



**Economic and Social  
Council**

Distr.  
GENERAL

ECE/TRANS/WP.1/102  
13 April 2006

ENGLISH  
Original: FRENCH

**ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE**

**INLAND TRANSPORT COMMITTEE**

Working Party on Road Traffic Safety  
Forty-eighth session  
Geneva, 20-23 March 2006

**REPORT OF THE WORKING PARTY ON ROAD TRAFFIC SAFETY  
ON ITS FORTY-EIGHTH SESSION**

**CONTENTS**

	<i>Paragraphs</i>	<i>Page</i>
Attendance .....	1 - 2	3
Introduction .....	3 - 10	3
Adoption of the agenda .....	11	4
Adoption of the report of the forty-seventh session .....	12 - 13	5
Communications .....	14 - 16	5
Amendments to and implementation of the 1968 Conventions on Road Traffic and on Road Signs and Signals and the 1971 European Agreements supplementing them .....	17 - 19	5
<b>Consolidated Resolution on Road Traffic (R.E.1)</b>		
(a) Restructuring of and introduction to R.E.1 .....	20 - 22	6

**CONTENTS (continued)**

	<i>Paragraphs</i>	<i>Page</i>
(b) Driving under the influence of alcohol, drugs and medication .....	23 - 26	6
(c) Improving motorcycle and moped safety .....	27 - 28	9
(d) Increasing seat belt usage .....	29	10
(e) Overtaking .....	30 - 32	10
(f) Pedestrian rules and signs .....	33 - 34	10
(g) Driving permits .....	35 - 36	11
(h) Communication and road safety .....	37	12
(i) Daytime use of lights .....	38	12
(j) Night driving .....	39	12
(k) Speed .....	40	12
(l) Mobile phones .....	41	13
(m) First-aid kit .....	42	13
(n) New issues .....	43	13
<b>Consolidated Resolution on Road Signs and Signals (R.E.2)</b>		
(o) Safety in tunnels .....	44 - 45	13
(p) Variable message signs (VMS) .....	46 - 47	13
Follow-up to the General Assembly resolutions on road safety .....	48	14
Preparation of the First Global Road Safety Week .....	49	14
Collection and dissemination of information .....	50	14
Other business .....	51 - 52	15
Adoption of decisions .....	53	15
<b>First Global Road Safety Film Festival .....</b>		<b>16</b>

## REPORT

### ATTENDANCE

1. The Working Party on Road Traffic Safety (WP.1) held its forty-eighth session in Geneva from 20 to 22 March 2006, chaired by Mr. Alexander Yakimov (Russian Federation). Representatives of the following member States participated: Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and United States of America.

2. The European Commission, the European Conference of Ministers of Transport (ECMT), and the following non-governmental organizations were represented: Council of Bureaux, International Organization for Standardization (ISO); Federation of European Motorcyclists' Associations (FEMA); European Federation of Road Traffic Victims (FEVR); European Cyclists' Federation (ECF); International Federation of Motorcyclists (FIM); International Federation of Pedestrians (FIP); International Road Safety Organization (PRI); International Road Federation (IRF); International Motorcycle Manufacturers Association (IMMA); FIA Foundation for the Automobile and Society; and as an observer: LASER EUROPE.

### INTRODUCTION

3. The Director of the Transport Division, Mr. Capel Ferrer, said that it was difficult for him to open the meeting in the absence of its Chairman since 1999, Mr. Bernard Périsset (Switzerland), who had died unexpectedly on 16 October 2005. He paid tribute to Mr. Périsset, stating that his passing was a great loss for the Working Party and for road safety, of which he had been a dedicated advocate. After a minute of silence in Mr. Périsset's honour, he invited delegates to add personal tributes to the condolence book that was at their disposal. He had already circulated the book among the Inland Transport Committee by agreement with the FIA Foundation, which had launched the initiative during the London meeting of the United Nations Road Safety Collaboration held in November 2005. Lastly, he thanked the Government of Switzerland for having made Mr. Périsset available for UNECE activities.

4. The Director of the Transport Division then reported to the Working Party on developments since the forty-seventh session. He began by emphasizing the importance of the United Nations General Assembly resolution adopted on 26 October 2005 on improving global road safety. In particular, he pointed to the fact that the resolution welcomed the work done by WP.1 to improve international legal standards, encourage member States to accede to conventions on road traffic and road signs and signals, and support the organization in 2007 of the First Global Road Safety Week, as originally proposed by WP.1. The regional commissions and the World Health Organization (WHO) had been given the responsibility for jointly organizing that event.

