



**Economic and Social  
Council**

Distr.  
GENERAL

TRANS/WP.1/78  
23 October 2001

ENGLISH  
Original: FRENCH

---

**ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE**

INLAND TRANSPORT COMMITTEE

Working Party on Road Traffic Safety

**REPORT OF THE WORKING PARTY ON ROAD TRAFFIC SAFETY  
ON ITS THIRTY-SEVENTH SESSION  
(10-14 September 2001)**

**ATTENDANCE**

1. The Working Party on Road Traffic Safety held its thirty-seventh session in Geneva from 10 to 14 September 2001. Representatives of the following member States of the Economic Commission for Europe participated: Austria; Czech Republic; Denmark; Estonia; Finland; France; Germany; Hungary; Latvia; Luxembourg; Netherlands; Norway; Poland; Portugal; Romania; Russian Federation; Spain; Sweden; Turkey.

The European Conference of Ministers of Transport (ECMT) and the International Organization for Standardization (ISO) were represented.

Representatives of the following non-governmental organizations also took part: European Federation of Road Traffic Victims (FEVR); Federation of European Motorcyclists' Associations (FEMA); International Touring Alliance/International Automobile Federation (AIT/FIA); International Federation of Pedestrians (FIP); International Motorcycle Manufacturers Association (IMMA); International Road Federation (IRF); International Road Safety (PRI).

## **OPENING OF THE SESSION**

2. The meeting had two parts: the first part (10 September), chaired by Mr. José Capel Ferrer, Director of the UN/ECE Transport Division, was entirely devoted to the evaluation of the Third Road Safety Week (1-7 May 2000); the second part (11 to 14 September) was devoted to the work proper of WP.1. In the absence of the Chairman and the two Vice-Chairmen, all three of whom had been prevented from attending, it took place under the joint chairmanship of Mr. Gunnar Hoel (Norway) and Mr. Pim Hol (Netherlands), whom the Working Party appointed ad interim.

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

(*Document: TRANS/WP.1/77*)

3. The agenda was adopted without amendments.

## **EVALUATION OF THE THIRD ROAD SAFETY WEEK** (*agenda item 2*)

(*Documents: TRANS/WP.1/2000/30 and Add.1, TRANS/WP.1/2000/42, TRANS/WP.1/2001/11 and Add.1, TRANS/WP.1/2001/27 and informal documents Nos. 3, 3 bis and 3 ter of the current session*)

4. The Inland Transport Committee at its sixty-third session (13-15 February 2001) had considered it vital on the one hand to analyse the results of the Third Road Safety Week and assess its value added as a United Nations campaign, and on the other hand to consider possibilities of organizing other manifestations of that type in the future at closer intervals and/or over longer periods.

Working Party WP.1 at its thirty-sixth session (3-6 April 2001) had decided to devote a special day (10 September 2001) to this evaluation and had established a small informal group to prepare the meeting. Following the group's meeting on 3 July 2001, the secretariat had sent the member States of UN/ECE a list of points for discussion and a questionnaire (letter 2001/TRANS/3751, dated 23 July 2001).

The evaluation was carried out in accordance with the list of points for discussion which had been prepared; the section headings appear below in bold type italics.

### ***5. Analysis of the impact of the Third Road Safety Week***

On the basis of written information transmitted by 18 member States (documents TRANS/WP.1/2000/30 and Add.1, TRANS/WP.1/2000/42 and TRANS/WP.1/2001/11 and Add.1) following the campaign and the analysis of the 14 replies to the questionnaire, the secretariat presented the overall results of the road safety campaign, consolidated in informal documents Nos. 3, 3 bis and 3 ter of the thirty-seventh session and in document TRANS/WP.1/2001/27. The Working Party thanked the secretariat and, following the presentation, concluded that the campaign had had a positive or very positive impact in the majority of countries which had provided information. These were mainly Central and

Eastern European countries, the CIS countries and two countries from the European Union. The representative of FEVR expressed regret at the lack of interest in the campaign in the European Union.

#### 6. *Reflections for the future*

The participants considered that the organization of a campaign under the auspices of the United Nations was very beneficial but that the role of the United Nations in road safety needed to be reinforced. In order to give greater resonance to UN/ECE's activities in that sphere, Mr. Capel Ferrer stressed the benefit and importance for the secretariat of having a list of addresses of the various media (press, radio and television) in the ECE countries. The members of WP.1 were asked to send the secretariat the addresses and e-mail addresses of their media to which press releases prepared by the secretariat could be sent.

WP.1 also approved the continuation of UN/ECE road safety campaigns which should be based on the following principles:

- ?? Selection of a sufficiently broad theme leaving member States completely free to adapt it to their own needs. WP.1 would be responsible for defining this theme.
- ?? The expression "Road Safety Week" should be kept since it constituted an established brand name.
- ?? As a compromise between the proposal to organize longer and more frequent campaigns and the proposal to maintain the status quo, it was decided to organize Road Safety Week every four years. The next Road Safety Week would therefore be held in 2004.
- ?? It would be desirable to hold a launch seminar in Geneva immediately before the Fourth Road Safety Week with the participation of high-level officials from national road safety administrations, universities, etc.
- ?? It would also be desirable to associate the press officers of the ministries concerned with the preparation of the Fourth Road Safety Week in order to improve the development of the national campaigns and their better coordination.

#### 7. *Role of the UN/ECE secretariat*

In addition to the activities already carried out by the secretariat (brochures, Internet, seminars, press releases, etc.), it was recommended that the secretariat's coordination activities should be increased, particularly with regard to the exchange of information on annual road safety campaigns by member States. States were therefore requested to send the secretariat brief information (maximum one page) on their campaigns in one of the official languages of UN/ECE. It was also proposed that the secretariat should send an official letter to the ministers responsible for road safety informing them of the next Road Safety Week and inviting them to participate actively.

