



**Economic and Social  
Council**

Distr.  
GENERAL

TRANS/WP.1/2002/5  
15 January 2002

ENGLISH  
Original: FRENCH

---

**ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE**

INLAND TRANSPORT COMMITTEE

Working Party on Road Traffic Safety  
(Thirty-eighth session, 19-22 March 2002)

**EVALUATION OF THE THIRD ROAD SAFETY WEEK IN THE ECE REGION**

**Addendum 1**

**SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN BY STATES IN THE  
CONTEXT OF THE THIRD ROAD SAFETY WEEK (1-7 May 2000)**

**Note by the secretariat**

In the context of the follow-up to the Third Road Safety Week (1 to 7 May 2000) on the theme of vulnerable road users, the principle of which had been decided on by the Inland Transport Committee in a resolution of 16 January 1998, the secretariat initiated a survey shortly after in the UN/ECE member countries in order to have a first evaluation of the Week's impact in the region. Eighteen countries replied to the invitation sent out by the secretariat. These replies can be found in documents TRANS/WP.1/2000/30 and Add.1, TRANS/WP.1/2000/42 and TRANS/WP.1/2001/11 and Add.1.

The Inland Transport Committee at its sixty-third session (13-15 February 2001) considered it essential both to analyse the results of the Third Road Safety Week and evaluate its value added as a United Nations campaign and to consider possibilities of organizing other demonstrations of this nature in the future on a more frequent basis and/or over longer periods.

The Working Party on Road Traffic Safety (WP.1) at its thirty-sixth session decided to devote a special day (10 September 2001) to this evaluation. A small informal group was established to prepare for this meeting and met on 3 July 2001, after which the secretariat sent ECE member States a list of items for discussion and a questionnaire in a letter dated 23 July 2001 (ref.: 2001/TRANS/3751).

On the basis of written information transmitted after the Third Road Safety Week (*contained in the documents referred to in the first paragraph*) and replies to the questionnaire summarized in informal documents 3, 3 bis and 3 ter of the thirty-seventh session and statements of declared intention by countries (*to be found in four information letters from UN/ECE published before the start of the Third Road Safety Week*), the secretariat had prepared a consolidated document for the 10 September 2001 think tank with the reference TRANS/WP.1/2001/27, available in French only.

In the light of the new replies received since then and in order to enable delegations to have the consolidated information in the other UN/ECE languages for the thirty-eighth session, the secretariat has grouped all the information available, updated to 1 January 2002, in a single document to which it has made some editorial improvements, and included the summary tables previously circulated as informal documents, which can be found in annexes 1, 2 and 3.

---

## I. INTRODUCTION

This consolidated note is based on the information transmitted as follows:

18 written communications were received by the secretariat following the Third Road Safety Week;

16 countries replied to the questionnaire of 23 July 2001;

10 countries had notified the secretariat of their intentions prior to the start of the Third Road Safety Week.

In all, 28 UN/ECE member States provided information at least once at a given moment (16 countries once, 8 twice, 4 three times).

In order to provide a more specific approach to the general impact of this road safety week, the information transmitted by member States has been classified by topic.

## II. ANALYSIS OF THE INFORMATION

Information transmitted after the Third Road Safety Week (written communications and replies to the questionnaire from a total of 25 countries) reveals the following:

### A. General impact:

- a positive impact in 14 countries
- a limited or minor impact in 7 countries
- no impact in 4 countries.

### B. Participants:

- Major involvement of the public authorities at the highest level in 14 countries, including:

*Prime Minister:* in 5 countries

*Minister of Transport:* in 14 countries

*Other ministers:* in 8 countries

In three countries, these three authorities were involved;

In four countries, the last two were involved;

In six countries, the minister of transport was the main authority involved;

In four countries, the first level of authority involved was the road safety administration.