5. On 7 February 2006, to promote the Global Week in ECE countries, the Inland Transport Committee had adopted a resolution (No. 257), copies of which were available to delegates in all three languages. The resolution supported the holding of two scheduled events at the Palais des Nations: the World Youth Assembly, on 23 and 24 April 2007, and the Global Road Safety

Stakeholder Forum, which would follow. The members of the Working Party should publicize and promote the implementation of the resolution as extensively as possible in their countries so as to ensure that the Global Week would be a success. The Director expressed thanks to the FIA Foundation, which had announced a grant of \$200,000 to finance the Global Week; he hoped other organizations would also provide financial support.

6. Regarding preparations for the Global Week in the ECE region, the small group established by WP.1 had already met twice and a third meeting was scheduled for 23 March to take advantage of members' presence in the Working Party. To prepare for the Global Week at the international level, the United Nations Road Safety Collaboration had also established an organizing committee of the five United Nations regional commissions, WHO, the World Bank and other organizations such as the FIA Foundation and PRI. That committee was responsible for developing materials for worldwide use, including the slogan and the logo, and for ensuring coordination at all levels.

7. Following up on the General Assembly resolutions, the third meeting of the United Nations Road Safety Collaboration, established in 2003 upon the initiative of WHO, had been held in London in November 2005, enabling the objectives of the Collaboration to be finalized and strategies for achieving its objectives to be defined. The Global Road Safety Week had been one of the important subjects addressed. The fourth meeting of the Collaboration would be held on 10 and 11 May 2006 in Bangkok.

8. Regarding Consolidated Resolutions R.E.1 and R.E.2, Mr. Périsset had set the objective of completing the revision, at least of R.E.1, by the end of 2006, with a view to issuing a modernized version for the Global Road Safety Week in April 2007. To assist the Working Party in that task, the Inland Transport Committee had agreed to let it hold a special session from 27 to 30 June 2006.

9. The First Global Road Safety Film Festival would be held on 23 March 2006, under the auspices of ECE and in cooperation with LASER EUROPE. The event was backed by the Inland Transport Committee and members of the Working Party were invited to take an active part since the Festival would afford an opportunity to promote the Global Road Safety Week one year before it took place.

10. The Director then invited the Working Party to elect a new Chairman. In accordance with Rule 14 of the Rules of Procedure of WP.1, Mr. Alexander Y. Yakimov (Russian Federation) was elected Chairman until elections to be held at the fiftieth session of the Working Party in November 2006. During the session, Ms. Isabel Brites (Portugal) was elected second Vice-Chairman, along with Mr. Dan Link (Israel).

#### **ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA (agenda item 1)**

Document: ECE/TRANS/WP.1/101

11. The agenda was adopted without change.

**ADOPTION OF THE REPORT OF THE FORTY-SEVENTH SESSION OF THE WORKING PARTY (agenda item 2)**

Document: TRANS/WP.1/100 and Add.1 and Add.2

12. The report (TRANS/WP.1/100 and Add.1 and Add.2) of the forty-seventh session was adopted with the word “withdrawn” in the second line of paragraph 45 (English version only) amended to read “reiterated”.

13. The Chairman said that he would send to the secretariat some editorial corrections to the Russian version of document TRANS/WP.1/100/Add.2 on roadside controls.

**COMMUNICATIONS (agenda item 3)**

14. The Working Party was informed by the secretariat that as of 1 January 2006 all documents published by ECE and its subsidiary bodies would have symbols beginning with “ECE”. The secretariat also reported that the Inland Transport Committee had approved the terms of reference and rules of procedure adopted by the Working Party at its forty-seventh session (TRANS/WP.1/100/Add.1).

15. Under this item, the Chairman invited representatives of WP.1 to attend an international conference on Traffic Safety Management for Large Cities to be held in Saint Petersburg (Russian Federation) on 21 and 22 September 2006.

16. The representative of ISO provided information on three items of interest to WP.1: a workshop on vehicles, to be held in March 2007 during the Geneva car show, in cooperation with the International Telecommunication Union, the International Electrotechnical Commission (IEC) and ISO Committees 22 and 24; a new standard (21750) for the dashboard display of tyre pressures; and ISO work on driving permits.