8. ***Scope of the next UN/ECE road safety campaign***

It was decided to limit the scope of future road safety campaigns to the UN/ECE region but to keep the other United Nations regional commissions informed. Mr. Capel Ferrer agreed to raise the matter at a meeting of Directors of Transport Divisions of all the regional commissions to be held in Bangkok in January 2002.

9. ***Possible partners, funding***

The Working Party agreed that it would be beneficial to involve other partners, such as ECMT, the European Union or GRSP, as well as the private sector, particularly insurance companies, automobile clubs and vehicle manufacturers, in future road safety campaigns.

**ADOPTION OF THE REPORT OF THE THIRTY-SIXTH SESSION OF THE WORKING PARTY** (*agenda item 3*)

(Document: TRANS/WP.1/76 and Corr.1)

10. The report of the thirty-sixth session was adopted subject to the replacement in Annex I (new chapter of R.E.1 on safety of pedestrians), paragraph 1 (e) (ii), of “the Vienna Convention on Road Signs and Signals” by “the European Agreement supplementing the Vienna Convention on Road Signs and Signals”. IRF thanked the secretariat for improving the presentation of the report.

**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.1/2001/36)

11. The secretariat informed WP.1 of the new accessions to these legal instruments since the thirty-fifth session. Yugoslavia (succession) had become a Contracting Party to all the aforementioned instruments, including their Protocols, and to the European Agreement on Road Markings, while Georgia had become a Contracting Party to the Vienna Convention on Road Signs and Signals.

(a) **Recommendations of the Ad Hoc Legal Expert Group** (*agenda item 4 (a)*)

(Documents: TRANS/WP.1/2001/23 and Add.1, TRANS/WP.1/2001/6, TRANS/WP.1/2000/20, informal document No. 3 of the thirty-sixth session (*distinguishing sign*))

12. The Working Party at its thirty-sixth session had requested the Ad Hoc Legal Expert Group (Luxembourg, Norway, Russian Federation and Switzerland, chaired by Norway) to consider or reconsider from a legal point of view the proposals adopted by WP.1, particularly those relating to priority at roundabouts, behaviour at pedestrian crossings, the incorporation of the distinguishing sign in the vehicle registration plate and the use of blue markings.

The Ad Hoc Legal Expert Group met in Luxembourg on 18 and 19 June 2001. WP.1 considered the recommendations of the Expert Group overall (TRANS/WP.1/2001/23) and provided the follow-up given below. All proposals for amendments of the legal instruments adopted by WP.1 are set out in full in annex 1 to this report.

13. **Priority at roundabouts:** WP.1 endorsed the proposals of the Legal Expert Group:

?? To delete the amendment to article 18 of the Vienna Convention on Road Traffic adopted previously (document TRANS/WP.1/2001/23, paragraph 1 (a));

?? To amend Annex 1, Section D, paragraph 3 of the Vienna Convention on Road Traffic as indicated in document TRANS/WP.1/2001/23, paragraph 1 (b). The Russian Federation requested that “prescribe” should be replaced by “notify” in the Russian version;

?? To delete (document TRANS/WP.1/2001/23, paragraph 3) the versions of Annex 1D3 in the European Agreement supplementing the Vienna Convention on Road Signs and Signals, i.e. all of paragraph 3 (Compulsory Roundabout) referred to in paragraph 21 of the Agreement.

Germany and the Russian Federation agreed to these proposals.

14. **Behaviour at pedestrian crossings:** On the basis of the work carried out by ECMT (TRANS/WP.1/1998/4, para. 1.4) and in a concern to ensure the same meaning in the three official UN/ECE languages of the English expression “using, or about to use” (referring to giving way to pedestrians on a crossing) in article 21.2, paragraphs (a) and (b) of the Vienna Convention on Road Traffic, the Legal Expert Group proposed the insertion (cf. document TRANS/WP.1/2001/23, para. 9) after “pedestrians already using” of “or clearly having the intention of using it”.

Since this proposal was not adopted because of divergences of opinion, the International Federation of Pedestrians (IFP) was asked to submit new proposals for the next session of WP.1 in conjunction with the secretariat.

15. **Distinguishing signs:** The Legal Expert Group had received the mandate of considering all the proposals which had been adopted by WP.1 except for paragraphs 3.2 and 3.3 of informal document No. 3 by the secretariat, prepared for the thirty-sixth session, on which substantive divergences had emerged. All the proposals submitted in this context by the Legal Expert Group, contained in document TRANS/WP.1/2001/23, paragraph 15 (a) to (o), were adopted. WP.1 requested the secretariat, however, to submit at the next session a proposed text for paragraph 15 (b) to amend the European Agreement supplementing the Vienna Convention on Road Traffic. The purpose of this amendment was to make it obligatory also for vehicles registered in Europe to affix a distinguishing sign on the front registration plate of the vehicle when the distinguishing sign was incorporated in the plate.

As regards the two points pending (3.2 and 3.3 of informal document No. 3) concerning the placing of the distinguishing sign on the registration plate, WP.1 was unable to reach a conclusion and postponed the discussion until its next session.

16. **Blue markings:** WP.1 adopted the proposals of the Legal Expert Group contained in document TRANS/WP.1/2001/23, paragraphs 18, 21 and 22. The intention of these proposals, based on proposals originally submitted by Poland, was:

?? To amend the end of the first sentence of paragraph 2 of article 29 of the Vienna Convention on Road Signs and Signals. The phrase “*where parking is permitted or restricted*” was replaced by: “*where parking is permitted but subjected to some conditions or restrictions (limit of duration, payment, category of user, etc.)*”;

?? To delete paragraph 9 (c) (vii) of Annex 1, Section C, Chapter II, of the Vienna Convention on Road Signs and Signals;

?? To amend paragraph 6 of the annex to the Protocol (Ad article 29 of the Convention) on Road Markings Additional to the European Agreement supplementing the Vienna Convention on Road Signs and Signals in order to bring the wording into line with the above amendment of article 29.

