



**Economic and Social
Council**

Distr.
GENERAL

TRANS/WP.1/81
7 May 2002

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-EIGHTH SESSION
(19-22 March 2002)**

ATTENDANCE

1. The Working Party on Road Traffic Safety held its thirty-eighth session in Geneva from 19 to 22 March 2002. Representatives of the following member States of the Economic Commission for Europe participated: Austria; Azerbaijan; Czech Republic; Denmark; Estonia; Finland; Germany; Hungary; Israel; Italy; Latvia; Luxembourg; Netherlands; Norway; Poland; Portugal; Romania; Russian Federation; Sweden; Switzerland; United States of America. The European Commission (EC) was represented, as were the following non-governmental organizations: European Federation of Road Traffic Victims (FEVR); International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC); International Touring Alliance/International Automobile Federation (AIT/FIA); International Federation of Pedestrians (FIP); International Motorcycle Manufacturers Association (IMMA); International Road Federation (IRF); International Road Transport Union (IRU); International Road Safety Organization (PRI). A representative of the TEM project also took part in the meeting.

OPENING OF THE SESSION

2. The meeting was opened by Mr. José Capel Ferrer, Director of the UN/ECE Transport Division, who welcomed the participants and wished the current Chairman, Mr. Bernard Périsset (Switzerland), a rapid recovery in the name of the Working Party WP.1. In view of the importance and the urgency of improving the road safety situation, he suggested that WP.1 might look into the possibility of establishing targets for reducing accidents in the medium/long term in the UN/ECE region and combine it with a system for monitoring results.

3. In the absence of the Chairman who was unable to attend, the meeting was jointly chaired by the two Vice-Chairmen, Mr. Dan Link (Israel) and Mr. Alexander Yakimov (Russian Federation).

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA (agenda item 1)

Document: TRANS/WP.1/79

4. The agenda was adopted without amendments but the secretariat was asked to inform the Russian Translation Section of the corrections to the Russian text concerning distinguishing signs, as indicated in informal document No. 3.

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

Document: TRANS/WP.1/78

5. The report of the thirty-seventh session was adopted without amendments.

SIXTY-FOURTH SESSION OF THE INLAND TRANSPORT COMMITTEE (agenda item 3)

6. The secretariat informed WP.1 of the Inland Transport Committee's request to finalize as soon as possible the amendments to the Vienna Conventions and the European Agreements supplementing them; the Committee had agreed to the holding, if necessary, of an additional meeting of WP.1 in 2002 for that purpose (25-29 November 2002). It noted that the Committee had also supported the modernization of Consolidated Resolutions R.E.1 and R.E.2. It had further informed delegates of the Inland Transport Committee's request to all its subsidiary bodies, in the wake of the 11 September attacks, to consider security in transport bearing in mind ECMT's work on the subject. The secretariat therefore invited WP.1 to address this question, beginning with a list of aspects with security implications. Lastly, it informed delegates of the other decisions the Inland Transport Committee had taken which had a direct impact on WP.1's work, and particularly decisions concerning the recommendations of the Ad hoc Multidisciplinary Group of Experts on Safety in Tunnels contained in its report of 10 December 2001 (cf. also para. 30).

**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)**

(a) Recommendations of the Ad hoc Legal Expert Group

Documents: TRANS/WP.1/2001/23; TRANS/WP.1/78, annex 1

7. The recommendations of the Ad hoc Legal Expert Group adopted by WP.1 at its thirty-seventh session and reproduced in annex 1 of the relevant report (TRANS/WP.1/78) gave rise to a number of formal comments addressed to the secretariat.

(b) Distinguishing signs

Documents: TRANS/WP.1/78, annex 1; TRANS/WP.1/2002/13; informal documents Nos. 1 and 5

8. The Working Party at its thirty-seventh session had adopted the proposals regarding distinguishing signs contained in Chapter 1A of annex 1 of document TRANS/WP.1/78. The Working Party had, however, requested the secretariat to prepare a proposal for an amendment to the European Agreement supplementing the Convention on Road Traffic, to the effect that the distinguishing sign should also appear on the front registration plate when it was displayed on the rear plate.

9. On the basis of the proposal by the secretariat reproduced in document TRANS/WP.1/78, annex I, chapter II, WP.1 considered that this provision should appear in the Vienna Convention and that the wording should be adapted to include the idea that where a front registration plate was mandatory on a vehicle, it should contain the same information and symbols as those on the rear plate.

10. For the content of paragraphs 3.2 and 3.3 reproduced in document TRANS/WP.1/2002/13, on which it had been unable to reach agreement, the Working Party took the following decisions based on the proposal submitted in informal document No. 5:

- When a distinguishing sign is incorporated into the registration plate, it shall be placed on the far left or right of the plate, but preferably on the left.
- When a regional or local symbol or emblem is displayed on the registration plate in addition to the national distinguishing sign, that sign shall obligatorily be placed on the far left of the plate.