**AMENDMENTS TO AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE 1968 CONVENTIONS ON ROAD TRAFFIC AND ON ROAD SIGNS AND SIGNALS AND THE 1971 EUROPEAN AGREEMENTS SUPPLEMENTING THEM (agenda item 4)**

Document: TRANS/WP.1/2005/11 and informal session documents 1, 2 and 3

17. The Chairman of the Legal Group recalled that following a request for advice from WP.1 submitted by the World Forum for the Harmonization of Vehicle Regulations (WP.29) on the compatibility with the Vienna Convention on Road Traffic of two new systems currently being studied intended for installation on vehicles (TRANS/WP.1/2005/11), the Legal Group had been assigned the task of considering the question in greater detail. At its meeting on 16 and 17 January 2006 it had reconsidered the question in the presence of a representative of the European Commission: the outcome appeared in the report replicated by informal document No. 2. There being no French or Russian translations of the report of the Legal Group meeting, however WP.1 had postponed discussion of the question and requested that the report be made a formal document for consideration at its fiftieth session.

18. In response to a proposal from WP.29 on automatic activation of the hazard warning signal and indication of emergency braking (not currently authorized under the

Vienna Convention on Road Traffic), the Legal Group had proposed an extra paragraph at the start of Annex 5 to the Vienna Convention stating that the provisions of the Annex would be considered fulfilled if, for the specific item concerned, the vehicle met the requirements of the relevant regulation annexed to the 1958 Agreement.

19. The Group had also continued its work on the definition of mopeds, motorcycles, motorized tricycles, quadricycles and light quadricycles. The Working Party had asked the Group to submit an interim report on that item, with a formal symbol, for consideration at its fiftieth session (7-10 November 2006).

## **REVISION OF CONSOLIDATED RESOLUTIONS R.E.1 AND R.E.2 (agenda item 5)**

Documents: TRANS/SC.1/294/Rev.5 and TRANS/SC.1/295/Rev.3

### **Consolidated Resolution on Road Traffic (R.E.1)**

#### **(a) Restructuring of Consolidated Resolution R.E.1 and its introduction**

Documents: ECE/TRANS/WP.1/2005/15/Rev.1 and ECE/TRANS/WP.1/2006/1

20. The Working Party quickly reviewed document ECE/TRANS/WP.1/2005/15/Rev.1, showing the revised structure of the future R.E.1. The Chairperson, speaking on behalf of the Russian Federation, drew attention to translation errors in the Russian text and said that the necessary corrections would be forwarded to the secretariat.

21. The Working Party expressed satisfaction with the quality of the introduction to R.E.1 (ECE/TRANS/WP.1/2006/1) prepared by Mr. Périsset in conjunction with the secretariat. It requested the secretariat to amend the text relating to items I (references to General Assembly resolutions), II (mention the role of the Sultanate of Oman and clarify the chronology of events) and IV (divide the first indent in two).

22. It also discussed the purpose of updating and revising R.E.1 in relation to the Vienna Convention on Road Traffic and the European Agreement supplementing it. After discussion it was agreed that R.E.1 should address all countries, not just the Contracting Parties to the Convention, and should thus be considered a supplement to the Convention, not an exhaustive guide to road traffic and safety repeating and expanding on every item in the Convention. R.E.1 should be seen as a guide to best practice, supplementing the Convention on subjects that were not covered or were insufficiently explained; it could thus, if necessary, refer to the respective provisions of the Convention, so as to facilitate referral to it by readers.

#### **(b) Driving under the influence of alcohol, drugs and medication**

Documents: ECE/TRANS/WP.1/2006/2 and ECE/TRANS/WP.1/2006/3

23. The Working Party undertook a preliminary examination of the draft recommendation (ECE/TRANS/WP.1/2006/3) prepared by the small group (Finland, Italy (chair), Romania, United States of America and WHO). Comments were made on the following sections:

- **Legislation:** With the exception of paragraph 5, virtually all the paragraphs came in for criticism, either because certain provisions were incompatible with national legislation, or because some of the recommendations were too drastic, or because they were not rigorous enough. The point was made that they were just recommendations and as full a list as possible should be drawn up so that countries could refer to those that suited their particular situations and requirements. In that connection, the secretariat stated that some of the recommendations in resolution TRANS/SC.1/336/Rev.1 of 13 March 1989 had not been reproduced, despite their continued relevance. To clarify the situation, it was decided to prepare a comparative table of the two texts for the forty-ninth session, it being recalled that the objective was to make the future revised R.E.1 a guide to best practice that could be used around the world. In paragraph 8, “below” should read “above”;
- **Enforcement:** The small group was requested to rewrite paragraphs 1, 2, 4 and 5. As currently worded, some delegations found these paragraphs unclear or difficult to understand;
- **Assessment and rehabilitation:** The small group was invited to enlarge on the matter of “alcohol interlocks” so as to highlight the various solutions that were being piloted. Countries should also be urged to explore other ways of preventing drinking and driving. The small group was requested to mention experiments in a number of countries, especially schemes targeting young people, designed to stop alcohol-impaired drivers from taking the wheel;
- **Partnerships:** The group was also asked to enlarge on that point.

24. The chairperson of the small group (Italy) said that a revised draft would be prepared in the light of the comments for the extraordinary session scheduled for 27 to 30 June. The secretariat indicated that, to ensure translation into the three working languages, the deadline for submitting documents would be 11 April 2006.

25. The Working Party undertook a detailed examination of the drinking and driving questionnaire, as revised by the small group (ECE/TRANS/WP.1/2006/2) in the light of comments made at the forty-seventh session. Observations were made on the following points:

- Question 2: Amend the English and Russian versions to reflect the concept of “above a certain BAC”.
- Question 2 (a): Split the question as follows: “New/Novice or Probationary Drivers” and “Young Drivers”.
- Question 2.1: Amend as follows: “If the crash results in injuries or death, are the penalties more severe if the offender was driving under the influence of alcohol?”
- Question 2.2: Subdivide as question 2 (a) above.
- Question 3: Amend as follows: “Is the sale of alcohol permitted in the following places? (If yes, please tick)”. After each item, indicate yes or no.

- Question 4: Amend as follows: “What is the minimum age at which a person is permitted to purchase alcohol?”, then list the alcoholic drinks in increasing order of alcohol content.
- Question 5: Amend as follows: “Does your country have legislation prohibiting open flasks or bottles of an alcoholic drink in moving vehicles (except public transport)?”
- Question 6: Amend to read “preventive methods” and provide some examples in brackets after “High-risk area patrols”.
- Question 7: Amend as follows: “What signs or reasons might prompt the police to ask for a breath test?”

7.1 Signs: (Cite items 1, 3, 5 and 6)

7.2 Reasons: (Cite items 2, 4, 7 and 8). Amend item 2 as follows: “Detection by an instrument to detect alcohol”.

Amend item 7 as follows: “Accident (specify severity:

- Accident not resulting in injury
- Accident resulting in minor injury
- Accident resulting in serious injury
- Fatal accident ...)”

Delete the repetition of “Detection” in the English version.

- Question 8: Amend as follows: “What tests are necessary to prove that someone is intoxicated and to prosecute them?”
- Question 9: Amend as follows: “What are the consequences for a driver who refuses to take a breath test:
  - At a police station? ...
  - At a medical service? ...”
- Question 10: **[Editorial change affecting French version only]**.
- Question 11: In the first column, specify what is being measured and delete the row 0.0. In (b), (d) and (e), specify the maximum duration in brackets. Split “Temporary immobilization or confiscation” and add the following penalties: “(k) Ordered to retake driving test; and (l) Other (specify ...)”.

26. The secretariat was requested to send the questionnaire to ECE member States as soon as it had been amended as indicated above.

**(c) Improving motorcycle and moped safety**

Documents: TRANS/WP.1/2004/6/Rev.2, TRANS/WP.1/2004/9/Rev.1 and ECE/TRANS/WP.1/2006/4

27. The secretariat informed the Working Party that 14 countries had replied to the questionnaire on mopeds (TRANS/WP.1/2004/9/Rev.1) and 15 to the one on motorcycles (TRANS/WP.1/2004/6/Rev.2). It invited countries that had not already done so to send in their replies without delay.

