



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
DIRECTORATE-GENERAL FOR MOBILITY AND TRANSPORT
DIRECTORATE B – European Mobility Network
Ports & Inland Navigation Unit

JWG (12)m 63
2 August 2012
Or. nl fr/de/nl/en

JOINT WORKING GROUP

DRAFT REPORT
of the 35th joint meeting of experts from the Member States
of the European Union and the Central Commission for the Navigation of the Rhine
“Technical Requirements for Inland Waterway Vessels”

(Directive 2006/87/EC laid down the technical requirements for inland waterway vessels,
Rhine Vessels Inspection Regulations)

12 and 13 June 2012
in Brussels

Present: see **Annex**

Chairmanship: Mr Theologitis, European Commission, DG MOVE

1. Adoption of the agenda and of the reports on the 34th meeting and of the hearing on greenhouse gas emissions

JWG (12)m 29

JWG (12)m 30 prov. = RV (12)m 11 prov. = RV/G (12)m 31 prov.

JWG (12)m 49

The working group approves the agenda.

Mr KLICHE notes that various documents were received at a late date and, therefore, could not be studied. In fact, any documents distributed less than two weeks prior to the meeting should not be included in the agenda.

The chairperson states this will be taken into account.

The reports are approved with some changes.

With reference to the report, Mr VERMEULEN repeats his question whether a request by multiple member states regarding a commission meeting in the autumn would be accepted by COM.

The CHAIRPERSON states that this cannot be confirmed as multiple aspects influence the planning of commission meetings.

2. Reports on current issues by the European Commission, the river commissions and the Member States

2.1 Current status of changes in the comitology procedure

The CHAIRPERSON explains that the four language versions of the two amendments are currently being modified. The remarks of the member states will be processed. The French version, in particular, requires much time. The final versions are expected to be presented within a few weeks. The amendments will then be presented to the European Parliament. This will take approximately one month. To conclude, the Commission's internal comitology procedure must still follow. The implementation date will be modified.

The amendment of the HDB (Hull DataBase) is still in the ISC phase (Inter Service Consultation). DG-Just and the data protection coordinator have made suggestions for references to relevant EU regulations. The Legal Department has asked for an elucidation of a number of specific aspects. There do not seem to be major differences of opinion. Consultations with the Legal Department will hopefully be rounded off soon.

Mr BIERINGER inquires after the nature of the comments by the Legal Department.

CHAIRPERSON: Elucidation of the amendment's text is currently being discussed with the Legal Department. The improvements relate to the passages where the contribution of the EHDB (European Hull Database) to the criteria specified in Article 20 is explained such as technical progress and equal competitive conditions.

Mr KLICHE asks when the letter from D will be answered.

The CHAIRPERSON states that the letter will be answered after conclusion of the ISC.

2.2 Central Commission for the Navigation on the Rhine

Mr PAULI reports on the Inspection Commission. The member states of the CCNR regret the fact that the EU COM was not represented and deem presence of COM at these meetings of vital importance. Since this concerns a joint working group that strives for continuity, the CCNR and COM must make joint decisions and should, therefore, be present during the various commission meetings.

A discussion on the report regarding the reduction of greenhouse gases following a public inquiry with the business community could not be completed this spring. The decision will be postponed until the autumn meeting.

Approval of the use of LNG (Liquefied Natural Gas) for propulsion has been discussed. The fact that the first vessel running on natural gas was operational was cause for satisfaction. The technical working group has issued a recommendation and more requests seem to be following. New amendments were discussed, but must be harmonised with the European Commission to make sure that the decision can be implemented at the same time.

With reference to questions about the availability of authorities for certification of purification systems on-board, it was announced that at least one authority and one technical department have been appointed.

2.3 No representatives of the Danube Commission and the Sava Commission were present

2.5 The member states had no additional announcements to make

3 Possible future amendments of the technical requirements

3.1 Annex II, Article 7.12 – Elevating wheelhouses

JWG (12)m 29, point 5.1

JWG (10) 74 rev. 3 – Com. BE and Secr.

JWG (12) 24 – Com. EBU/ESO

JWG (12) 50 – Com. Secr.

Mr PAULI states that the working group agreed to the proposal and implemented the final modifications in JWG (10) 74 rev. 3 during the last meeting. The EBU/ESO has requested the chance to express their opinion again by email. However, the EBU/ESO were sent the final report and the proposals for change and (Mr Rusche) did not ask any additional questions.