11. The Working Party invited the Ad hoc Legal Expert Group to submit a proposal for a text for the thirty-ninth session incorporating the above decisions.

(c) Issues transferred from the European Conference of Ministers of Transport (ECMT)

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

(i) Behaviour at pedestrian crossings

Documents: TRANS/SC.1/WP.1/1998/4; TRANS/WP.1/2001/23; TRANS/WP.1/2002/6; TRANS/WP.1/2002/10

12. The Working Party at its thirty-seventh session had considered the proposed amendments concerning the behaviour of drivers at pedestrian crossings on the basis of documents TRANS/WP.1/1998/4 and TRANS/WP.1/2002/23, paragraph 9. However, in view of the persistence of divergences among member States, the Working Party had requested FIP to prepare new proposals along with the secretariat for the thirty-eighth session.

13. Since the deadlines imposed made this arrangement impossible, FIP and the secretariat each submitted a proposal, contained in documents TRANS/WP.1/2002/6 and TRANS/WP.1/2002/10, respectively.

14. Since none of the proposals had been supported by the majority of delegations, the Working Party decided to keep the current wording "about to use" in the English version of article 21 (b) of the Vienna Convention on Road Traffic and not to change the other language versions, but, following a comment by the representative of Norway, it considered that it would nevertheless be appropriate to address problems of concordance of existing provisions in the Convention and the relevant European Agreement. It therefore decided to establish a small informal group, led by Mr. Link (Israel), with a view to submitting proposals for the thirty-ninth session.

(ii) Siting of traffic signs

15. The Working Party at its thirty-seventh session, after considering a draft questionnaire on the siting of traffic signs, prepared by the relevant small group (Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Israel, Spain, AIT/FIA, FRI and PRI, chaired by France) had asked the group to prepare a new fuller draft.

16. In the absence of the chairman, the secretariat informed WP.1 of subsequent developments. The chairman, after testing the questionnaire with members of a small group, had concluded that it was impossible to summarize the rules for siting priority traffic signs in a simple and useful form and as a result the problems of feasibility of the draft made it doubtful that the work could continue.

17. Following a discussion, WP.1 asked the small group to submit a note to the thirty-ninth session setting out the problems encountered and the reasons why it recommended that the study on that subject should not be continued and presenting directions that could be envisaged for future work on the question. The representative of PRI for her part suggested that

at the March 2003 session of WP.1, half a day should be reserved for identifying the directions to be given to WP.1's work on the various areas relating to traffic signs (cf. also paras. 29 and 37 below).

(iii) Mobile phones

Documents: TRANS/WP.1/2001/30; TRANS/WP.1/2002/15

18. The Working Party at its thirty-seventh session had considered a proposed amendment prepared by the relevant small group (Germany, Israel, Romania and Spain, chaired by Israel), with the symbol TRANS/WP.1/2001/30, concerning the use of mobile phones and other onboard devices liable to distract drivers.

19. WP.1 had decided that, in view of ongoing discussions in the European Union, it was premature to prepare a proposal which would apply to all equipment liable to distract the attention of drivers and had asked the small group to prepare a new proposal concerning mobile phones exclusively; the proposal had been submitted in document TRANS/WP.1/2002/15.

20. Since neither of the two alternatives proposed had been accepted, the Chairman proposed that WP.1 should at its thirty-ninth session make a choice, among the following texts submitted during the session if possible, although proposals sent to the secretariat by 14 June 2002 would not be excluded:

Variant A (Netherlands) - All persons driving a vehicle shall reduce all activity other than driving to a strict minimum. The driver of any vehicle whatsoever shall therefore be prohibited from using a mobile phone or a car phone held in the hand or held otherwise while driving.

Variant B (Israel) - The driver of any vehicle whatsoever shall be prohibited from using a mobile phone or a car phone while driving unless it is not held in the hand or held otherwise.

Variant B (Germany) - It is recommended that domestic legislation shall stipulate clearly that the use of mobile phones or radiotelephones by vehicle drivers is permitted only if it does not have an adverse effect on road safety. In all circumstances legislation shall prohibit all drivers from using a mobile phone or radiotelephone held in the hand or supported between the head and the shoulder.

(iv) Definition of mopeds and motorcycles

Documents: TRANS/WP.1/2001/34; TRANS/WP.1/2002/4

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

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

23. On behalf of the small group, the representative of IMMA recalled the context of the study and introduced document TRANS/WP.1/2002/4 which described in detail the impact new definitions would have on the text of the Convention on Road Traffic and the European Agreement and summarized the questions which needed to be considered in the circumstances. He hoped, however, that, since the study was a long-term one, other members would help him in that task so that he would not be the only person bearing the responsibility of the group.

