



Economic Commission for Europe
Inland Transport Committee
Global Forum for Road Traffic Safety
Seventy-seventh session

Geneva, 18-21 September 2018

**Report of the Global Forum for Road Traffic Safety on its
 seventy-seventh session**
Contents

	<i>Paragraphs</i>	<i>Page</i>
I. Attendance.....	1-4	3
II. Adoption of Agenda (agenda item 1).....	5	3
III. Activities of interest to the Working Party (agenda item 2).....	6	3
IV. Convention on Road Traffic (1968) (agenda item 3).....	7-23	3
A. Consistency between the Convention on Road Traffic (1968) and Vehicle Technical Regulations.....	7	3
B. Driving permits.....	8-10	4
C. Automated driving	11-23	4
V. Convention on Road Signs and Signals (1968) (agenda item 4).....	24-26	5
Group of Experts on Road Signs and Signals	24-26	5
VI. Consolidated Resolution on Road Traffic (R.E.1) (agenda item 5).....	27-31	6
A. A Safe System Approach.....	27-28	6
B. Amendment proposals on distracted driving	29	6
C. Amendment proposals on policies for Powered Two Wheelers (PTW)	30	6
D. Amendment proposals on Vulnerable Road Users (VRU)	31	7
VII. Group of Experts on Improving Safety at Level Crossings (agenda item 6).....	32	7
VIII. Revision of the terms of reference and rules of procedure for WP.1 (agenda item 7)	33	7
IX. Sustainable Development Goals: Potential contribution by WP.1. (agenda item 8)	34-35	7

X.	Definition of a serious injury (agenda item 9).....	36	7
XI.	Other Business (agenda 10).....	37-41	8
XII.	Date of next session (agenda item 11).....	42-43	8
XIII.	Election of officers. (agenda item 12)	44	8
XIV.	Adoption of the report of the seventy-seventh session (agenda item 13).....	45	8
Annex I	Global Forum for Road Traffic Safety (WP.1) resolution on the deployment of highly and fully automated vehicles in road traffic.....		9
Annex II	ITC Strategy until 2030.....		13

I. Attendance

1. The Global Forum for Road Traffic Safety (WP.1) held its seventy-seventh session in Geneva from 18 to 21 September 2018, chaired by Ms. L. Iorio (Italy). Representatives of the following ECE member States participated: Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

2. The representatives of non-ECE member States also participated: Algeria, Australia, Brazil, India, Japan, Jordan, Lebanon, Morocco, Republic of Korea, State of Palestine and Tunisia.

3. The European Union and the following non-governmental organizations were also represented: American Automobile Association (AAA), European Association for Automotive Suppliers (CLEPA), EuroMed Transport Project, European Transport Council, Fédération Internationale de l'Automobile (FIA), Federation of International Motorcycling (FIM), Institute of Road Traffic Education (IRTE), International Organization of Motor Vehicle Manufacturers (OICA) International Organization for Standardization (ISO), Laser Europe, Towards Zero Foundation and World Bicycle Industry Association (WBIA).

4. The Representative from the University of South Carolina also participated.

II. Adoption of the Agenda (agenda item 1)

5. The Global Forum for Road Traffic Safety (WP.1) adopted the session's agenda (ECE/TRANS/WP.1/164). France, Luxembourg, Russian Federation and Switzerland endorsed the French and Russian versions of the report of the last WP.1 session (as per ECE/TRANS/WP.1/163 paragraph 47).

III. Activities of interest to the Working Party (agenda item 2)

6. Due to time constraints, neither interventions nor presentations were made for this agenda item. However, national delegations and international organizations had the opportunity to submit in writing, information on national and international road safety activities and initiatives, including recent and forthcoming changes to their traffic legislation as well as any information on the events taking place prior to the next WP.1 session. In this context, Informal document No. 3 from the Government of the Republic of Moldova and Informal document No. 4 from the EUROMED Transport Support Project have been submitted.

