



**Economic and Social
Council**

Distr.
GENERAL

TRANS/WP.1/2002/27
15 July 2002

ENGLISH
Original: FRENCH

ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE

INLAND TRANSPORT COMMITTEE

Working Party on Road Traffic Safety
(Thirty-ninth session, 23-26 September 2002,
agenda item 3 (c) (iv))

**AMENDMENTS TO AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE 1968 CONVENTIONS
ON ROAD TRAFFIC AND ON ROAD SIGNS AND SIGNALS AND THE
1971 EUROPEAN AGREEMENTS SUPPLEMENTING THEM**

Definition of mopeds and motorcycles

The Working Party at its thirty-seventh session had considered a proposal prepared by IMMA on behalf of the small group (Belgium, Italy and IMMA, chaired by Belgium). The proposal contained amendments to the European Agreement supplementing the Convention on Road Traffic, relating to the definition of mopeds and quadricycles, with the aim of bringing the definitions used in the Convention and the European Agreement closer to those used in Directive 92/61/EEC as amended by the European Union (TRANS/WP.1/2001/34).

The Working Party had made the small group responsible for preparing a document for the thirty-eighth session on the consequences that would arise from the use of new definitions, particularly as regards traffic rules and driving permits.

On behalf of the small group the representative of IMMA introduced document TRANS/WP.1/2002/4, which described in detail the impact new definitions would have on the text of the Convention on Road Traffic and the European Agreement and summarized the questions which needed to be considered in the circumstances.

In view of the complexity of the problems raised and in order to give a direction to the future work of the small group, WP.1 requested the secretariat to send member States the questionnaire prepared by the representative of IMMA. The replies received can be seen in the attached table.

From the replies received a large majority can be seen to be in favour of the adoption of the European Union's definitions (Question 1) and the classification of quadricycles as motor vehicles (Question 2). Opinions were more divided, however, on the inclusion of quadricycles in the European Agreement (Question 3) and the treatment of light quadricycles as motor vehicles (Question 3 (b) (i)) although affirmative answers predominated. As for question 3 (b) (ii) on the treatment of these vehicles as mopeds, there was a slight predominance of negative replies. It should, however, be noted that six countries did not return an answer to questions 3 (a), 3 (b) (i) and 3 (b) (ii).

Replies to the questionnaire on mopeds and motorcycles

The numbers in brackets correspond to the numbers of the questions in the questionnaire

Country	Separate “tricycles” from “motorcycles”? (1)	Use the EU definition? (1)	Include “quadricycles” in the European Agreement? (2)	“Quadricycles” classified as “motor vehicles”? 3 (a)	“Light quadricycles” to be treated in the European Agreement as motor vehicles? 3 (b) (i)	“Light quadricycles” to be treated in the European Agreement as mopeds? 3 (b) (ii)
Armenia	No	-	No	-	-	-
Denmark	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Spain	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Estonia	No experience	-	-	-	-	-
Finland	EU legislation	EU legislation ¹	-	-	-	-
France	Yes	Yes ²	Yes	Yes	No	Yes ^{2 bis}
Hungary	Yes	Yes	No	-	-	-
Latvia	Yes	Yes ³	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Luxembourg	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Norway	Yes	Yes ⁴	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
United Kingdom	Yes ⁵	Yes	-	Yes	Yes	Yes ^{5 bis}
Switzerland	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Turkey	Yes ⁶	Yes	No	-	-	-
USA	Yes	Yes ²	-	-	-	-
Yugoslavia	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
TOTAL	12 Yes	12 Yes	7 Yes	9 Yes	6 Yes	4 Yes
15 replies	2 No	1 No	4 No	6 No reply	3 No	5 No
	1 No reply	2 No reply	4 No reply		6 No reply	6 No reply

Notes

¹ WP.1 should, in the absence of EU legislation, discuss driving permits for mopeds and light quadricycles.

² In France, quadricycles are subject to rules which, generally speaking, are not those of motorcycles or cars.

^{2 bis} Yes, in principle, but mopeds will in the future be subject to registration.

³ Supports the idea from a technical point of view of including the definitions of tricycles and quadricycles in the Vienna Convention and harmonizing them with Directive 2002/24/EC. The question of driving permits should be discussed.

⁴ Although Norway used yes and no to simplify its replies, it will modify them slightly when the subjects of registration, driving permits, traffic rules, technical requirements, etc. are considered. Some of the definitions may even be reconsidered, if necessary.

- Annex 5 should be considered by WP.29 as mandated by WP.1. If, for example, WP.1 decides that annex 5 should be harmonized with the EU regulations, the work should be carried out by WP.29. While it should be borne in mind that annex 5 consists of general rules for the vehicles principally in circulation, although the EU rules are detailed for type acceptance, harmonization should ensure that rules are not in conflict. For example the type and number of headlamps should be the same for each category of vehicle;
- Careful consideration should be given to whether the amendments should be included in the European Agreement only.

⁵ It would be advisable to adopt the definitions of Directive 2002/24/EC. GRSE has been working to establish international definitions for categories of vehicles. Its work should be taken into account.

^{5 bis} In the United Kingdom, every vehicle used on the road is subject to registration, a driving permit and technical requirements except for electrically-assisted bicycles.

⁶ The Turkish definition of motorcycles includes both two-wheeled and three-wheeled vehicles. This leads, however, to difficulties in practice. It would therefore be preferable to separate tricycles from motorcycles.