17. **Driving permit:** The amendment proposed in document TRANS/WP.1/2001/23, paragraph 24, was adopted. The purpose of this proposal was to bring into line the three language versions of the text of article 41.2 (b) and (c) containing either an “and” or an “or” which seemed unnecessary to the Legal Expert Group. WP.1 endorsed the deletion of the conjunctions.

(b) **Issues transferred to the Working Party by the European Conference of Ministers of Transport (ECMT) (*agenda item 4 (b)*)**

(Documents: TRANS/SC.1/WP.1/1997/13, TRANS/SC.1/WP.1/R.140 and Add.1 to 7, TRANS/WP.1/1998/4)

(b) (i) Siting of traffic signs

(Documents: TRANS/SC.1/WP.1/R.140/Add.4 and informal document No. 7 (*thirty-seventh session*))

18. The Working Party at its thirty-sixth session had confirmed its decision to make the relevant small group (Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Israel, Spain, AIT/FIA, IRF and PRI) responsible for preparing a feasibility study on harmonization of the siting of traffic signs for its thirty-seventh session. France meanwhile agreed to take the chair and said that although the group had not been able to meet in its full form it proposed to concentrate its work initially on priority and danger signs with a view to ascertaining the situation where these signs

were concerned. On this basis the small group had prepared a preliminary draft questionnaire for the current session (cf. informal document No. 7) proposing the following indicative timetable:

- ?? Sending of the draft questionnaire to all delegates prior to the thirty-eighth session (March 2002);
- ?? Discussion and finalization of the questionnaire at the thirty-eighth session (March 2002);
- ?? Sending of the questionnaire to member States in April/May 2002 for replies by 30 June 2002;
- ?? Presentation of the replies to the questionnaire: September 2002 (if sufficient replies);
- ?? Submission of the first draft document for discussion: April 2003.

19. WP.1 thanked France for agreeing to chair the small group and the group itself for having initiated work on the subject so promptly and efficiently.

20. The secretariat for its part hoped that the questionnaire, which would be submitted to WP.1 at its next session when it would be finalized, would from the start be structured so as to facilitate the use of the replies at a later date.

(b) (ii) Mobile phones

*(Documents: TRANS/WP.1/2001/20, TRANS/WP.1/2001/30, TRANS/WP.1/2001/40 and Corr.1)*

21. The Working Party at its thirty-sixth session had requested the small group (Germany, Israel, Romania and Spain, chaired by Israel) to prepare a recommendation on the use of mobile phones while driving, with a view to its incorporation into Consolidated Resolution R.E.1, and a proposal for the amendment of the Vienna Convention, based on a more general approach and also concerning other equipment that might distract drivers.

22. Following discussion of the document prepared by the small group (TRANS/WP.1/2001/30) and submitted by the delegation of Germany in the absence of the Chairman, WP.1 requested the small group to prepare new proposals in the light of recent developments within the European Union.

23. While a broad consensus emerged in favour of an amendment to the Convention in respect of mobile phones, several delegations nevertheless proved reserved regarding the extension of the scope of the proposal to all devices which might distract the driver. The subject of mobile phones is also discussed under item 5 (d) below.

(b) (iii) Definition of mopeds and motorcycles

*(Documents: TRANS/WP.1/2000/41, TRANS/WP.1/2001/34)*

24. The Working Party at its thirty-fifth session had studied a proposal to amend the European Agreement supplementing the Convention on Road Traffic (definition of mopeds and motorized quadricycles) (TRANS/WP.1/2000/41) and requested the relevant small group (Belgium, Italy and IMMA, chaired by Belgium) to prepare a fuller and more detailed proposal, with particular attention to the possible consequences of the amendment.

25. In the absence of the acting Chairman, the document prepared by the small group (TRANS/WP.1/2001/34) was submitted by the representative of IMMA. He recalled that the purpose of such amendments was to bring the definitions of the European Agreement supplementing the Vienna Convention into line with those contained in amended Community Directive 92/61/EEC. Since several delegations had shown some reserve regarding the new definitions which might lead to major repercussions (particularly for quadricycles) on other aspects (traffic regulations, driving permits in particular), WP.1 invited the small group to prepare a document for the thirty-eighth session analysing the consequences of introducing the new definitions proposed. It also considered that it was necessary for WP.29 to be consulted on these definitions. Lastly, it requested the secretariat to inform Belgium, which chaired the group, of the decisions taken.

(c) **Driving permit**

*(Documents: TRANS/WP.1/2001/5 and Add.1 and 2, TRANS/WP.1/2001/29, TRANS/WP.1/2001/32, informal document No. 6 of the current session)*

26. The Russian Federation which was chairing the relevant small group (Bulgaria, France, Israel, Luxembourg, Romania, Russian Federation, Spain and IMMA) submitted a progress report on the work of the group on behalf of the acting Chairman who was absent. It was recalled that the long-term objective of the group was to prepare a new Annex 6 to the Vienna Convention on Road Traffic and a standard model driving permit. The replies to the secretariat's questionnaire had served as a basis for the work of the small group which had met in Madrid in March 2001 and in St. Petersburg on 30 and 31 August 2001.

27. WP.1 began by considering the proposals emerging from the Madrid meeting contained in document TRANS/WP.1/2001/32, all of which had been adopted in principle. Germany had, however, entered a reservation on the principle of requiring the DDP in addition to the IDP (cf. paragraph 1 of the above-mentioned document). WP.1 asked the Legal Expert Group to consider the questions of the terminology used in paragraphs 1 and 2 of the document, particularly the use of "valid" instead of "appropriate". It also requested the small group to submit proposals concerning the suspension of the international driving permit (IDP) if the domestic driving permit (DDP) were suspended and the inclusion in the Convention of minimum harmonized conditions for the issue of driving permits.