IV. Convention on Road Traffic (1968) (agenda item 3)

A. Consistency between the Convention on Road Traffic (1968) and Vehicle Technical Regulations

7. WP.1 considered ECE/TRANS/WP.1/2017/1/Rev.1 (France, Italy and Laser Europe) which presents a consolidated text of the relevant parts of the Convention and contains the already adopted and still to be adopted amendment proposals. At this session, WP.1 reviewed and revised ECE/TRANS/WP.1/2017/1/Rev.1 until point 61 (c), Chapter IV (Exemptions). At the next session, the working party is expected to continue discussing Chapter IV and subsequently decide on all other outstanding provisions using

ECE/TRANS/WP.1/2017/1/Rev.1. The Government of Germany informed WP.1 of two amendment proposals which it intends to include in ECE/TRANS/WP.1/2017/1/Rev.1 for discussion at the next session.

B. Driving permits

8. The secretariat informed WP.1 that – in addition to the French and Russian versions of the International Driving Permit (IDP) brochure based on ECE/TRANS/WP.1/2014/8/Rev.2 - translations in Arabic, Chinese and Spanish were also available on the WP.1 website. WP.1 expressed its appreciation to the United Nations Secretary's - General Special Envoy for Road Safety for providing financial resources to undertake these translations.

9. The informal group of experts on driving permits presented ECE/TRANS/WP.1/2018/1/Rev.1, which contains a comparison of three potential driving permit options for the future, including the pros and cons of each option. The selection of the options was guided by the principles of harmonization, security, and acceptability to contracting parties. In addition, FIA made a presentation on costs and benefits of developing an “enhanced” IDP for the United Arab Emirates with embedded high-level security features (Informal document No.7). The results of a qualitative study on how IDPs are used by motorists undertaken by the Australian Automobile Association – a FIA affiliate – was made available in Informal document No. 8. WP.1 discussed the three options, took note that many delegates expressed their preference for option B, and requested the informal group of experts to reflect on the comments provided and – to the extent possible – incorporate them into ECE/TRANS/WP.1/2018/1/Rev.2 to be tabled at the next session.

10. WP.1 took note of a letter from the Minister of Roads and Urban Development, Islamic Republic of Iran presenting the country's position on the formats of domestic and international driving permits.

C. Automated driving

11. The Russian Federation made a statement on its legislative work to allow and facilitate participation in traffic of highly and fully automated vehicles (e.g., creation of special testing zones and infrastructure pilot projects).

12. The French delegate in his capacity as the Chair of the Informal Group of Experts on Automated Driving sought and received an extension of the mandate to continue the ongoing work. A document to address the issues of “activities other than driving” based on Informal document No. 1 (May 2018) and Informal document No. 4 (May 2018) will be tabled at the next session as ECE/TRANS/WP.1/2018/2/Rev.1. Similarly, the French delegate and the Informal Group of Experts intend to – on the basis of ECE/TRANS/WP.1/2018/3 – prepare a document to address “situations when a driver operates a vehicle from the outside of the vehicle” (as ECE/TRANS/WP.1/2018/3/Rev.1).

13. Informal document No. 9 – containing a literature review on the impact of task activity on takeover from automated driving – was submitted and presented by the European Transport Safety Council.

14. WP.1 discussed and adopted ECE/TRANS/WP.1/2018/4/Rev.2 with changes. The final adopted text is in Annex I, as non-binding guidance, titled “Global Forum for Road Traffic Safety (WP.1) Resolution on the deployment of highly and fully automated vehicles in road traffic”. It requested the secretariat to incorporate the changes and table

ECE/TRANS/WP.1/2018/4/Rev.3 at the next session for information only. Belarus, Belgium, Canada, France, the Russian Federation and Switzerland, volunteered to expedite the French and Russian translations of ECE/TRANS/WP.1/2018/4/Rev.3 by submitting the translated and verified text to the secretariat. The secretariat was requested to explore the possibilities of promoting the resolution with a press release or other means.