- Involvement of local communities in varying degrees: in 11 countries
- Involvement of the police services in varying degrees: in 9 countries
- Involvement of schools in varying degrees: in 13 countries
- Involvement of associations and NGOs in varying degrees: in 14 countries
- Involvement of the private sector (insurance, companies, etc.) in varying degrees: in 10 countries
- Involvement of the media in varying degrees: in 17 countries and to a major extent in 11.

**C. Means:**

- Use of a logo/emblem/specific acronym: in 4 countries
- Creation of a slogan: in 4 countries
- Press: in 20 countries
- Radio: in 17 countries
- TV: in 15 countries
- Brochures/posters: in 18 countries
- Internet: in 6 countries
- CD Rom: in 1 country
- Other: in 12 countries, in particular:
  - Stickers: 4 countries
  - Various objects with logos: 3 countries
  - Competitions (schools): 8 countries
  - Press conferences/workshops/seminars/round tables/debates: 7 countries
  - Films/video clips/short films: 2 countries

- Road safety course: 3 countries
- Games: 1 country
- Parades: 1 country
- Rallies: 2 countries
- Announcements in stations: 2 countries
- Distribution of excerpts from the highway code in stations: 1 country
- Special road safety magazine: 1 country.

**D. Company actions and activities**

- In order to take the topic of the Third Road Safety Week into consideration, five countries indicated that they had amended their programme accordingly and six that the theme of the campaign was being included in the planned programme.

In eight countries, activities concerned all the following target groups of vulnerable users: pedestrians, motor cyclists and moped riders, cyclists, children and elderly persons.

Campaigns limited to certain target groups were carried out in 11 countries (*pedestrians: 8 countries; motor cyclists/moped users: 5 countries; cyclists: 9 countries; children: 7 countries; elderly persons: 3 countries; others: 2 countries*).

- Some countries indicated that they had in addition organized campaigns on specific subjects, including:
  - Child visibility at night (use of arm bands): 1 country
  - Respecting speed limits, wearing helmets/seat belts: 1 country
  - Inviting motorcyclists to drive with their headlights turned on: 1 country
- Others indicated that they had initiated parallel activities, such as:
  - Medical checks for drivers: 1 country
  - Vehicle inspections: 2 countries
  - Reinforced inspections: 2 countries

- Sobriety tests: 1 country
- Inspection of companies transporting children: 1 country
- Checks on the equipment of certain vehicles (bicycles, carts, wheelchairs) for night visibility: 1 country
- Lastly, one country announced that it had improved signs and signals on roads, traffic lights and pedestrian crossings for the campaign.

**E. Structures set up:**

Four countries used the Third Road Safety Week as an opportunity to set up new structures, such as: the establishment of a transport safety committee, the creation of a road safety alliance between NGOs and public authorities, the establishment of local committees or affiliation to the European Federation of Road Traffic Victims (FEVR).

**F. Duration of activities:**

- Limited to the Week:
  - 11 countries (for 6 countries, the information needs to be confirmed)
- Duration longer than the Week: 10 countries distributed as follows:
  - in four, activities began before and continued after;
  - in two, activities began with the Week and continued after;
  - in three, activities took place throughout the year 2000;
  - in one, activities were held on another date.

**G. Effects on road safety:**

Effects were positive in eight countries (including one to be confirmed) and mainly positive in six (in the latter case, no reduction was reported in the number of accidents, or persons killed or injured). They took the form of:

- Reduction in number of accidents in seven countries
- Reduction in number of persons killed in six countries
- Reduction in number of persons injured in seven countries.

**H. Interest in the Third Road Safety Week:**

- Pronounced: 7 countries
- Average: 10 countries
- Minor: 7 countries
- None: 1 country.

**I. Reasons invoked for lack of interest (sometimes several reasons):**

- Lack of interest in international activities: 4 countries
- Lack of visibility of UN/ECE initiatives: 1 country
- Theme already covered: 3 countries
- Theme not part of the national programme: 1 country
- Other: 3 countries
- No reply provided: 2 countries.