Both Mr KLICHE and Mr VERMEULEN indicate that their proposals have been discussed with the business communities in Germany and the Netherlands. Although not all proposals were adopted, the business communities have been informed and are involved.

Mr FÜNGERLINGS mentions that the transitional provision in Paragraph 12 only applies to item c. This means that an inspection is only required for item c.

The CHAIRPERSON states that the document will be modified accordingly.

Mr BÜRGI suggest supplementing the Dutch term "hefmechanisme" (lifting mechanism) with the term "mechanisme voor het neerlaten" (lowering mechanism); Mr CROO states that "lowering" is already implied in the Dutch term "hefmechanisme"; Mr WERNICKE indicates that in German the term "Mechanisme" may cause confusion. Mr BIERINGER and Mr BÜRGI do not think this will be a problem for Austria and Switzerland.

The CHAIRPERSON decides to leave the linguistic differences as they are, to redistribute the document and to await the response by the business community.

3.2 Annex II Articles 15.03 (4) and 15.06 (8) – Number of persons to be taken into account

JWG (10) 48 = RV/G (10) 53 – Com. BV

Mr BROERE states that in the French language version there is some confusion regarding the coefficients 1.1 and 1.5 in the formulas $P = 1.1 F_{max} \cdot 0.075$ and $1.5 F_{max} \cdot 0.075$ (used respectively to calculate the surface area of the evacuation area and to calculate the capsizing moment).

Mr BIERINGER explains that in both formulas it is clear which groups are concerned and that there is no doubt as to the formula's application.

In Germany and the Netherlands the regulation is clear; Mr KLICHE suggests this may be a French linguistic problem.

Mr BOYER states that, on the one hand, it concerns all persons and, on the other hand, all passengers with the same coefficient. France will check whether a correction will be required.

3.3 Annex II Chapter 19 – Traditional vessels

JWG (12) 22 – Com. Secr.

JWG (12)m 49

JWG (12) 51 – Com. Secr.

The report of the public inquiry held in March is adopted with some editorial changes.

COM states that the EMH has presented its views and suggested changes to the proposed Chapter 19. COM indicates that the parliaments in the member states are very interested in this topic. This means that the changes to Chapter 19 suggested by the EMH should be taken seriously and the response by the JWG must be substantiated.

Mr BOYER, MR BIERINGER and Mr Kliche all endorse the political sensitivity and the necessity of careful consideration, but feel that, by presenting the document, it might appear as if this concerns a COM viewpoint.

COM regrets this perception and explains that during the previous JWG meeting the EMH has clarified its views and has requested that the proposed Chapter 19 be modified as included in the proposal for improvement presented by the EMH. This proposal has been placed on the agenda and COM only points out that a clear and convincing response by the JWG is important in this.

The WORKING GROUP decides to consider the proposal by EMH JWG (12) 22 and to compare it with the current JWG document JWG (12) 22.

The EMH proposes to highlight the fact that "it being worth it must be retained" as specified in Article 1.01, item 25a. The proposal to delete demonstration goals in item 25a is rejected by the working group.

Where 25b is concerned, the EMH foresees that it will not always be possible to apply the original design. That is why it would be best to delete the final part of the sentence "the agreement of the building method at the time of the inspection". After discussion, all delegates can agree to this.

The CHAIRPERSON decides that the proposal by the EMH will be adopted and that the particular section of the sentence will be deleted.

Where Article 19.01 is concerned, the various language versions are extensively discussed. In essence, the English version of the EMH proposal includes the same wording as the JWG proposal.

Mr Kliche remarks, however, that the EMH is in fact proposing to delete the second part under 1) and item 2 as this is covered by item 3 and they would, therefore, be superfluous. Mr BOYER, Mr BIERINGER, Mr Kliche and Mr VERMEULEN see no major differences between the two proposals, but feel that item 2 should be retained.

Mr BIERINGER points out that the current wording fits the structure and set-up of Annex II. The reference to conjunction with other articles is important, as it can help prevent unintentional elucidation of the text.

The CHAIRPERSON concludes that the JWG text uses a broader wording. This helps clarify the essence of the article from the perspective of the Directive. Hence, the JWG text remains as is.

Article 19.02, item 6. The term flag state is not included in the Directive. The competent authorities, in this case the Inspection Bodies, are responsible for the issue of certificates and recommendations. Where vessels are concerned that only navigate in national waters, the competent authority has the possibility to deviate from the regulations in Annex II when certifying vessels for zones 1 and 2 (additional requirements) or reduced requirements for zones 3 and 4 according to Article 5, and where specific categories of ships or vessels in restricted areas according to Article 7 are concerned.