15. France introduced Informal document No. 6, which contains a very preliminary amendment proposal to Article 8 in the 1968 Convention on Road Traffic. The French delegate stated that the amendment appears necessary because the Conseil d'Etat had declared that vehicles with SAE levels 4 and 5 on the French territory would not be in conformity with the country's obligations under the 1968 Convention on Road Traffic. France informed WP.1 that it intends to revise Informal document No. 6 and re-submit it in March 2019.

16. Subsequently, WP.1 had a preliminary discussion on Informal document No. 6. Belgium and the Russian Federation expressed the desire and need to amend the 1968 Convention on Road Traffic. In particular, the Russian Federation delegate stressed the need to amend the 1968 Convention on Road Traffic to provide international and thus domestic legal basis for automated vehicles, as well as overcome the current legal difficulties, ensure international harmonization, and define automated vehicles.

17. Sweden stated that work on amendments is necessary in the future and it stressed the importance of not working on liability issues.

18. Germany stressed that fragmentation of the international regulatory framework should be avoided, and harmonization should be aimed for.

19. The UK delegate stated that the UK government has set out that both Conventions allowed for the use of SAE levels 4 and 5 vehicles and additive amendments were not needed. However, clarificatory amendments may be desirable in the future built on evidence gathered from the use of the resolution as adopted and that the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland was happy to work on this issue in Informal Group of Experts on Automated Driving (IGEAD). The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland also stated that liability is beyond the scope of WP.1 work.

20. Japan supported Germany and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

21. The Canadian delegate stated that, as a contracting party to the 1949 Convention on Road Traffic, clarificatory amendments to the conventions lead to better harmonization.

22. WP.1 agreed that the IGEAD would carry out a preliminary work on Informal document No. 6.

23. WP.1 took note of presentations made by the Law Commission of England and Wales and National Transport Commission (Australia) on "a [United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland] perspective on national legal frameworks for the deployment of automated vehicles" and "automated vehicle regulatory reform in Australia" respectively.

V. Convention on Road Signs and Signals (1968) (agenda item 4)

Group of Experts on Road Signs and Signals

24. The Chair of the Group of Experts on Road Signs and Signals updated WP.1 on the progress made by the Group in reviewing the 1968 Convention on Road Signs and Signals

and the 1971 European Agreement supplementing the convention. To this end, the Chair introduced Informal document No. 1 which contains the Group's first draft of the final report. The Chair sought and received agreement of the Global Forum for Road Traffic Safety on the proposed structure of the report. The report will be submitted at the March 2019 session of WP.1. The Chair also briefly explained the amendment proposals contained in Informal document No. 1. WP.1 expressed its appreciation for the work done by the Group.

25. The Global Forum for Road Traffic Safety (WP.1) agreed to extend the mandate of the Group of Experts on Road Signs and Signals until the end of June 2019. During that time, the Group is requested to evaluate and prepare the final recommendations on the "non-Convention" signs (to be submitted to WP.1 in September 2019). Accordingly, the secretariat has scheduled the final session for 20-21 June 2019 to make it possible for the Group to submit its final report.

26. The secretariat updated WP.1 on the progress of developing e-CoRSS¹ (electronic version of the 1968 Convention on Road Signs and Signals).

VI. Consolidated Resolution on Road Traffic (R.E.1) (agenda item 5)

A. A Safe System Approach

27. WP.1 decided to continue discussing ECE/TRANS/WP.1/2014/6/Rev.1 which incorporates the amendment proposals of Sweden to include a safe system approach into the Consolidated Resolution on Road Traffic (R.E.1) at the next session (beginning with paragraph 11.1.4).

