 of the ES-TRIN can still be used.
- The discussions revealed differences in the way in which the inspection bodies implement these provisions before the 30 December 2018 deadline.

**Next steps validated by the CESNI/PT Working Group:**

- This question will be examined jointly with the French question on the territorial jurisdiction of Inspection Bodies (CESNI/PT (18) 25 = CESNI (18) 24).

\*\*

**BE2** – Request for inspection – *RVIR, 2.02 and Directive (EU) 2016/1629, Annex V, 2.02*

**The joint meeting confirms the following interpretation:**

When an inspection body has carried out an inspection on board a craft, can the owner, after a certain period of time, submit a new request to another inspection body if the inspection has not yet been entirely completed and therefore no definitive certificate has yet been issued? What happens when the craft has changed owners in the meantime and the new owner wants to recover the original certificate?

In order to counter “shopping” and prevent that the owner submits his request for inspection to more than one inspection body, good practice is to refuse an inspection where an inspection is still being carried out by another inspection body.

Similarly, where the craft has changed ownership, the original inspection body to which the application was submitted shall continue its work. The initial applicant shall bear all of the costs arising from this inspection.

However, if two Inspection bodies agree, the issuing or renewal of the certificate can be transferred from one to the other. Communication between the two inspection bodies is indispensable to the transfer of the inspection files.

Proof that an inspection by an inspection body is in progress can be provided in two ways:

- by any entry / stamp on the certificate or
- by the temporary withdrawal of the certificate, which is replaced by a provisional certificate.

An amendment of the European Hull Database (EHDB) is desirable to indicate whether the certificate is in the process of being issued or renewed by an inspection body.

**Next steps validated by the CESNI/PT Working Group:**

The Working Group does not validate the above interpretation. There are still inconsistencies on how to harmonise the practices of the Inspection Bodies or on the use of the EHDB for this purpose. A mandate is given to the German delegation to prepare a working document for an ESI instruction.

\*\*

**AT2** – Entries and modifications to the Union inland navigation certificate – *Directive (EU) 2016/1629, Annex V, 2.07*

**The joint meeting confirms the following interpretation:**

Article 2.07 of the Directive stipulates that any change of registration or of home port is to be notified to the competent authority, with the Union inland navigation certificate being submitted for the change to be entered.

Is it permissible to withdraw the Union certificate owing to the change of registration number?

Changes in registration number can be entered in the Union certificate by any competent authority. If the authority making the entry in the certificate is not the issuing authority, it is required to notify the issuing authority of the change. A change in registration number is no reason to withdraw the Union certificate.

**Next steps validated by the CESNI/PT Working Group:**

- Add a database entry (ES-TRIN-faq).

\*\*

**BE5, CH3, DE8** – Issuing of an inland navigation certificate – *ES-TRIN, ESI-I-1*

**The joint meeting confirms the following interpretation:**

How should the inland navigation vessel certificate be filled out when being extended?

The entries recording the inspection and other information (excluding area of operation) in items 10 and 11 may only be made when the inland navigation certificate is first issued. All extensions are to be entered under item 49.

The details entered under items 10 and 11 on page 2 may only be amended when the entire certificate is replaced. Details on which certificate is replaced shall be entered under item 9.

When a craft switches from one certificate to another (for example, from inspection certificate to Union certificate), the complete certificate shall be replaced.

The historical record documented by the entries in item 49 is especially important for the inspection and extension of the inland navigation vessel certificate. This is the basis for applying the ES-TRIN, especially when applying transitional provisions. A loss of information could result in incorrect administrative action (e.g. application of a transitional provision that is no longer applicable after conversion).

**Other remarks:**

- The difficulties in the Netherlands are down to an IT problem and a solution needs to be found to comply with ESI-I-1.
- Work on a new model of the inland navigation vessel certificate within CESNI could solve various difficulties to do with extension.
- Because of exclusive national competences, particular attention needs to be paid to completing traffic licences in zone 1 or 2 on page 2.

**Next steps validated by the CESNI/PT Working Group:**

- Add a database entry (ES-TRIN-faq).
- Invite the Dutch delegation to report on the corrections made by the IT solution.

\*\*

#### **CH4 – Entries on the inland navigation vessel certificate – RVBR / Directive (UE) 2016/1629**

##### **The joint meeting confirms the following interpretation:**

*Are the classification societies permitted to make entries directly in the inspection certificate/EU certificate and replace pages without involving the competent inspection bodies?*

Each Member State is competent to make its own arrangements for implementing the regulations.