**III. CONCLUSION**

It emerges from an analysis of the above information that the Third Road Safety Week had a very positive or mainly positive impact in the countries to the east of the European Union (12 countries) and in 2 western countries. In seven other countries (basically western), acceptance was limited. These results show that the campaign was well received in the majority of the countries which expressed their reaction.

As regards the duration of future campaigns, of the 16 countries which replied to this point the majority (7 countries) were in favour of keeping the situation as it is, while the other countries were in favour of longer campaigns and/or greater frequency (see annex 3).

Annex 1 (English only)

Summary table of replies to the questionnaire on 3rd Road Safety Week

IMPACT

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

COUNTRY	Involvement of State authorities (2)	Implementation of new organizational structures (7)	Would a campaign have been conducted in 2000 without 3rd RSW? (4)	Measurable positive impact on road safety (8)	Measurable reduction in the number of: (9)			Extension of positive effects after the campaign? (10)	General effects of the 3rd RSW (11)
					Accidents	Killed	Injured		
<b>Azerbaijan*</b>	Prime Minister Minister of Transport Others ministers Road safety administration Others/Police	No	Not specified	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>	Not specified	Very positive
<b>Belarus</b>	Prime Minister Minister of Transport Other ministers Road safety administration Police Others	No	No	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b> Little	<b>Yes</b> Little	<b>Yes</b> Little	No	Rather positive
<b>Bulgaria*</b>	Minister of Transport	No (to be confirmed)	Not specified	<b>Yes</b>	–	–	–	Not specified	Very positive (to be confirmed)
<b>Croatia</b>	Police	<b>Yes</b>	Yes	No	–	–	–	No	Very positive
<b>Czech Republic</b>	Minister of Transport Other ministers Road safety administration Police Others	No	Yes	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b> 6.3%	No	<b>Yes</b> 6.3%	<b>Yes</b>	Rather positive



COUNTRY	Involvement of State authorities (2)	Implementation of new organizational structures (7)	Would a campaign have been conducted in 2000 without 3rd RSW? (4)	Measurable positive impact on road safety (8)	Measurable reduction in the number of: (9)			Extension of positive effects after the campaign? (10)	General effects of the 3rd RSW (11)
					Accidents	Killed	Injured		
<b>Estonia</b>	Prime Minister Minister of Transport Other ministers Road safety administration Police	No	Yes	No	-	-	-	No	Limited
<b>Finland</b>	Road safety administration	No	Yes	No	-	-	-	No	Limited
<b>France</b>	No	No	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	None
<b>Georgia*</b>	Minister of Transport Other ministers Road safety administration Others/Police	<b>Yes</b>	Not specified	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>	Not specified	Very positive
<b>Germany</b>	Minister of Transport Others	No	Yes	No	-	-	-	-	None
<b>Israel</b>	Others	No	Yes	No	-	-	-	No	None
<b>Latvia*</b>	Road safety administration	Not specified	Not specified	Yes (to be confirmed)	-	-	-	Not specified	Rather positive (to be confirmed)
<b>Malta* (Republic of)</b>	No	No	Not specified	No	-	-	-	No	None
<b>Luxembourg</b>	Minister of Transport Police	No	Yes	No	-	-	-	-	Rather positive