28. WP.1 considered a part of ECE/TRANS/WP.1/2018/5/Rev.1 prepared by Italy, Spain, and the United States of America (Role of penalties and other restrictive measures). Discussion will resume at the next session with paragraph 3 of 2.4.1.3.

B. Amendment proposals on distracted driving

29. WP.1 discussed ECE/TRANS/WP.1/2017/2/Rev.1 and will continue its discussions starting from section 1.5.2.1 (to be checked by the secretariat) at the next session.

C. Amendment proposals on policies for Powered Two Wheelers (PTW)

30. The delegate of Institute of Road Traffic Education (IRTE) made a presentation about powered two wheelers in South East Asia to provide background for ECE/TRANS/WP.1/2018/6 (and corresponding comments contained in Informal document No. 5). WP.1 considered how to proceed with ECE/TRANS/WP.1/2018/6 (formerly Informal document no. 4 (March 2018)) and invited delegates to provide comments to the authors. The revised document will be tabled at the next session as ECE/TRANS/WP.1/2018/6/Rev.1. The IRTE representative also pointed out the colour combination inconsistencies allowed by the 1968 Convention on Road Signs and Signals (i.e., round red and white mandatory signs which are in conformity with the Convention).

¹ Electronic Convention on Road Signs and Signals (e-CoRSS).

The Chair of the Group of Experts agreed with the IRTE representative and pointed out that the issue had already been identified in the draft report. WP.1 took note of this information and decided to discuss this issue while reviewing the final report recommendations of the Group of Experts on Road Signs and Signals in March 2019.

D. Amendment proposals on Vulnerable Road Users (VRU)

31. WP.1 took note of the IRTE invitation to a “crash investigation and data system design for South-East Asian countries” event to be organized in early January or February 2019.

VII. Group of Experts on Improving Safety at Level Crossings (agenda item 6)

32. The secretariat informed WP.1 about the follow up to recommendations contained in the final report of the Group of Experts on Improving Safety at Level Crossings, in particular in relation to creating a ECE working party on level crossings together with International Union of Railways (UIC) and the European Union Agency for Railways (ERA). WP.1 took note of the information provided (i.e. that no interest has been expressed by outside organizations) and stressed the importance of enhancing safety at level crossings. It encouraged the delegates to bring forth level crossing issues for discussion at future meetings.

VIII. Revision of the terms of reference and rules of procedure for WP.1 (agenda item 7)

33. WP.1 continued discussing ECE/TRANS/WP.1/100/Add.1/Rev.4 and revised its section on Terms of Reference of the Global Forum for Road Traffic Safety up to paragraph 1 (h). WP.1 will continue revising ECE/TRANS/WP.1/100/Add.1/Rev.4 at the next session.

IX. Sustainable Development Goals Potential contribution by WP.1 (agenda item 8)

34. The Inland Transport Committee (ITC) Bureau, supported by the secretariat, has further elaborated the draft ITC Strategy until 2030 (ECE/TRANS/2019/R.1). In line with ITC decisions (ECE/TRANS/274, para. 17), the Bureau requested that (a) the discussion of the ITC strategy becomes part of the agendas of the meetings of the Working Parties until the end of the year and (b) that the draft strategy document be circulated accordingly to governments to facilitate the consultations. Given the above background, WP.1 government delegates discussed ECE/TRANS/2019/R.1 and provided comments (attached in Annex II).

35. The countries participating in the EUROMED Transport Support Project (Algeria, Lebanon, Jordan, Morocco, State of Palestine, and Tunisia) made presentations which described road safety policy initiatives in their respective countries and how they intend to contribute to meeting Sustainable Development Goal road safety targets 3.6 and 11.2. The presentations are available on the WP.1 website. WP.1 expressed its appreciation for EUROMED countries participation and engagement.