According to the EMH, a recommendation by the Commission would mean a too long procedure.

COM: The recommendation procedure has been used by the CCNR for decades and has been generally accepted by the member states. The regulations in this area included in the Directive are identical to those in the Rhine regulations. Only the decision-making process within the Commission has not been mandated to the working group or the Commission.

In general, a recommendation based on Article 2.19 is required when the vessel deviates from the rules in Annex II. Where international (cross-border) navigation is concerned, the recommendation will be harmonised with the competent authorities of other member states, in this case be presented to the Commission in accordance with Article 19.

Mr KLICHE proposes to include the possibility of deviation where traditional vessels are concerned in Annexes III and IV, (for example: "Traditional vessel, recommendation in accordance with Article 19") in case of the issue of national certificates for traditional vessels.

The WORKING GROUP supports the proposal to amend Annexes III and IV. COM promises to present this possibility to the Legal Department since the provisions made in Article 20 must also be met.

Mr BIERINGER states that, according to this article, the technical progress must be served; which is not self-evident or expedient where historical vessels are concerned.

The EMH feels that the final passage in Article 19.03, item 6, is unclear and it can better be deleted.

Mr BIERINGER explains that the recommendation involves two conditions. On the one hand, (a) the description of the deviations of the regulations and, on the other hand, (b) the plan that indicates where and when persons other than crew members may be on-board. If the condition under b has not been met, i.e. there is no plan as to when and where "people" are allowed on-board, the final passage specifies that people are allowed on-board when the vessel is moored and machines that are freely accessible have been shut down.

Mr KLICHE states that the meaning of the text is clear, but that it might be better to include the wording in a separate item (7).

Following an extensive discussion as regards content, the working group agrees with an improved version of the final passage in a separate item 7.

The CHAIRPERSON *requests Mr KLICHE to hand in a proposal*. The working group agrees to the proposal below for item 7.

7. *In case a recommendation by the Commission is not required under the condition as specified in section b, the following should be added under item 8 in the "Traditional vessel" Annex:
"Persons other than crewmembers or those present on-board for service reasons may only be on-board when the vessel is safely moored and freely accessible machines and mechanically driven systems have been shut down."*

The EMH proposes to delete the final sentence in the definition of the traditional vessels' expert at d): "Administrative instruction no. 26". The expert is expected to be fully knowledgeable about the building techniques of traditional vessels of that time. In general, this appears to be a too strict provision. Mr CROO suggests cutting the word "fully".

Mr BONE suggests changing the English "familiar" text into "familiar with" in the present case. The working group deems this to be a good alternative for full deletion.

Mr BOYER points out that in addition to Chapter 19, the Directive offers many opportunities for guaranteeing the navigation of traditional vessels in the future. It might be a good idea to clarify the opportunities provided by the Directive by means of a diagram. The working group thinks this a very good suggestion. *Mr BOYER states he is prepared to initiate this*.

The CHAIRPERSON concludes that the text of the chapter on traditional vessels has been modified based on suggestions made by the EMH. This rounds off the discussion regarding Chapter 19.

3.4 Update of the international standards cited in the regulations

JWG (12)m 29, point 9.1

JWG (12) 6 rev. 2 = RV/G (12) 7 rev. 2 – Com. Secr.

JWG (12) 23 = RV/G (12) 25 – Com. EBU/ESO

JWG (12) 46 = RV/G (12) 47 – Com. Secr.

Mr PAULI explains that delegations have pointed out obsolete standards. On the one hand, the problem concerns standards that are being modified and, on the other hand, standards that are being withdrawn.

Mr KLICHE thinks this should be dealt with by the CCNR secretariat.

Mr PAULI agrees to this where the modified standards are concerned, but wonders what should be done about the standards that have been withdrawn.

Mr FÜNGERLINGS remarks that the specification of the issue date can also be deleted since new standards are automatically enforced and old standards can be used for another 20 years.

Mr Füngerlings and Mr Pauli will create a draft proposal. Mr Pauli promises to draw up an overview. The discussion can then be held based on these.

3.5 Prevention of water pollution and abatement of noise

JWG (12) 31 – Com. RO

Mr NEAGU elucidates his overview. Chapter 8b of UN/ECE Resolution 61 does not fully match Directive 2006/87/EC.