28. The draft recommendation (ECE/TRANS/WP.1/2006/4) prepared by the small group (United States of America (chair), FEMA, FIM and IMMA) gave rise to the following comments (the sections not specifically mentioned were adopted):

- Section 6.1.1.1.2 “Equipment of the cyclist”: Delete “worn on their arms and legs”, which is too restrictive, since retro-reflective devices may be worn on any part of the body;
- Section 6.1.1.2: In the Russian version, replace “cyclists” with “cycles”;
- Section 6.2.1 “Introduction”: Recast the second paragraph by deleting the numbers given and by showing the causes of accidents, and delete the end of the last sentence in the third paragraph, beginning with “... for it is this dialogue, which ...”;
- Section 6.2.1.3 “Protective gear”: be tougher about motorcycle helmets, adding a sentence saying: “National legislation should make the wearing of a helmet obligatory for motorcyclists”;
- Section 6.2.1.6 “Infrastructure”: Delete the reference to the Norwegian strategy;
- As sections 6.2.2.1.1.1 to 6.2.2.1.1.2 and 6.2.2.2.1.1 to 6.2.2.2.1.4 contained alternative proposals from PRI which appeared in italics, that organization was requested to join with the small group to present a joint proposal during the forty-ninth session;
- Section 6.2.2.2.2.2 “Safety of motorcyclists”: Amend the last sentence to read: “Governments shall make it compulsory for motorcycle riders to drive with passing lamps or daytime running lamps switched on in daylight”. The same provision should be added to section 6.2.2.1.3 regarding mopeds.

**(d) Increasing seat belt usage**

Document: ECE/TRANS/WP.1/2006/5

29. Regarding the draft recommendation (ECE/TRANS/WP.1/2006/5) prepared by the small group (Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America (chair) and the FIA Foundation), it was requested that the following sections be reviewed or checked (the sections not specifically mentioned were adopted):

- “Legislation” section: The secretariat should check the content of the first paragraph with the WP.29 secretariat, as it refers to rules 14 and 44. The small group was requested to recast the third paragraph to take account of size, and to go into more detail on child restraint systems on the basis of the responses to the questionnaire (TRANS/WP.1/2004/7/Rev.2). The secretariat remarked on the absence of any reference to exemptions from the wearing of safety belts, and underscored the need to emphasize the importance of using and promoting the symbol for medical exemptions contained in the current R.E.1, to facilitate international traffic;
- “Education” section: Replace “Education and publicity” with “Education and information campaigns”.

**(e) Overtaking**

Document: ECE/TRANS/WP.1/2006/6

30. At its forty-eighth session, the Working Party, taking into consideration the desire expressed by most countries to introduce new definitions of overtaking in the Vienna Conventions, had given a mandate to a small group (Estonia, Poland, Romania, Russian Federation, FEMA) to prepare a proposal. It emphasized that the mandate did not necessarily mean that the proposal would be followed by adoption by the Working Party, and that in any case, if amendment was considered appropriate, it should first be taken up in R.E.1 before being incorporated into the Vienna Conventions.

31. The chairperson of the small group explained that before presenting such a proposal it had been considered necessary to draw up a new questionnaire (ECE/TRANS/WP.1/2006/6) to give the group guidance on the most appropriate definition to take into consideration.

32. Despite doubts expressed by several delegations about follow-up action, the Working Party adopted the draft questionnaire and requested the secretariat to send it out as soon as possible.

**(f) Pedestrian rules and signs**

Document: ECE/TRANS/WP.1/2006/7

33. On behalf of the small group (Israel, Netherlands (replaced by Denmark), Switzerland, FIP and the Global Road Safety Partnership (GRSP), with FIP chairing), the representative

of FIP presented a draft amendment to the recommendation on pedestrian safety (ECE/TRANS/WP.1/2006/7) adopted by WP.1 in April 2001 (see report TRANS/WP.1/76). He said that the questionnaire previously considered by the Working Party had been revised and would be sent to the secretariat for distribution. The secretariat pointed out that timing constraints would prevent the results of the study from being taken into consideration as part of the current revision of R.E.1.

34. The Working Party studied the text in detail; the group was requested to revise it on the basis of the following observations (the sections not specifically mentioned were adopted):

- Section 1 (a) (Pavements and footpaths): First paragraph: Specify that the road surface marking is for parking. Second paragraph: Specify “those **designed for use at walking speeds** which are used ...”;
- Section 1 (b) (Pedestrian crossings): Revise and clarify paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 and delete references to signals, which should be covered by R.E.2;
- Section 1 (c) (Pedestrian subways and footbridges): Include the notion that devices must be installed to prevent people from crossing at dangerous places;
- Section 1 (e) (Traffic calming areas): Revise the part on signs and signals by deleting references to signals covered by R.E.2;
- Section 1 (f) (School zones): Tie in with the content of the current R.E.1;
- Section 1 (g) (Infrastructure provisions for pedestrians in rural areas): Delete the last sentence, on black spots;
- Section 2: In the Russian version, remove the problem in the title;
- Section 2 (a): Replace “actors” with “**road users**”;
- Section 2 (d): Add at the end of the sentence: “**by emphasizing their vulnerability**”.