If the classification societies are acting on behalf of the inspection body, they must abide by the same rules for completing the certificates and the obligations to inform the other inspection bodies (for example RVIR Article 2.09(4)). National law may explicitly give the classification societies the competence to act on behalf of the inspection bodies and to issue certificates/ inland navigation vessel certificates. In the absence of an appropriate legal basis, only the inspection bodies are authorised to fill in the certificates/ inland navigation vessel certificates.

##### **Other remarks:**

- A presentation on the way in which vessel inspections are conducted and certificates are issued in the Netherlands was given to the Joint Working Group in 2014 (see JWG (14)m 59, point 8.1).

##### **Next steps validated by the CESNI/PT Working Group:**

- Take note of the analysis.

\*\*

#### **NL8 – Issuance of Community inland navigation certificates – Directive (EU) 2016/1629, Article 29**

##### **The joint meeting confirms the following interpretation:**

The exceptions granted under Article 29 of Directive 2016/1629 must be entered on the certificate. How are certificates which do not mention these exceptions to be dealt with?

In the absence of explicit entries in the certificate, the vessel cannot be granted the corresponding derogations.

In the event of any shortcomings identified during a conformity check (Article 22 of the Directive) the relevant procedure applies. This involves, if appropriate, suspension of navigation, notification to the inspection body that issued the certificate and a withdrawal of the certificate by the issuing inspection body (Article 15 of the Directive).

##### **Other remarks:**

The detailed list of exceptions granted under Article 29 is entered in item 52 of the certificate. In the interests of transparency, some experts recommend that this page be capable of being provided both in the national language and in English. Instruction ESI-I-1 could be modified as a result.

##### **Next steps validated by the CESNI/PT Working Group:**

- Add a database entry (ES-TRIN-faq).
- Examine the appropriateness of amending ESI-I-1 to require a translation of the list of exceptions under item 52 of the certificate or to take this into account when revising the model certificate.

\*\*

### **Additional questions proposed by the small groups**

Annex 3, pages 46 to 49

Owing to insufficient time the joint meeting was unable to examine additional questions proposed by the small groups. These questions concern the following topics:

- Alarm systems in the pump rooms.
- Recognition as an expert for pressure vessels.
- The extension of the validity period of EU certificates (Article 11 of the Directive) for pressure vessels.
- Definition of "major repair" (Article 14 of the Directive).

### **Next steps validated by the CESNI/PT Working Group:**

- Ask the Secretariat to draw up a working document with the questions and proposed answers.
- Examine these questions at the forthcoming meetings of the CESNI/PT Working Group and decide on a common interpretation if appropriate.

\*\*

## **4. Conclusions**

The joint meeting of the inspection bodies in Vienna in 2008 enabled the following outcomes to be achieved.

Almost 80 experts from 12 CESNI Member States, the classification societies and river commissions, answered numerous questions on the practical application of the technical prescriptions for inland navigation vessels and took part in an intensive exchange of opinions and experience in several rounds of discussions.

After the three days of the meeting, the 50 questions submitted beforehand by the experts on the application of the ES-TRIN had largely been answered. The experts' discussions on the application of the technical requirements also generated numerous proposals for harmonised interpretations.

Moreover, this meeting was also an opportunity to inform experts in the field about how CESNI works, the evolution of international regulatory frameworks and the ES-TRIN's entry into force in October 2018. Notwithstanding CESNI having made possible convergence between European regulatory frameworks, what is now required is the correct implementation of the ES-TRIN to maintain a high level of safety, to limit the environmental impact and to ensure fair inland navigation conditions. The role of the Inspection body experts in this implementation, and in supporting the emergence of innovation was especially highlighted.

Subject to examination by the CESNI/PT Working Group, the results from the joint meeting could give rise to entries in the database for the application of the technical requirements "E-TRIN-faq" and will also feed into the CESNI's future activities, in particular future amendments of the ES-TRIN.

The PARTICIPANTS thank the Austrian delegation for the great hospitality and the Secretariat for the excellent organisation. They also express the wish to schedule these joint meetings more regularly (if possible before 2021).

\*\*\*

<b>Annexes are located on website under</b>	<b>CESNI/PT 2018 EN</b>	<b>- cesnipt18_41en_m_1, cesnipt18_41en_m_2, cesnipt18_41en_m_3, etc.</b>
<b>Les annexes sont enregistrées sur le site sous</b>	<b>CESNI/PT 2018 FR</b>	<b>- cesnipt18_41fr_m_2</b>
<b>Die Anlagen stehen auf der Website unter</b>	<b>CESNI/PT 2018 DE</b>	<b>- cesnipt18_41de_m_2</b>
<b>De bijlagen staan op de website onder</b>	<b>CESNI/PT 2018 NL</b>	<b>- cesnipt18_41nl_m_2</b>