X. Definition of a serious injury (agenda item 9)

36. WP.1 took note of presentation about a “serious injury definition” delivered by Italy. Also, the WP.6 secretariat provided information on progress in producing a new version of the Glossary for Transport Statistics. In particular, a new definition for a serious injury based on the Maximum Abbreviated Injury Scale (MAIS) will be added as a “parallel” definition (i.e. in addition to the existing one). WP.1 invited Sweden to provide information about the use of MAIS definition in the country at the next session.

XI. Other Business (agenda item 10)

37. In consideration of celebrating the 50th anniversary of the 1968 Conventions on Road Traffic and on Road Signs and Signals, the secretariat informed WP.1 about a possibility of organizing an event in collaboration with the United Nations Secretary-General’s Special Envoy for Road Safety, who had agreed to participate and provide financial support for the event scheduled for 26 March 2019 in Geneva.

38. The secretariat informed WP.1 about the establishment of the United Nations Road Safety Trust Fund (UNRSTF) in April 2018 and the ongoing efforts to operationalize it. The inaugural meetings of the UNRSTF Advisory Board and Steering Committee were held in mid-August, next sessions are scheduled for November 2018.

39. At the last session, Sweden proposed to consider a new topic that is a relationship between the 2015 amendment of Article 8 and the possibilities to take effective measures to reduce the risk of using motor vehicles as terror weapons (para. 44, ECE/TRANS/WP.1/163). At this session, Sweden decided not to pursue this subject at this time.

40. Following the most recent meeting of the “WP.1 and World Forum for the harmonization of vehicle regulations (WP.29) Executive Task Force” on 17 September 2018, the Chair updated WP.1 on latest developments. The Task Force will consist of about 10 government officials (five from each working party) and will act as an informal mechanism to plan the next joint meeting and act as a hub for information exchange. Its first objective is to organize a joint WP.1/WP.29 session on 18 February 2019 in Geneva. The next meeting of the Task Force will take place on 15 November 2018 in Geneva.

41. WP.1 did not discuss other issues.

XII. Date of next session (agenda item 11)

42. The next regular session of WP.1 is scheduled to take place on 25-29 March 2019 in Geneva.

43. On 18 February 2019 in Geneva, there will be a special WP.1 session entirely dedicated to a joint WP.1/WP.29 event to discuss the issues (undecided at the time of writing) of common interest (tentatively identified as “other activities than driving” and terminology).

XIII. Election of officers (agenda item 12)

44. The Working Party elected its officers for the period of March 2019 – September 2020. Ms. L. Iorio (Italy) was re-elected as the Chair while Mr. D. Mitroshin (Russian Federation) and Mr. J. Valmain (France) were re-elected as two Vice-Chairs.

XIV. Adoption of the report (agenda item 13)

45. The Working Party adopted the report of its seventy-seventh session.

Annex I

Global Forum for Road Traffic Safety (WP.1) resolution on the deployment of highly and fully automated vehicles in road traffic

I. Preamble

1. The Global Forum for Road Traffic Safety (WP.1) of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe,

(a) Noting that the Convention on Road Traffic done at Geneva on 19 September 1949, and the Convention on Road Traffic done at Vienna on 8 November 1968 have had significant bearing on the definition of domestic road traffic legislation and regulation and have noticeably improved road safety;

(b) Noting the continuous progress of automotive and digital technologies, which could improve road safety, including through the deployment of highly and fully automated vehicles in road traffic;

(c) Recognizing the potential for innovative safety technologies to improve social well-being by preventing motor vehicle accidents, both in ways that can now be foreseen and in ways that cannot yet be predicted, and desiring to avoid further obstacles that could impede the development of technologies that could offer significant benefits;

(d) Recognizing the potential for the mentioned technologies to support the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals by improving road traffic safety, inclusive mobility (including for those who cannot currently drive a motor vehicle), and by creating strategies where safe and efficient mobility is a tool for socio-economic growth and governance;

(e) Noting the need to provide guidance to support the safe, global deployment of highly and fully automated vehicles in road traffic;

has prepared and adopted this Resolution on 20 September 2018.