28. WP.1 also received a report of the results of the St. Petersburg meeting. It would consider the proposals prepared at that meeting (cf. informal document No. 6 in English and Russian) at its thirty-eighth session. France offered to prepare a French version of the document rapidly so as to speed up the procedure for the consultation of member States on the content of the proposals to be initiated by the secretariat. The deadline for comments on these proposals was set as 31 December 2001. The small group had scheduled a meeting early in March 2002 in order to prepare a new draft Annex 6 to the Vienna Convention.

**(d) Accident black spot sign**

*(Document: TRANS/WP.1/2001/9)*

29. The Working Party at its thirty-sixth session had considered the information on accident black spot signs transmitted by the Governments of member countries (TRANS/WP.1/2001/9). The European Commission had at that time informed the Working Party that a study on the overall issue of accident black spots had been initiated late in 2000 and it had offered to report on the progress of the study to the Working Party at its thirty-seventh session. As a result of staff changes in the European Commission, it had not been possible to provide any information on accident black spots. Consideration of this issue, which depended heavily on the European Commission, would resume when the situation permitted.

**(e) Safety in road tunnels**

*(Informal document No. 5 (thirty-seventh session))*

30. A report was made to WP.1 on the recommendations adopted by the Ad Hoc Multidisciplinary Group of Experts on Safety in Tunnels in July 2001. In accordance with the request by the Inland Transport Committee at its February 2001 session, the Working Party was requested to make a first general review of the recommendations concerning road traffic and safety.

31. Since the Working Party only had access during the meeting to a partial English version of the report of the Group of Experts which was in the process of finalization (cf. *informal document No. 5 of the current session*), it postponed consideration of the recommendations within its sphere of competence until its thirty-eighth session with a view to their possible incorporation either in the Vienna Conventions and European Agreements or in the Consolidated Resolutions. For this purpose and so that the members of WP.1 could have an overall view of the problems of safety in tunnels, a request was made that delegates should be able to have access to the full final report once it was available in the three UN/ECE languages. WP.1 nevertheless wished to have complete freedom regarding the recommendations which came within its sphere of competence.

**(f) Harmonization of road signs**

*(Document: TRANS/WP.1/2001/35)*

32. In accordance with the agreement reached at the thirty-sixth session, IRF, in consultation with AIT/FIA, submitted a feasibility study (*cf. document TRANS/WP.1/2001/35*) on possibilities of harmonizing road signs and signals with respect to regulatory and danger warning signs. This 1996 study for the European Commission had been backed by a computerized program (available on CD-ROM). The Working Party had also been able, by means of an electronic tool designed for the purpose, to view the presentation of a study on the creation of an international direction indication system on the E-road network (Reports of the Right Way Group).

33. The Working Party thanked IRF for these very interesting presentations and wondered what possible follow-up could be in respect of the Vienna Convention on Road Signs and Signals, the European Agreement supplementing it and/or R.E.2. In order to assist delegations in this, IRF proposed to give a free copy of the CD-ROM dealing with these studies to countries which asked the secretariat for one. Delegations to which these CD-ROM would be sent were invited to send the secretariat their comments and reactions by 1 December 2001 at latest. On the basis of these comments, IRF and AIT/FIA would prepare a document and proposals for the next session of WP.1.

**(g) Visibility and legibility of road signs**

*(Document: TRANS/WP.1/2001/41)*

34. Following the Working Party's request at its thirty-sixth session, the representative of PRI submitted new proposals to amend the Vienna Convention on Road Signs and Signals and the European Agreement supplementing it with a view to improving the visibility and legibility of road signs.

After considering these proposals, WP.1 asked the representative of PRI to prepare a new document taking account of the comments made and also incorporating the problem of horizontal signs (road marking).

**REVISION OF THE CONSOLIDATED RESOLUTIONS ON ROAD TRAFFIC (R.E.1)  
AND ON ROAD SIGNS AND SIGNALS (R.E.2) (*agenda item 5*)**

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

**(a) Technical inspections**

*(Document: TRANS/WP.1/2001/25 and Corr.1)*

35. WP.1 endorsed the proposed recommendation concerning technical inspections adopted by WP.29 at its one hundred and twenty-third session, incorporating the

corrections proposed by the International Motor Vehicle Inspection Committee (IMVIC) (TRANS/WP.1/2001/25/Corr.1). This new text would be included in the next revision of R.E.1 instead of the present Annex 2 as contained in document TRANS/SC.1/294/Rev.5.

**(b) Skateboarders, roller skaters, etc.**

*(Documents: TRANS/WP.1/2000/24, TRANS/WP.1/2001/10, TRANS/WP.1/2001/28)*

36. On the basis of information transmitted by 23 member countries in documents TRANS/WP.1/2000/24, TRANS/WP.1/2001/10 and the consolidated document prepared by the secretariat (TRANS/WP.1/2001/28), WP.1 questioned the benefits of continuing discussion of the subject. It decided, however, to raise the matter again in a year's time with reference to a report that the International Federation of Pedestrians (IFP) had proposed to prepare, taking into account experience obtained in Switzerland following the introduction of a new category of road-users.

**(c) Use of daytime running lamps**

*(Documents: TRANS/WP.1/2001/12, TRANS/WP.1/2001/39 and informal documents Nos. 4, 4 bis and 4 ter (thirty-seventh session))*

37. Before envisaging the possibility of defining a common European approach to the question of the use of daytime running lamps in traffic, WP.1 had considered at its thirty-fifth session (3-6 October 2000) that information was first needed on domestic regulations in force and on country experience in that regard.

38. At its thirty-sixth session, on the basis of the draft questionnaire prepared by the delegation of Switzerland (TRANS/WP.1/2001/12), WP.1 gave this delegation and the secretariat the responsibility of preparing a new draft, taking the comments made into consideration. It was this questionnaire, redrafted as indicated (*cf. TRANS/WP.1/2001/39*), that the secretariat had sent to member States.