COUNTRY	Involvement of State authorities (2)	Implementation of new organizational structures (7)	Would a campaign have been conducted in 2000 without 3rd RSW? (4)	Measurable positive impact on road safety (8)	Measurable reduction in the number of: (9)			Extension of positive effects after the campaign? (10)	General effects of the 3rd RSW (11)
					Accidents	Killed	Injured		
<b>Netherlands</b>	Road safety administration Others ( <i>regional activities</i> )	No	Yes	No	-	-	-	-	Limited
<b>Norway</b>	Minister of Transport Road safety administration	No	Yes	No	-	-	-	-	Limited
<b>Poland*</b>	Prime Minister Minister of Transport Road safety administration	No, apparently	Not specified	Not specified	-	-	-	Not specified	Very positive
<b>Portugal*</b>	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	-	-	-	Not specified	Limited
<b>Romania</b>	Prime Minister Minister of Transport Other ministers Road safety administration Police/Others	<b>Yes</b>	No	<b>Yes</b>	Yes 4%	Yes 1.3%	Yes 4.2%	<b>Yes</b>	Very positive
<b>Russian Federation</b>	Minister of Transport Other ministers Road safety administration Police/Others	No	Yes	Yes	Yes 14%	Yes 17%	Yes 17.1%	<b>Yes</b>	Rather positive
<b>Slovak Republic</b>	Police	No	Yes	-	-	-	-	Yes	Limited

COUNTRY	Involvement of State authorities (2)	Implementation of new organizational structures (7)	Would a campaign have been conducted in 2000 without 3rd RSW? (4)	Measurable positive impact on road safety (8)	Measurable reduction in the number of: (9)			Extension of positive effects after the campaign? (10)	General effects of the 3rd RSW (11)
					Accidents	Killed	Injured		
<b>Spain</b>	Road safety administration	No	No	No	-	-	-	-	Rather positive
<b>Sweden</b>	No	-	Yes	-	-	-	-	-	Limited
<b>Turkey*</b>	Minister of Transport Other ministers Road safety administration Police/Others	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	-	-	-	Not specified	Very positive (to be confirmed)
<b>Ukraine*</b>	Minister of Transport Road safety administration	<b>Yes</b>	Not specified	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>	Not specified	Very positive
<b>TOTAL (25 replies) (9*)</b>	5 Prime Minister 14 Minister of Transport 8 Other ministers 15 Road safety administration 10 Police 10 Others 3 No	4 Yes 17 No 3 Not specified 1 (-)	13 Yes 3 No 9 Not specified	9 Yes 10 No 3 Not specified 3 (-)	7 Positive effects 18 (-)	6 Positive effects 1 No 18 (-)	7 Positive effects 18 (-)	4 Yes 6 No 8 Not specified 7 (-)	8 Very positive 6 Rather positive 7 Limited 4 None

\* Information based solely on written communications transmitted by UNECE countries after the 3rd RSW.

Annex 2 (English only)

Summary table of replies to the questionnaire on 3rd Road Safety Week

**ACTIONS UNDERTAKEN**

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

COUNTRY	Nature of actions undertaken (3)		Duration of actions (3.2) (3.3)	Targeted groups (3.1)						Means used (3.2)						Other actors involved (6) <i>M= medium S= strong L= little N= none U= unknown (-)= no answer or not applicable</i>					
	Specific activities (3.1)	Integrated action (3.3)		Pedestrians	Motorcycles/moped	Cyclists	Children	Elderly	Others	Press	Radio	TV	Internet	CD Rom	Brochures/folders	Others	Regional/Local bodies	Schools	Associations/NGO	Private sector	Media
<b>Azerbaijan*</b>	All groups	-	The week (to be confirmed)							X	X	X			X	X	S	S	S	S	S
<b>Belarus</b>	All groups	-	The week							X	X	X			X	X	N	N	N	L	U
<b>Bulgaria*</b>	All groups	-	The week and continued after							X	X	X			X	X	S	-	S	S	S
<b>Croatia</b>	Targeted	Fitted into the planned programme	Throughout 2000	X					X	X		X					-	-	-	-	-
<b>Czech Republic</b>	Targeted	-	Throughout 2000	X		X	X			X	X	X	X		X	X	M	M	S	N	M
<b>Estonia</b>	All groups	Modified programme	The week and continued after	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	M	L	N	L	S
<b>Finland</b>	Targeted (extended to car drivers)	Fitted into the planned programme	In 2000 but other dates			X				X	X						L	U	M	N	L