II. Scope

2. This Resolution:

(a) Is intended to guide Contracting Parties to the Convention on Road Traffic done at Geneva on 19 September 1949, and the Convention on Road Traffic done at Vienna on 8 November 1968, with respect to the safe deployment of highly and fully automated vehicles in road traffic, in order to support the enhancement of road traffic safety, mobility and socio-economic progress,

(b) Provides complementary recommendations supporting the road safety principles of the 1949 Convention on Road Traffic, and the 1968 Convention on Road Traffic, to facilitate the safe, global deployment of highly and fully automated vehicles in road traffic,

(c) Will evolve as technology develops and as experience and evidence accumulate regarding the use of highly and fully automated vehicles in road traffic. Therefore, the explicit inclusion of a recommendation in this Resolution should not be construed as the implicit exclusion of any other,

- (d) Takes into consideration the role of human beings in the context of highly and fully automated vehicles,
- (e) Offers recommendations at a global level to achieve a safe interaction between highly and fully automated vehicles and all road users,
- (f) May, moreover, facilitate the development, under the guidance of the Global Forum for Road Traffic Safety (WP.1), of future measures related to the safe deployment of highly and fully automated vehicles in road traffic.

III. Definitions

3. For the purpose of this Resolution:

- (a) “Automated driving system” refers to a vehicle system that uses both hardware and software to exercise dynamic control of a vehicle on a sustained basis.
- (b) “Dynamic control” refers to carrying out all the real-time operational and tactical functions required to move the vehicle. This includes controlling the vehicle’s lateral and longitudinal motion, monitoring the road environment, responding to events in the road traffic environment, and planning and signalling for manoeuvres.
- (c) “Operational design domain” (ODD) refers to the environmental, geographic, time-of-day, traffic, infrastructure, weather and other conditions under which an automated driving system is specifically designed to function.
- (d) “Highly automated vehicle” refers to a vehicle equipped with an automated driving system. This automated driving system operates within a specific operational design domain for some or all of the journey, without the need for human intervention as a fall-back to ensure road safety.
- (e) “Fully automated vehicle” refers to a vehicle equipped with an automated driving system. This automated driving system operates without any operational design domain limitations for some or all of the journey, without the need for human intervention as a fall-back to ensure road safety.

IV. Recommendations for automated driving systems in highly and fully automated vehicles

4. Automated driving systems in highly and fully automated vehicles should:
- (a) Make road safety a priority;
 - (b) Monitor and safely interact with the surrounding traffic environment;
 - (c) Endeavour to safely tolerate errors of the vehicles’ users, inside and outside of the vehicle, and of other road users in order to minimize potential effects of such errors;
 - (d) Comply with traffic rules, including those referring to:
 - (i) Interacting safely with other road users;
 - (ii) Following instructions from law enforcement authorities, and those authorized to direct traffic;
 - (iii) Maintaining smooth and safe flow of traffic.
 - (e) Only operate within their ODD;

- (f) Be capable of achieving a state that maximizes road safety when a given trip cannot or should not be completed for example in case of a failure in the automated driving system or other vehicle system;
- (g) React to unforeseen situations in a way that minimizes danger to the vehicle's users and other road users;
- (h) Communicate with their users and other road users, in a clear, effective and consistent way, by providing sufficient information about their status and intention, and enabling an appropriate interaction;
- (i) Clearly and effectively provide appropriate notice, if the vehicle leaves its ODD;
- (j) Operate in a way that enables verification as to whether or not they are or were performing dynamic control; and
- (k) Enable their deactivation in a safe manner.