39. WP.1 welcomed the fact that 28 countries had replied to the questionnaire prior to the session and thanked the secretariat for preparing a consolidated version of the replies received (*cf. informal documents Nos. 4, 4 bis and 4 ter*). The Working Party had taken note of the results of the replies submitted by the secretariat and ongoing developments in the European Union. An extract from the Communication of 11 July 2001 adopted by the European Commission (COM(2001)389 final) on the commitment by the automobile industry to increasing pedestrian protection, which included daytime running lamps among the measures envisaged, was distributed during the meeting as an informal document. A document on the subject transmitted by the Federation of European Motorcyclists' Associations (FEMA), presenting its position, was also distributed during the meeting as an informal document.

40. WP.1 requested the secretariat to convert informal documents Nos. 3, 3 bis and 3 ter into formal documents incorporating the requests of Finland and Denmark. In the absence of the delegation of Switzerland, the original author of the questionnaire, WP.1 decided to reconsider this very delicate matter at its next session in the light of the latest developments in the automobile industry and the European Union. Several delegations proved very reticent, however, on the measure proposed by the automobile industry in the context of its planned voluntary commitment to equipping all new vehicles with daytime running lights (DRL). WP.1 also voiced its concerns as to the consequences in terms of road safety of the coexistence on the roads, for a relatively lengthy period of transition, of vehicles with and without lights if the measure proposed by the automobile industry were endorsed by the European Union.

41. WP.1 requested that the results of the survey on the basis of the questionnaire should be transmitted to WP.29.

**(d) Mobile phones**

*(Document: TRANS/WP.1/2001/31)*

42. Supplementing the decisions taken under item 4 (b) (ii) above, WP.1 considered the possibility of preparing a recommendation on the use of mobile phones while driving. It thanked the secretariat for the note it had prepared on the subject (cf. the above-mentioned document), and invited the small group to submit a recommendation to Governments at the next session taking the content of that document into account.

**(e) Dangerous vehicle accessories**

43. Since the secretariat's attention had been drawn on several occasions to the dangers which could arise from certain accessories mounted on vehicles, such as, for example, bull bars, WP.1 was asked to consider a possible follow-up. The Working Party's opinion was that it was an important issue which should be discussed in greater detail at the thirty-eighth session, particularly in the light of ongoing Community developments. It was specified that the European Commission's Communication on the voluntary commitment of the automobile industry, referred to under item 5 (c) above, also dealt with the question of bull bars.

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

**(f) Road works signing**

*(Documents: TRANS/WP.1/2000/29, TRANS/WP.1/2001/33 and Add.1)*

44. The Working Party addressed the compromise text drafted by the delegations of the Russian Federation and Denmark. Since this text had led to various reactions, particularly regarding the deletion of paragraph 2.2 of the draft recommendation (cf. TRANS/WP.1/2001/33), WP.1 decided to come back to the question at its next session and requested PRI and IRF to submit the new text needed for paragraph 2.2.

**FOLLOW-UP OF THE VIENNA (TRANSPORT AND THE ENVIRONMENT) AND LONDON (TRANSPORT, ENVIRONMENT AND HEALTH) CONFERENCES**  
(agenda item 6)

(Documents: TRANS/WP.1/2000/38, ECE/AC.21/2001/4)

45. The secretariat informed the Working Party of the latest developments in the follow-up of these two Conferences since the thirty-sixth session of WP.1. The Working Party noted that a High-Level Meeting on Transport, Environment and Health had been held in Geneva on 4 May 2001, during which the UN/ECE/WHO Synthesis Report (Overview of Instruments relevant to Transport, Environment and Health and Recommendations for Further Steps) was considered. On the basis of this report, which also recommended the initiation of negotiations on a new framework convention, the secretariat specified that several important decisions had been taken during the High-Level Meeting, including the merging of the Vienna and London processes and the creation of a tripartite group with responsibility for continuing internationally the preparatory work for a possible initiation of negotiations on the drafting of a framework convention.

46. The secretariat indicated that two of the measures recommended in the Synthesis Report were of direct concern to WP.1, namely, those to which paragraph 189 (c) and (d) referred. The Working Party stressed that these measures had already been taken into account in WP.1's work but that issues such as drunk driving and the definition of minimum standards for non-motorized vehicles and cycle paths still remained to be addressed.

47. The Working Party asked the secretariat to keep it informed of forthcoming developments in the follow-up to the Conferences and to indicate all those that could have an impact on its work. It may be noted that all documents referring to the follow-up to these Conferences may be consulted on the UN/ECE Web site at the following address: [www.unece.org/poja](http://www.unece.org/poja).

**APPLICATION OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY IN ROAD SAFETY**  
(agenda item 7)

(Documents: TRANS/WP.1/2001/15, TRANS/WP.1/2001/37)

48. The Working Party began discussion of document TRANS/WP.1/2001/15 transmitted by the delegation of Germany by bringing to the fore the problems of Intelligent Speed Adaptation (ISA) systems vis-à-vis the rules of the Vienna Convention on Road Traffic. In view of diverging positions on the compatibility of such systems with the Vienna Convention and road safety in general, and in the absence of the delegation of Switzerland, the author of document TRANS/WP.1/2001/37, WP.1 decided to continue the discussion at its thirty-eighth session. The delegation of the Netherlands announced that it would prepare a document setting out its position.

**DRAFT PROGRAMME OF WORK FOR 2002-2006** (*agenda item 8*)

(*Document: TRANS/WP.1/2001/26*)

49. WP.1 examined the draft programme of work for 2002-2006 carefully; the programme of work is now considered every two years in accordance with a decision taken by the Inland Transport Committee. It approved the programme subject to a number of amendments which took the form of modifications, additions and deletions. The programme of work, thus reworded, can be found in annex II to this report. It will be submitted to the Inland Transport Committee for adoption at its sixty-fourth session in February 2002.

