## CENTRAL COMMISSION FOR THE NAVIGATION OF THE RHINE

CLNI/CONF (12) 10 Corr. 12 September 2012 Or: fr fr/de/nl/en

<u>Diplomatic conference organised by the CCNR</u> for the adoption of the revised Strasbourg Convention on the limitation of liability in inland navigation (CLNI) (Strasbourg, 25-27 September 2012)

## Examination of the draft revised Strasbourg Convention on the Limitation of Liability in Inland Navigation (CLNI 2012)

Communication from the Luxembourg delegation

[addressed to the Secretary General]

Please find below the position adopted by Luxembourg on the draft revised Strasbourg Convention on the limitation of liability in inland navigation (CLNI 2012):

On Art. 1, para. 2e): Luxembourg agrees with the FR proposal given in its communication CLNI/CONF (12) 5 to include "lakes" in the scope of the Convention.

On Art. 2, para. 1a: Luxembourg agrees with the FR proposal given in its communication CLNI/CONF (12) 5 to include "dam" locks in the list of items subject to the limitation of liability.

On Art. 3 a): Luxembourg agrees with the FR proposal given in its communication CLNI/CONF (12) 5 which states that "as appropriate" claims in respect of assistance operations are to be excluded. On this point, Luxembourg recalls that it is not a signatory to the corresponding specific Convention and that it does not intend to be bound by a legal instrument containing obligations resulting from; another legal instrument.

On Art. 6) and Art. 7): Luxembourg agrees with the arrangement of Articles 6 and 7 as set out by France in its communication CLNI/CONF (12) 5 and the addition of a phrase referring to the possibility of constituting more than one fund.

On Art. 14: Luxembourg maintains its reservation indicated in the footnote.

## On the Declaration of extinction of the CLNI

As Luxembourg was one of the four States that ratified the CLNI, it calls on the Secretary General's office for an opinion on the legality of the declaration proposed by the Netherlands. As an alternative to this route, it is proposed that the Declaration should be worded in such a way that it would coordinate denunciation by the four signatory States so that this would take effect simultaneously or within a very short space of time in order to minimise legal insecurity and complexity for the profession.

(signed) Max Nilles

\*\*\*