V. Recommendations for users of automated driving systems in highly and fully automated vehicles

- 5. Users of automated driving systems in highly and fully automated vehicles should:
 - (a) Be aware and informed of their proper use prior to starting the journey;
 - (b) Meet the requirements for their safe use and follow the procedures for their use;
 - (c) Be able to communicate with the vehicle;
 - (d) Understand if, and when, it is necessary to exercise dynamic control to complete a journey. If the user is required to exercise dynamic control, or chooses to do so, they must:
 - (i) Hold the necessary driving permits; and
 - (ii) Comply with traffic rules.
 - (e) Act lawfully at all times so as not to compromise road safety regardless of whether they or automated driving systems are exercising the dynamic control.

VI. Further recommendations

- 6. Governments should consider:
 - (a) Promoting public awareness and understanding of the safe use of highly and fully automated vehicles to help secure the potential safety, mobility, and socioeconomic benefits;
 - (b) Adopting policies in accordance with their privacy regulations regarding the necessary data to assess:
 - (i) The safety impact of the use of highly and fully automated vehicles to support technological and regulatory advancement;
 - (ii) The causal factors involved in road traffic safety incidents, such as collisions, or traffic rule violations with highly and fully automated vehicles to resolve legal issues.

(c) Working on security measures including cybersecurity, to safeguard the proper functioning of automated driving systems in highly and fully automated vehicles; and

(d) Incorporating the recommendations in this Resolution into their domestic legal and policy frameworks for road traffic in a way that recognizes their national context, working with civil society and industry.

VII. Final provision

7. This Resolution will be periodically reviewed and updated to address technological and/or regulatory developments concerning highly and fully automated vehicles.

Annex II

ITC Strategy until 2030

The Global Forum for Road Traffic Safety (WP.1) welcomes the opportunity to provide the following comments on ECE/TRANS/2019/R.1 (ITC Strategy, draft zero). Overall, the document is of high quality, valuable and useful. WP.1 wishes to point out the following to be considered for possible inclusion in the next version of the document:

- Even if the ITC strategy calls for transport regulators to work with telecom regulators it needs to recognize that for transport to be effective, transport regulators must work with other socio-economic, including land use planning, regulators;
- Given that ITC wishes to become global, ITC processes must be truly global (e.g., voting mechanisms, interpretation and translation). If ITC ambition is to be a global and regional centre, it follows then Regional Commissions should be engaged and part of the process;
- Development of road transport corridors (e.g. Euro-Asian land Transport Links (EATL) must mandatorily embed/include road safety considerations/elements;
- Incorporate direct references to WP.1 work (similar to IMO, ICAO references);
- Given that this is a visionary document, add references (in Vision section) to the ongoing work on automated vehicles;
- Need to stress that WP.1 work addresses road safety challenges (VRU, distraction, etc.) by facilitating the embedding of technology into road safety legal frameworks;
- Automated driving (as one of priority actions) requires reflections and WP.1 offers an effective platform to do that
- ITC strategy will need to recognize that new technologies will deliver significant benefits but will be introduced over a period of time so a transition period is inevitable (eg. for automated vehicles, in mixed traffic, cyclists and pedestrians are particularly vulnerable);
- The document should provide better recognition of the fact that significant resources are spent to support (via a large number of informal groups of experts) the work of formal working parties. Without this work and its recognition, the work of the formal groups may not be able to proceed as quickly;
- The implementation of UNECE legal instruments should be strengthened by a greater use of non-binding instruments and other mechanisms such as promotional material;
- Road safety is adequately represented in the document;
- Social inclusion should be mentioned (safe mobility as a means for social inclusion)
- The need to strive to make safest vehicles affordable to all (not only to high income countries) should be noted;
- “Enhance support” – it is unclear what “enhance support” mean on p.11;
- Do not solely concentrate on legal instruments – traffic and road signs resolutions i.e. non-binding tools are useful too;
- “Vision” – not inspirational enough (the wow factor missing!);
- Need to revise the Vision section (vision is not a goal!);

- Actions sections do not seem balanced;
 - On automated vehicles, the document describes the status quo instead of painting the future;
 - Vehicle automation is a priority; road safety also to be an ITC priority;
-