**ELECTION OF OFFICERS** (*agenda item 9*)

50. In the absence of the Chairman and the two Vice-Chairmen, the election of officers was postponed until the thirty-eighth session of WP.1. The Working Party thanked the delegates of Norway and the Netherlands for having acted in turn as Chairman at a moment's notice at the thirty-seventh session.

**OTHER BUSINESS** (*agenda item 10*)

51. The representative of the European Federation of Road Traffic Victims (FEVR) reported to the Working Party on the results of a seminar on human aspects of road safety, held in Budapest on 30 and 31 August 2001, which had led to the adoption of five recommendations. He hoped that these recommendations, aimed at more appropriate behaviour in the event of an accident and which, if put into effect, would enable many lives to be saved, would be taken into account in the work of WP.1 and proposed to submit a document on the subject. Following the comment that WP.1 had already adopted a resolution along these lines on assistance to victims at its thirty-sixth session, the representative of FEVR said that this resolution constituted only an initial step towards an assistance scheme which could be developed on the basis of the recommendations adopted in Budapest. WP.1 agreed that the subject would be broached at the thirty-eighth session provided that a document setting out these recommendations was available in time.

52. In order to avoid overlapping with the ECMT seminar to be held in Prague on 14 and 15 March 2002, the thirty-eighth session of WP.1, initially scheduled from 11 to 15 March 2002, had been postponed until 19 to 22 March 2002. The deadline for the submission of documents had been set at 21 December 2001. The Working Party was also informed of the dates currently scheduled for the second 2002 meeting of WP.1, which were 17 to 20 September (thirty-ninth session). WP.1 proposed exceptionally, however, to hold a third meeting in order to be able to finalize proposals for the amendment of the Conventions and Agreements. It hoped to obtain the approval of the Inland Transport Committee for this special session (fortieth session) which, if approved, would be held from 25 to 29 November 2002.

53. Since the delegate from Spain, Mr. Cesar Lozano, had said that he would be retiring at the end of the year, the Working Party thanked him for his active participation and his valuable contributions to the work of WP.1 and expressed its best wishes for his retirement.

54. Following the dramatic attacks on the United States on 11 September 2001, WP.1 paid tribute to the thousands of victims in the three minutes of silence observed throughout Europe on 14 September at midday.

**ADOPTION OF DECISIONS** (*agenda item 11*)

55. The list of decisions taken by the Working Party at its thirty-seventh session and prepared by the secretariat was adopted.

---

## Annex I

### SUMMARY OF AMENDMENTS TO THE CONVENTIONS AND AGREEMENTS ADOPTED BY WP.1 (THIRTY-SEVENTH SESSION)

*This document is purely informal*

(The amendments appear in bold type)

#### I. Amendments to the Vienna Convention on Road Traffic

##### A. Distinguishing signs (*cf. paragraph 15 (a) to (o) of document TRANS/WP.1/2001/23*)

?? Add the following provision to the end of Article 37, paragraph 1 of the Vienna Convention on Road Traffic, as amended:

**“This sign may either be placed separately from the registration plate or may be incorporated into the registration plate(s).”**

?? Paragraph 2 (first sentence) of Article 37 of the Vienna Convention on Road Traffic, as amended, is modified to read:

“2. Every trailer coupled to a motor vehicle and required under Article 36 of this Convention to display a registration number at the rear shall also display at the rear, **either separately from its registration plate or incorporated into it**, the distinguishing sign of the State where the registration number was assigned.”

Article 37, paragraph 3 of the Vienna Convention on Road Traffic as amended is modified to read:

“3. The composition of the distinguishing sign and the manner of displaying it **or its incorporation into the registration plate shall conform to the conditions laid down in Annexes 2 and 3** to this Convention.”

?? Annex 1, paragraph 9 of the Vienna Convention on Road Traffic, as amended, is modified to read:

“9. Contracting Parties may refuse to admit to their territories in international traffic any motor vehicle, or any trailer coupled to a motor vehicle, which displays a distinguishing sign other than **one of those** prescribed in Article 37 of this Convention. **Contracting Parties may not refuse admission to a vehicle which has a distinguishing sign placed separately from the registration plate in conformity with the provisions of this Convention substituting a non-conforming distinguishing sign which is incorporated into the registration plate(s).**”



?? The heading of Annex 2 of the Vienna Convention on Road Traffic, as amended, is modified to read:

**REGISTRATION NUMBER AND PLATE OF MOTOR VEHICLES AND TRAILERS IN INTERNATIONAL TRAFFIC**

?? Annex 2, paragraph 3 (first sentence) of the Vienna Convention on Road Traffic, as amended, is modified to read (deletion of “special”):

“3. When the registration number is displayed on a (...) plate, this plate shall be flat and fixed in a vertical or nearly vertical position and at right angles to the vehicle’s median longitudinal plane.”

?? Annex 2, paragraph 4 of the Vienna Convention on Road Traffic, as amended, is modified to read:

“4. **Without prejudice to the provisions of Annex 5, paragraph 61 (g) of this Convention, the background of the registration plate on which the registration number and, where applicable, the distinguishing sign of the State in which the vehicle is registered, possibly completed by the flag or emblem according to the conditions defined in Annex 3, is displayed, may be of a retro-reflective material.**”

?? A new paragraph 5 is added to Annex 2 of the Vienna Convention on Road Traffic, as amended, to read:

“5. **The background of the part of the registration plate on which the distinguishing sign is incorporated shall be of the same material as that used for the registration number.**”

?? Annex 3 of the Vienna Convention on Road Traffic, as amended, is replaced by the following:

“1. The distinguishing sign referred to in Article 37 of this Convention shall consist of one to three letters in capital Latin characters. (...)”