Mr KLICHE states that apart from the technical regulations, other regulations also apply to the Rhine and the Danube. The Convention on the Collection, Deposit and Reception of Waste Produced During Navigation on the Rhine and Inland Waterways (CDNI) is in force where the Rhine is concerned that Danube countries can join. Various recommendations apply where the Danube is concerned.

There are overlaps, but technical regulations and police regulations must remain separated.

Mr VERMEULEN agrees with Germany; Resolution 61 largely overlaps the CDNI. It may be prudent to check whether any omissions can be completed.

Mr BOYER is of the same opinion as Germany and the Netherlands and feels that any overlaps should be prevented.

Mr NEAGU finds that Chapter 8a in Resolution 61 and Directive 2006/87/EC are the same, but that Chapter 8b in Resolution 61, shipbuilding regulations, should be adopted.

Mr BIERINGER finds there are many different principles since the regulations of member states can be identified. He shares the Romanian opinion that there should be a clear distinction between technical and operational regulations. Solid technical requirements included in the CDNI could be included in Annex II of the Directive.

The CHAIRPERSON concludes that most delegations feel that a better division of the regulations is possible and that sound ideas have been suggested, but that realisation involves a great deal of work. The question is which delegations are prepared to contribute.

Mr KLICHE states that the Danube Commission leans towards adopting the CDNI rules; this will be discussed during its meeting in September.

The CHAIRPERSON concludes that more time may be required to crystallise ideas more and to offer delegations the opportunity to come up with mutual suggestions.

3.6 Foreseen amendments and corrections to the technical requirements

JWG (12) 1 rev. 1 = RV (12) 1 rev. 1 = RV/G (12) 1 rev. 1 – Com. Secr.
JWG (12) 44 = RV (12) 28 = RV/G (12) 45 – Com. Secr.

Mr PAULI explains that the abovementioned documents should be checked by all delegations for editorial improvements before finalisation.

Mr KLICHE points out that the comments do not only apply to the Directive. Mr CROO states he would like to harmonise editorial comments bilaterally. Mr BOYER promises to send comments. Mr BONE states that in Article 15.06 (8) "Commission of Inquiries" should be replaced by "Inspection Body".

4 Possible future corrigenda of the technical requirements

JWG (12) 44 = RV (12) 28 = RV/G (12) 45 – Com. Secr.

The CHAIRPERSON explains that the wording should be modified in the current amendments as well as the Directive. A known example is the change from "Community" to "Union" in the Directive's integral text. Corrigenda will be provided that may also apply to individual language versions. The delegations are invited to present suggestions for possible future corrigenda for all language versions of Directive 2006/87/EC.

Mr BOYER points out that it takes time to implement these corrigenda. Mr KLICHE proposes to change all types of certificates into "vessels' certificates". Germany wants to change as little as possible.

Mr BIERINGER and Mr CROO warn against yet again new terms, as certain terms are already established.

Mr NEAGU argues for specific reference to the Directive or the Rhine.

COM states that term modifications in the certificates can wait until renewal of the certificate.

The CHAIRPERSON emphasises the importance of sound and timely harmonisation of the corrigenda in the JWG.

5 Application of the technical requirements

5.1 Application of transitional provisions

JWG (12)m 2, point 7
JWG (12) 52 – Com. EU-COM

The CHAIRPERSON states that the documents have not been made available in all languages and have not been sent on time. Therefore, discussion thereof will be moved to a next meeting.

Mr KLICHE regrets this and feels the need for clarity regarding current legislation. In his opinion, current legislation only applies to areas to which there was an entitlement, i.e. areas where navigation was already allowed.

The CHAIRPERSON prefers this to be *discussed during the next meeting*.

5.2 Joint meeting of the Inspection Bodies in Wrocław 8 - 10 May 2012

JWG (12)m 2, point 8

JWG (12) 3 = RV (12) 2 = RV/G (12) 3 – Com. Secr.

JWG (12) 14 rev. 1 = RV/G (12) 16 rev. 1 – Com. Secr.

JWG (12) 47 = RV/G (12) 48 – Com. BG

The CHAIRPERSON announces that the report on the seminar is still being drawn up. JWG (12) 14 rev. 1 includes questions by Bulgaria. These were not received on time for inclusion in the final list of questions. The questions were, for a large part, informally answered during the seminar.