COUNTRY	Nature of actions undertaken (3)		Duration of actions (3.2) (3.3)	Targeted groups (3.1)						Means used (3.2)						Other actors involved (6) M= medium S= strong L= little N= none U= unknown (-) = no answer or not applicable				
	Specific activities (3.1)	Integrated action (3.3)		Pedestrians	Motorcycles/moped	Cyclists	Children	Elderly	Others	Press	Radio	TV	Internet	CD Rom	Brochures/folders	Others	Regional/Local bodies	Schools	Associations/NGO	Private sector
France	-	-	-													-	-	-	-	-
Georgia*	All groups	-	The week (to be confirmed)						X	X	X			X	X	S	-	S	S	S
Germany	-	Modified programme	The week					X	X					X	X	L	-	M	-	L
Israel	Targeted	Modified programme	The week				X							X	X	N	L	L	N	N
Latvia*	Targeted	-	The week (to be confirmed)	X	X	X	X		X	X	X			X	X	-	S	-	-	S
Malta* (Republic of)	No	No	-													N	N	N	N	N
Luxembourg	All groups (extended to general behaviour)	-	Before and continued after						X	X	X			X	X	-	M	S	S	S
Netherlands	Targeted	Fitted into the planned programme	The week		X				X	X				X		M	M	M	L	M
Norway	Targeted	Fitted into the planned programme	The week			X			X	X	X	X		X		M	M	S	N	S

COUNTRY	Nature of actions undertaken (3)		Duration of actions (3.2) (3.3)	Targeted groups (3.1)						Means used (3.2)						Other actors involved (6) M= medium S= strong L= little N= none U= unknown (-) = no answer or not applicable					
	Specific activities (3.1)	Integrated action (3.3)		Pedestrians	Motorcycles/moped	Cyclists	Children	Elderly	Others	Press	Radio	TV	Internet	CD Rom	Brochures/folders	Others	Regional/Local bodies	Schools	Associations/NGO	Private sector	Media
Poland*	All groups	-	The week (to be confirmed)							X	X	X	X		X	X	S	S	-	-	S
Portugal*	Targeted	-	The week (to be confirmed)		X	X				X	X				X		-	M	-	-	M
Romania	Targeted	Fitted into the planned programme	Throughout 2000	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	X		X						
Russian Federation	All groups	Fitted into the planned programme	Before and continued after							X	X	X			X		M	M	S	L	S
Slovak Republic	Targeted	Modified programme	Before and continued after	X	X	X	X			X	X	X					U	U	M	M	M
Spain	-	Modified programme	Before and continued after	X	X	X				X			X		X		-	-	-	-	-
Sweden	-	-	-														-	-	-	-	-
Turkey*	Targeted	-	The week (to be confirmed)	X			X		X	X	X				X	X	S	S	S	-	S

COUNTRY	Nature of actions undertaken (3)		Duration of actions (3.2) (3.3)	Targeted groups (3.1)						Means used (3.2)						Other actors involved (6) <i>M= medium  S= strong  L= little  N= none  U= unknown  (-) = no answer or not applicable</i>					
	Specific activities (3.1)	Integrated action (3.3)		Pedestrians	Motorcycles/ moped	Cyclists	Children	Elderly	Others	Press	Radio	TV	Internet	CD Rom	Brochures/ folders	Others	Regional/ Local bodies	Schools	Associations/ NGO	Private sector	Media
Ukraine*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
<b>TOTAL</b> (25 countries) (9*)	8 All groups  11 Targeted  5 (-) No answer or not applicable  1 No	5 Modified programme  6 Fitted into the planned programme  13 (-) No answer or not applicable  1 No	11 The week  4 Before and continued after  2 The week and continued after  3 Throughout 2000  1 In 2000 but other dates  4 (-) No answer or not applicable	8 X	5 X	9 X	7 X	3 X	2 X	20 X	17 X	15 X	6 X	1 X	18 X	12 X	5 M 6 S 2 L 3 N 1 U 8 (-)	6 M 5 S 2 L 2 U 8 (-)	5 M 8 S 1 L 3 N 8 (-)	1 M 5 S 4 L 5 N 10 (-)	4 M 11 S 2 L 2 N 5 (-) 1 U

\* Information based solely on written communications transmitted by UNECE countries after the 3rd RSW.