**2. When the distinguishing sign is displayed separately from the registration plate, it must conform to the following conditions:**

2.1 The letters shall have a height of at least 0.08 m and their strokes a width of at least 0.01 m. The letters shall be (...) in black on a white **background** having the shape of an ellipse with the major axis horizontal. **The white background may be of a retro-reflective material.**

2.2 When the distinguishing sign consists of only one letter, the major axis of the ellipse may be vertical.

**2.3 The distinguishing sign shall not be affixed in such a way that it could be confused with the registration number or impair its legibility.**

**2.4** On motorcycles and their trailers, the dimensions of the axes of the ellipse shall be at least 0.175 m and 0.115 m. On other motor vehicles and their trailers, the dimensions of the axes of the ellipse shall be at least:

- (a) 0.24 m and 0.145 m if the distinguishing sign comprises three letters.
- (b) 0.175 m and 0.115 m if the distinguishing sign comprises less than three letters.

**3. When the distinguishing sign is incorporated into the registration plate(s), the following conditions shall apply:**

**3.1 The letters shall have a height of at least 0.02 m, taking as a reference a registration plate 0.110 m high.**

**3.2 (to be defined).**

**3.3 (to be defined).**

**3.4 For motorcycles and their trailers and/or for registration plates taking up two lines, the size of the letters of the distinguishing sign as well as, where applicable, the size of the national flag or emblem or the symbol of the regional economic integration organization which the country belongs to may be appropriately modified.**

**4. The relevant provision of Annex 2, paragraph 3, shall apply to (...) the distinguishing sign.”**

**B. Driving permit** (*cf. paragraph 24 of document TRANS/WP.1/2001/23 and paragraph 31 of document TRANS/WP.1/2000/20*)

?? Article 41, paragraph 2, of the Vienna Convention on Road Traffic, as amended, is modified to read:

“2. Contracting Parties shall recognize:

- (a) Any domestic permit drawn up in their national language or in one of their national languages, or, if not drawn up in such a language, accompanied by a certified translation;
  - (b) Any domestic permit conforming to the provisions of Annex 6 to this Convention;
- (...)

(c) Any international permit conforming to the provision of Annex 7 to this Convention, **on the condition that it is presented together with the corresponding domestic permit;**

as valid for driving in their territories a vehicle coming within the categories covered by the **permits**, provided that the **permits are** still valid and that **they were** issued by another Contracting Party or subdivision thereof or by an association duly empowered thereto by such other Contracting Party. The provisions of this paragraph shall not apply to learner-driver permits.”

*(Note: – In the English version, “and” should be deleted at the end of article 41, paragraph 2 (b).*

*– In the Russian version, the word “?” (and) should be deleted at the end of article 41, paragraph 2 (b).*

## II. Amendments to the European Agreement supplementing the Vienna Convention on Road Traffic

A new paragraph **26 bis** is inserted in the European Agreement supplementing the Vienna Convention on Road Traffic, as amended (see above), to read:

*(Proposal by the secretariat prepared in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) of document TRANS/WP.1/2001/23. To be considered at the thirty-eighth session of WP.1):*

**“26 bis** Ad Article 37 of the Convention (distinguishing sign of the State of registration)

### Paragraph 1

Additional subparagraph to be added at the end of the paragraph

To read: **‘When the distinguishing sign, possibly completed by the flag or emblem, is incorporated into the registration plate, it shall also be displayed on the front registration plate when the vehicle has two plates. This sign shall conform to the requirements defined by the Convention.’ ”**

## III. Amendments to the Vienna Convention on Road Signs and Signals

(a) **Blue markings** (cf. paragraphs 18 and 19 of document TRANS/WP.1/2001/23)

?? Article 29, paragraph 2, first sentence, of the Vienna Convention on Road Signs and Signals, as amended, is modified to read:

“2. If road markings are painted, they shall be yellow or white; however, blue may be used for markings showing places where parking is permitted **but subjected to some conditions or restrictions (limit of duration, payment, category of user, etc.).**”

?? Paragraph 9 (c) (vii) of Annex 1, Section C, Chapter II of the Vienna Convention on Road Signs and Signals, as amended, is deleted.

(b) **Roundabouts** (*cf. paragraph 1 (b) of document TRANS/WP.1/2001/23*)

?? Annex 1, Section D, paragraph 3 of the Vienna Convention on Road Signs and Signals, as amended, to read:

“3. Sign D,3 ‘COMPULSORY ROUNDABOUT’, shall notify drivers that they must **follow the direction at the roundabout indicated by the arrows. If the roundabout is indicated by the sign D,3 together with the sign B,1 or B,2, the driver in the roundabout has priority.**”

IV. **Amendments to the European Agreement supplementing the Vienna Convention on Road Signs and Signals and its additional Protocol on Road Markings**  
(*cf. paragraphs 3 and 22 of document TRANS/WP.1/2001/23*)

?? *Paragraph 3* (Compulsory Roundabout), under paragraph 21 (Ad Annex 1, Section D, subsection II of the Convention) of the European Agreement, as amended, supplementing the Vienna Convention on Road Signs and Signals, is deleted.

?? Paragraph 6 (Ad Article 29 of the Convention) of the Annex to the Protocol on Road Markings Additional to the European Agreement, as amended, supplementing the Vienna Convention on Road Signs and Signals is amended to read:

“6. Ad Article 29 of the Convention

Paragraph 2

This paragraph to read:

‘The road markings shall be white. The term “white” includes shades of silver or light grey.

However:

?? markings showing places where parking is subjected **to some conditions or restrictions** may be blue;’

(rest of text unchanged).”