Mr CROO, the chairman of the plenary session, states that the questions relate to filling in the certificate, for example, replacement of pages in the certificate and the language version to be used. The term "flag" had already been discussed during the seminar and has no direct relationship to the technical certificate. The term "from Basel to open sea" relates to the waters where the Rhine Certificate is required.

Mr WERNICKE expresses his appreciation of the seminar. The information exchange between experts was effective and many participants found the process very valuable.

The WORKING GROUP *wants to briefly discuss the questions by Bulgaria during a next meeting*, since the answers to these questions may be of importance to multiple delegations.

The CHAIRPERSON *decides that the document with questions and brief answers will be drawn up by COM.*

5.3 Tonnage certificates for passenger ships

JWG (12) 56 = RV/G (12) 54 – Com. RS

Serbia explains that a passenger vessel with a Serbian certificate was detained in Croatia. The vessel did not have a tonnage certificate. This is not mandatory in Serbia. How is such a situation dealt with in other countries?

Mr WERNICKE explains that in Germany and on the Rhine only cargo vessels are issued with a tonnage certificate.

Mr BOYER states that in France all vessels of more than 10 displacement tons must have a tonnage certificate. When other countries issue a tonnage certificate, France recognises this. Therefore, it does not seem to be a problem that the tonnage certificate is modified by other member states.

Mr CROO explains that the UN-ECE rules describe which vessels require a tonnage certificate and how this should be arranged. The police regulations specify the vessels to which this applies, in the present case, where this is enforced. This may differ per country. In Belgium, vessels passing locks are formally required to carry a tonnage certificate.

Mr BIERINGER explains that the police regulations of the Danube Commission regarding passenger vessels do not prescribe a tonnage certificate and, therefore, no such certificate is issued in Austria where passenger vessels are concerned. Should data be required for passing locks, this is also included in the inspection certificate.

Mr KORVINK states that in the Netherlands, passenger vessels are required to carry a tonnage certificate. The certificate is necessary for filling in the vessel's length on the inspection certificate.

Mr BÜRGI is of the opinion that according to the International Convention on Tonnage Measurement of Ships of 1966, Annex V, only the displacement tons are calculated of passenger vessels and, therefore, there is no explicit requirement for a passenger vessel to carry a tonnage certificate.

Mr PAULI states that it is important for the authorities in the CCNR and the EU to deal with tonnage certificates in the same way.

Mr KLICHE remarks that tonnage certificates are not a topic for the JWG but for the police regulation working group.

Mr PAULI offers to present the outcome of this discussion in the CCNR to the Police Regulations for the Navigation of the Rhine (RPNR) working group. Perhaps any possible solutions can be initiated in the European Code for Inland Waterways (CEVNI) through this working group.

The CHAIRPERSON concludes that this discussion should not be held in the JWG and accepts Mr PAULI's offer.

6. Recommendations to the Inspection bodies

Motor tank vessel Adriana Maria

JWG (12) 55 = RV/G (12) 53 – Com. NL

The CHAIRPERSON states that RV/G has already adopted a recommendation for an identical fire extinguishing system on a vessel with a Rhine certificate. This means that the CCNR member states have actually already approved the principle of the type of fire extinguishing system.

Mr KORVINK remarks that this recommendation for this vessel has not yet been dealt with in the CCNR.

Mr MULDER remarks that a recommendation may be required per vessel, but the recommendation actually concerns the fire extinguishing system.

Mr FÜNGERLINGS states that a recommendation is required per vessel. Germany has no technical objections, but concludes that fire classes A and B are mentioned for the first time under item 7. This raises the question whether this also applies to fire class C.

Mr CROO states that fire classes A and B have been added, as was the case with the previous vessel, in order to focus attention on the fact that these systems are unsuitable for extinguishing gas fires. This means that fire class C is required when LNG is used.

Mr KLICHE remarks that the applicable fire class for vessels with LNG has not yet been discussed. This is not appropriate in this case and the inclusion of unnecessary information in recommendations should be avoided. If the vessel were to be converted for the use of LNG, whether this system complies must be reassessed.

Mr CROO agrees with Germany that in this case the issue of fire classes is unnecessary, but that this item should be included when revising Article 10.03b.

Mr KORVINK offers to draw up a proposal for Article 10.03b based on fire classes A, B and C.

Mr BÜRGI remarks that where the transport of dangerous substances is concerned, an ADN recommendation is also required.

The WORKING GROUP agrees to the recommendation while specifying that item 7 can be deleted. COM states that this is the first time that a recommendation for a vessel is presented without the CCNR working group having made a decision. In principle, the JWG proposal will be presented by the Commission to the member states in the Commission under Article 19 or through a written procedure. If there are no major objections, the Commission can finalise the decision.