**(g) Driving permits**

Document: ECE/TRANS/WP.1/2006/9

**(i) Draft recommendation**

35. The Working Party made the following comments about the draft recommendation on driving permits (ECE/TRANS/WP.1/2006/9) prepared by the representative of the European Commission and by the secretariat:

- Section 2.1: Delete “in Europe” in the English version;
- Section 2.1.1: Change the title to “Professional instruction for drivers”;

- Section 2.1.1.1: Improve the wording of the second and third paragraphs;
- Section 2.1.1.1.1: The Legal Group was requested to shorten the text.

**(ii) Driving permits issued in accordance with the 1949 Convention**

36. At its forty-seventh session, the Working Party, after discussing possible means of addressing the divergences between the provisions on driving permits in the 1949 and 1968 Road Traffic Conventions, decided to send the Contracting Parties a questionnaire asking them to indicate which solution they preferred. The Legal Group was requested to examine the questionnaire prepared by the Russian Federation and IMMA.

**(h) Communication and road safety**

Document: TRANS/WP.1/2005/16

37. During consideration of the above document, which had first been drawn up by Mr. Périsset, the Working Party requested some corrections in the following sections:

- Section 2.2.1: Revise the wording of the first sentence to make it more general;
- Section 2.2.1.2: Recast the first indent (emphasizing the “strategy” aspect) and clarify the second and third indents. Add a new indent on campaign impact assessment.

**(i) Daytime use of lights**

Document: ECE/TRANS/WP.1/2005/17/Rev.1

38. Pursuant to the discussions on the daytime use of lights (TRANS/WP.1/2005/17) at the forty-seventh session, the secretariat changed the text, as reflected in document ECE/TRANS/WP.1/2005/17/Rev.1. The text presented had been considered too descriptive: the addition of several related recommendations had been requested.

**(j) Night driving**

Document: TRANS/WP.1/2005/18

39. The Working Party requested that the part concerning drivers should be revised with the deletion of certain indents and a change in the introductory sentence.

**(k) Speed**

40. Consideration of this section (TRANS/WP.1/2005/16) was postponed to the forty-ninth session.

**(l) Mobile phones**

41. Consideration of this section (TRANS/WP.1/2006/8) was postponed to the forty-ninth session.

**(m) First-aid kits**

42. Consideration of this section too (TRANS/WP.1/2004/17) was postponed to the forty-ninth session.

**(n) New issues**

43. Consideration of the following subjects was postponed to the forty-ninth session: comments and proposals on various elements of R.E.1, formulated by FEVR (ECE/TRANS/WP.1/2006/10), safety of children (ECE/TRANS/WP.1/2006/11), special rules for certain categories of vehicles (ECE/TRANS/WP.1/2006/12) and professional driving instruction (ECE/TRANS/WP.1/2006/13).

**Consolidated Resolution on Road Signs and Signals (R.E.2)**

**(o) Safety in tunnels**

Documents: TRANS/WP.1/2005/10/Rev.1 and informal document for the session

44. At its forty-seventh session, the Working Party had decided, following information sent by the secretary of WP.15, to await possible new developments within that Working Party before taking a definitive decision on the final provisions to incorporate in R.E.2. Nonetheless, it adopted in principle the proposals that had been submitted to it (TRANS/WP.1/2005/10/Rev.1) with the changes made during the forty-seventh session, while mandating the Legal Group to follow the related developments.

45. The representative of the WP.15 secretariat, having recalled the context of those changes, presented in an informal document (in English only) the final text adopted by WP.15, which was distributed in the meeting room. The chairman of the Legal Group said that the Group had been kept abreast of current developments during its meetings in September 2005 and January 2006, and that the text presented in the informal document appeared acceptable from the legal standpoint, and could therefore, in principle, be adopted. However, since it was difficult to proceed with adoption in the absence of translations into the other two languages, WP.1 asked the Legal Group to consider the text during its meeting on 24 March with a view to submitting it in final form during the forty-ninth session for adoption and inclusion in R.E.2.