*Annex 3 (English only)***Summary table of replies to the questionnaire on 3rd Road Safety Week****INTEREST AND FUTURE CAMPAIGNS***The numbers in brackets correspond to the numbers of questions in the questionnaire*

COUNTRY	Interest in 3rd Road Safety Week (RSW) (1)	Reasons for the lack of interest (5)	Future campaigns (12)	
			Duration	Frequency
<b>Azerbaijan*</b>	<b>Strong</b>	–	No answer	No answer
<b>Belarus</b>	Medium	–	1 week	Every year
<b>Bulgaria*</b>	<b>Strong</b>	–	No answer	No answer
<b>Croatia</b>	Medium	–	1 month	Every 2 years
<b>Czech Republic</b>	Medium	–	1 week	Every year
<b>Estonia</b>	Medium	–	1 month	Every 3 years
<b>Finland</b>	Little	Theme already covered by national programme	1 year	Every 3 years
<b>France</b>	Little	Theme did not fit into the national programme/Others (conjectural problem)	1 week	Every year
<b>Georgia*</b>	<b>Strong</b>	–	No answer	No answer
<b>Germany</b>	Little	Lack of interest in actions carried out at the international level	1 month	Every 5 years
<b>Israel</b>	Little	- Lack of visibility of UNECE initiatives - Lack of interest in actions carried out at the international level - Lack of enthusiasm	1 week	Every 5 years
<b>Latvia*</b>	Medium	–	No answer	No answer
<b>Luxembourg</b>	Medium	–	1 week	Every 5 years
<b>Malta* (Republic of)</b>	None	No answer	No answer	No answer
<b>Netherlands</b>	Little	- Theme already covered by national programme - Theme already covered before - Lack of interest in actions carried out at the international level - Others (already a lot of attention to national campaigns)	1 year	Every 5 years



COUNTRY	Interest in 3rd Road Safety Week (RSW) (1)	Reasons for the lack of interest (5)	Future campaigns (12)	
			Duration	Frequency
Norway	Medium	–	1 week	Every 5 years
Poland	<b>Strong</b>	–	No answer	No answer
Portugal*	Medium	–	No answer	No answer
Romania	<b>Strong</b>	–	1 week	Every 5 years
Russian Federation	Medium	–	1 week	Every 5 years
Slovak Republic	Little	Lack of interest in actions carried out at the international level	1 week	Every 5 years
Spain	Medium	–	1 week	Every year
Sweden	Little	No answer	1 week	Every 5 years
Turkey*	<b>Strong</b>	–	No answer	No answer
Ukraine*	<b>Strong</b>	–	No answer	No answer
<b>TOTAL</b> (25 replies) (9*)	<b>10</b> Medium <b>7</b> Strong <b>7</b> Little <b>1</b> None	<b>1</b> Lack of visibility of UNECE initiatives <b>4</b> Lack of interest in actions carried out at the international level <b>2</b> Theme already covered by national programme <b>1</b> Theme already covered before <b>1</b> Theme did not fit into the national programme <b>3</b> Others <b>17</b> Not applicable (–) <b>2</b> No answer	<b>4</b> (1 week every year) <b>7</b> (1 week every 5 years) <b>1</b> (1 month every 2 years) <b>1</b> (1 month every 3 years) <b>1</b> (1 month every 5 years) <b>1</b> (1 year every 3 years) <b>1</b> (1 year every 5 years) <b>9</b> (No answer)	

-----