Mr KORVINK indicates that a temporary certificate can be issued that can be extended until the Commission has reached a decision according to the procedure.

Mr BOYER states he is very interested in the follow-up and that in France a number of vessels with a Community certificate are waiting for the possibility of a recommendation.

Mr CROO asks whether the CCNR must comply and publish. Mr PAULI states that no action is required during this phase of temporary certificates. Mr VERMEULEN remarks that the JWG is a joint working group and that, as a result, the CCNR has been informed. Germany and France agree with the Netherlands.

Mr BÜRGI also agrees, but points out that the ADN recommendation must be issued in Geneva.

The CHAIRPERSON concludes that the recommendation will be brought into the procedure and that the proposal and the procedure will be presented to the Legal Department.

7. Any other business

7.1 State of play of the European Hull Database

Mr BÄCK, acting project coordinator of PLATINA, gave a short speech on the state of affairs regarding the EHDB (European Hull Database). Currently, the database contains data from 10,628 vessels entered by 43 authorities from 9 member states (AT, BE, BG, CZ, FR, NL, PL, SLO and RO). The data relates to Rhine certificates, Community certificates and national certificates as well as dangerous substances and vessel dimension certificates. Four countries have implemented an automatic update with the EHDB.

The EHDB steering commission emphasises that the EHDB should be continued following PLATINA and that a legal foundation must be established regarding the obligation to provide the EHDB with ENI numbers.

Mr BOYER points out the practical implications. For example, France has a system for automatically notifying the EHDB about changes and has also arranged for training for users. In daily practice it is practical that data of vessels sold to France with a certificate from another member state can be easily verified.

Mr BIERINGER shares Mr BOYER's opinion and deems an EHDB where all member states participate of vital importance. In particular, the member states along the Danube are not involved in the data exchange of Rhine certificates while vessels with Rhine certificates do navigate and are sold to Danube countries.

Mr KORVINK states that the Netherlands also fully participates in the EHDB, but does not have the option of an automatic update. The Netherlands regrets the fact that not all member countries participate. This increases the risk of errors in the issue of ENI numbers.

The CHAIRPERSON declares that COM is convinced of the importance of a European Hull Database. COM will endeavour to establish a legal foundation for the EHDB and quick settlement of the amendment.

8. Date and location of next meetings

Mr BIERINGER refers to the programme and announces that the study visit to the shipyard in Linz starts at 8 a.m. on Tuesday. The point of departure is the Belgian Ministry of Transport and Infrastructure (BMVI). Meetings will be held on Wednesday and Thursday at the BMVI.

Start	End	Remarks
25-09-2012, 9 a.m.	27-09-2012, 5 p.m.	Inspection Regulation Working Group, Austria
11-12-2012, 9 a.m.	13-12-2012 4 p.m.	Joint Working Group and Inspection Regulation Working Group, Strasbourg

List of participants
Joint meeting of experts from the Member States of the EU and the CCNR, Brussels,
12 and 13 June 2012

COUNTRY	NAME	FIRST NAME
BELGIUM	CROO	Henk
BULGARIA	IGNATOV	Ivan
CZECH REPUBLIC	DABROWSKI	Vojtech
FRANCE	BOYER	Benjamin
FRANCE	BROERE	Robert
FRANCE	HENRY	Joaquim
GERMANY	FÜNGERLINGS	Friedrich
GERMANY	KLICHE	Winfried
GERMANY	WERNICKE	Alexander
HUNGARY	NYOLCZAS	Tamas
AUSTRIA	BIERINGER	Bernhard
POLAND	CHMIELEWSKI	Marek
ROMANIA	NEAGU	Alecsandru
SERBIA	Ms JOVANOVIC	Jelena
SLOVAKIA	VANICEK	Matej
SLOVAKIA	Ms CSOBOKOVA	Silvia
ZWITZERLAND	BÜHLER	Max
ZWITZERLAND	BÜRGI	Beat
THE NETHERLANDS	ARNTZ	Henk
THE NETHERLANDS	KORVINK	Leendert
THE NETHERLANDS	VERMEULEN	Rens
UNITED KINGDOM	BONE	Richard
CCNR	PAULI	Gernot
EUROPEAN COMMISSION	MULDER	Eise
EUROPEAN COMMISSION	PYTKO	Jaroslav