**(p) Variable message signs (VMS)**

Document: ECE/TRANS/WP.1/2005/6/Rev.2

46. At its forty-seventh session the Working Party requested the small group (France, Germany, Netherlands, Spain (chair)) to work on the issues of priority rules for VMS and static

signs and between different types of VMS, and on the special issue of lane control systems. The revised document presented by the chair of the small group (ECE/TRANS/WP.1/2005/6/Rev.2) gave rise to the following comments:

- Speed limits shown on VMS should not have priority over speed limits shown on fixed signs;
- VMS and fixed signs should not interfere with one another;
- Check which sign is to be used, C, 17<sup>a</sup> or C, 14, to signal the end of a speed limit;
- The sign most recently passed should have priority, whether VMS or fixed;
- VMS were not limited to the signs shown in the table contained in the above document. Others were also in use;
- Certain signs shown (for example, G-24, G-27) should be E signs;
- A rule should be included indicating the value given to VMS in relation to fixed signs;
- Mandatory signs should be circular and blue, and not square.

47. The small group was invited to prepare a revised document for the fifty-first session of the Working Party in March 2007, accompanied by an annex presenting, in a table, the proposals sent to the group by the representatives of WP.1, mentioning the follow-up given to them and, where appropriate, the reasons for their exclusion. In order to have as complete a document as possible, the chair of the small group asked the delegates to WP.1 to send their comments as soon as possible.

#### **FOLLOW-UP TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTIONS ON ROAD SAFETY (agenda item 6)**

48. The item in question was addressed by the Director of the Transport Division in his introduction to the session (see paragraph 7 of the present report) and did not give rise to any further discussion.

#### **PREPARATION OF THE FIRST GLOBAL ROAD SAFETY WEEK (agenda item 7)**

49. The item in question was addressed as well by the Director of the Transport Division in his introduction to the session (see paragraphs 4 to 7 of the present report) and did not give rise to any further discussion.

#### **COLLECTION AND DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION (agenda item 8)**

50. The item in question was not addressed during the session.

**OTHER BUSINESS (agenda item 9)**

51. The representative of ECF presented the EuroVelo project, the objective of which was to develop a network of cycle routes throughout Europe. The total length of the network would be over 60,000 kilometres, and over 20,000 kilometres were already in place. She thanked the countries that had responded to the questionnaire on the implementation of a harmonized sign system on the network, and said that her Federation intended to submit a draft recommendation to follow up on the support expressed for such harmonization,. The secretariat invited ECF to send in the draft by the end of August so that it could be translated for the November session of the Working Party, specifying that the topic could be discussed only at the March 2007 session.

52. The Working Party was informed that its forty-ninth session would be held from 27 to 30 June 2006. The dates for the autumn session had been set from 7 to 10 November 2007.

**ADOPTION OF DECISIONS (agenda item 13)**

53. The Working Party adopted the list of decisions taken at its forty-eighth session on the basis of a draft prepared by the secretariat.

### **First Global Road Safety Film Festival (23 March 2006)**

The First Global Road Safety Film Festival, organized under ECE auspices to mark the Working Party session, was held on 23 March 2006 in Room XIX of the Palais des Nations. The event, organized by ECE in cooperation with LASER EUROPE, brought together over 250 people.

Films from all regions of the world were shown. They had been selected by an international jury of road safety experts and had been divided into the following categories: communication and road safety campaigns; education and training; road risk prevention in professional circles; innovations for road safety; and TV broadcasts for road safety.

The prizes were awarded by Mr. Marek Belka, the Executive Secretary of ECE.

In the communication category, first prize was awarded to Denmark for the film *Dead Man Walking*, by Jonas Arnby. In the education category, first prize went to Israel for the cartoon film for children entitled *Zoo on Wheels*, by Einat Bilitzki. In the professional category, first prize went to *Portrait of Claude Nurdin*, by Fouad Benhamou. First prize in the innovations category went to the Develter driving simulator. In the TV broadcasting category, first prize was awarded to *Secours pour un cerveau câblé pour ça* (Help for a Hard-Wired Brain), prepared by Romain Cipièere for the town of Aubagne, France.

The jury awarded special prizes to films produced in the Sultanate of Oman, Morocco and Cambodia.

All information concerning the festival is available at the following website:  
<http://www.unece.org/trans/roadsafe/filmfestival.html>.

-----