## Annex II

### Draft programme of work

*(NOTE: Those parts of the programme of work which it is proposed to delete have been struck through and placed in square brackets. New elements appear in bold type.)*

#### DRAFT PROGRAMME OF WORK FOR 2002-2006

#### PROGRAMME ACTIVITY 02.3: ROAD TRAFFIC SAFETY

Priority: 1

Description: Mindful of the worldwide scope of its work, the Working Party on Road Traffic Safety (WP.1) will examine matters and adopt measures aimed at improving road traffic safety. To this end, it will consider, inter alia, the implementation of the Vienna Conventions on Road Traffic and on Road Signs and Signals and the European Agreements supplementing them and elaborate proposals for updating these legal instruments as well as the Consolidated Resolutions on Road Traffic and on Road Signs and Signals (R.E.1 and R.E.2). It will also seek to promote the global application of this work.

Work to be undertaken: The Working Party on Road Traffic Safety will pursue the following activities:

#### CONTINUING ACTIVITIES

- (a) Monitoring and encouraging the implementation of the Vienna Conventions on Road Traffic and on Road Signs and Signals **and the Protocol on Road Markings** and the European Agreements supplementing them, and elaboration of amendment proposals to these legal instruments with a view to raising of road safety standards. Priority: 1

#### Output expected by the end of ~~[2001]~~ 2002/2003:

?? Consideration and/or adoption where appropriate of a number of amendment proposals to the above instruments concerning, in particular, the safety of cyclists and moped riders; ~~[international]~~ driving permits; definitions of mopeds and motorcycles; siting of traffic signs; safety in tunnels (**user behaviour and signing**); ~~[signing of road works]~~; **priority at roundabouts; blue markings; mobile phones; behaviour at pedestrian crossings; incorporation of the distinguishing sign into the registration plate; accident black spots; visibility and legibility of signs** ~~[overtaking]~~ etc.;

~~[- Establishment of a feedback mechanism with the help of a questionnaire to be circulated among States Parties to the above legal instruments;]~~

- (b) Development of new recommendations to be included in the Consolidated Resolutions on Road Traffic and Road Signs and Signals (R.E.1 and R.E.2) and updating of the existing ones (in cooperation with other subsidiary bodies of the ITC) for the purpose of ensuring higher standards of safety on roads. Priority: 1

Output expected by the end of [2001] 2002/2003:

- ~~[- Formulation and inclusion in R.E.1 of new recommendations on pedestrians;~~
- ~~— Incorporation in R.E.1 and R.E.2 of recommendations concerning speed control humps and their signing, as well as the sign for contraflow cyclists and the conditions for its use;]~~
- Consideration, development and incorporation into R.E.1 and R.E.2 of recommendations concerning assistance to victims of road accidents, **technical inspections, use of mobile phones while driving, safety in tunnels, road works signing, safety of skateboarders, roller skaters, etc., use of daytime running lamps, visibility and legibility of road signs** ;
- **Issuance of R.E.1 according to the newly adopted structure;**
- ~~[- Submission to the Inland Transport Committee of revised texts of Consolidated Resolutions R.E.1 and R.E.2 for adoption.-]~~

- (c) Exchange of information on national road safety programmes, in particular taking into account means of financing of road safety activities, and on road safety regulations and requirements in force in member States and circulation of such information in order to avail Governments of the practice and experience gained on these matters. Priority: 3

Output expected by the end of [2000] 2002/2003: Updating the set of tables reflecting current national road traffic safety requirements, national legal instruments and national methods of training and follow-up for categories A and B driving licences.

- (d) Assisting countries in transition in the establishment of sound and up-to-date traffic safety practice and procedures [and organizing to this end workshops or seminars on road safety]. Priority: 2

Output expected by the end of [2000] 2002/2003: **Organization of a workshop or seminar on road safety possibly in collaboration with other organizations.**

~~[Participation in the organization of a workshop on assistance to victims of road accidents within the framework of the Third Road Safety Week (possibly in Hungary in May 2000).]~~

- (e) Consideration of selected timely topics related to road safety in the form of an in-depth discussion based on papers prepared by experts and undertaking appropriate follow-up action with a view to finding concerted solutions to the most urgent problems in the field of traffic safety. Priority: 2

Output expected by the end of [2000] 2002/2003: Identification of at least one timely topic for in-depth discussion.

#### ACTIVITIES OF LIMITED DURATION

- ~~[(f) Examination with the help of a small group of experts of the possibility of preparing a new legal instrument on driving permits based on the EU Directive 91/439/EEC.]~~ Priority: 1

~~Output expected by the end of [2001] 2002/2003: Decision on the possibility of developing a new legal instrument.~~

- (f)(g) ~~[Examination of the possibility of]~~ Contribution to activities envisaged in the Programme of Joint Action adopted at the 1997 Regional Conference on Transport and the Environment, **as well as the London Charter on Transport, Environment and Health**. Priority: 1

**Output expected by the end of 2002/2003: Consideration of proposals to amend the Vienna Conventions and European Agreements emanating from the Vienna and/or London follow-up processes.**

- (g) Preparation of the ~~[Third]~~ **Fourth** ECE Road Safety Week (2004) ~~[with a view to encouraging greater partnership between public administrations, private sector organizations and road users aimed at improving the safety of vulnerable road users.]~~ Priority: 1

Output expected by the end of [2000] 2002-2003:

?? ~~[Organization in May 2000 of the Road Safety Week campaign in the ECE region in accordance with the Programme adopted by WP.1.]~~

- ~~[(h) Evaluation of the Road Safety Week and adoption of possible follow up action.]~~

~~Output expected by the end of 2001: Organization of a day of evaluation on 10 September 2001.~~

- (h) (i) Consideration of possible approaches to the work on a United Nations Long-Term Strategy on Road Safety aimed at the establishment within the United Nations of a concerted programme of action in this regard. [~~Consideration of the form of collaboration with the World Bank Global Road Safety Partnership (GRSP)~~] Priority: [2] 3

Output expected by the end of [2000] 2002: Discussion on the possibility of developing a long-term strategy aimed at the improvement of road traffic safety in the ECE region and/or an alternative initiative.

-----