24. The Chairman thanked IMMA on behalf of WP.1 for the excellent work it had done and called for additional members for the small group. The secretariat for its part informed WP.1 that WP.29 was in the process of considering the definitions of mopeds and motorcycles.

25. In view of the complexity of the problems raised, WP.1 requested its members to consult their national experts. Concurrently, in order to be able to give a direction to the future work of the small group, the representative of IMMA distributed during the meeting a questionnaire, which can be found in annex 1 of this report. The Working Party asked the secretariat also to send the questionnaire to the member States through official channels and fixed the reply date at 14 June 2002.

(d) Driving permits

Documents: TRANS/WP.1/2002/3; TRANS/WP.1/2002/8 and Add.1

26. The Working Party at its thirty-seventh session had been informed of the conclusions of an unofficial meeting of the small group on driving permits (Bulgaria, France, Israel, Luxembourg, Romania, Russian Federation, Spain and IMMA, chaired by the Russian Federation), which had taken place in St. Petersburg (Russian Federation) in late August 2001. It had requested the secretariat to send the report of the meeting (TRANS/WP.1/2002/3) to the member countries, asking them to send in any comments in writing. The replies received could be found in documents TRANS/WP.1/2002/8 and Add.1.

27. Recalling the context of ongoing work on driving permits, the secretariat said that a third meeting of the small group, organized under the auspices of IMMA, had been planned in Annecy (France) in early April 2002 to consider a new draft version of Annex 6 of the Convention on Road Traffic.

28. The Working Party requested that the comments put forward by member States and the additional observations submitted by Germany should be taken into account at that meeting. During the session, several delegations also raised objections concerning the proposal to issue driving permits in credit card format only and to establish an "S" category of vehicles.

(e) Accident black spot sign

29. The Working Party had decided at its thirty-seventh session to postpone consideration of this agenda item pending the results of a study requested by the European Commission. Since there had been no new developments since then, WP.1 asked the representative of the European Commission to submit an interim report on ongoing work with a link to accident black spots and decided to include the question as part of the broader consideration of road signs (cf. also paras. 17 and 37 of this report).

(f) Safety in road tunnels

Documents: TRANS/AC.7/9 and Add.1; TRANS/AC.7/2002/1 and informal document No. 2

30. The secretariat informed WP.1 of the finalization by the Ad hoc Multidisciplinary Group of Experts on Safety in Tunnels of work on road tunnels, which had materialized in the report of 10 December 2001 and its 43 recommendations (TRANS/AC.7/9). It went on to say that, following the St. Gothard accident, two new recommendations had been added by the Group of Experts at a meeting held in January 2002 (TRANS/AC.7/9). Lastly, it recalled that the Inland Transport Committee at its February 2002 session had adopted a specific resolution on the subject in order to demonstrate the strategic importance of the recommendations.

31. The representative of the European Commission for his part drew the attention of delegates to the objectives pursued in the report and informed them that the Commission had organized an information campaign on the appropriate conduct for tunnel users to adopt depending on the circumstances encountered. He said that brochures and a CD-ROM would be distributed before the summer and invited the international organizations represented and UN/ECE to add their names to these tools. He also informed WP.1 of the forthcoming adoption by the Commission of a proposal for a directive on safety in tunnels, which took account of the recommendations of the Group of Experts in its annex. He stressed that WP.1 should direct its efforts in particular to the proposals concerning signs featured in annex 1 of document TRANS/AC.7/9 and its appendix.

32. In the wake of the invitation proffered by the representative of the European Commission, IRU, AIT/FIA, IRF and PRI expressed their intention of associating themselves with the information campaign.

33. With a view to pushing ahead in WP.1 with the consideration of the recommendations which came within its sphere of competence, the Working Party decided to establish a small group comprised of France, Norway, Switzerland (which would act as chairman), the European Commission, PRI, IRU and the secretariat. Its mandate would be to consider the recommendations and also take into account the measures contained in the declaration adopted by the transport ministers of the Alpine countries in Zurich in November 2001, to identify those which came within the sphere of competence of WP.1 and to propose solutions for incorporating them to best effect in the Vienna Conventions, the European Agreements or in the Consolidated Resolutions R.E.1 and R.E.2.

34. The secretariat said that the first meeting of the group would take place in Geneva just after the special meeting of the Ad hoc Group on AGR scheduled on 10 and 11 June 2002.

(g) Harmonization of road signs

Documents: TRANS/WP.1/2001/35; TRANS/WP.1/2002/17

35. The Working Party at its thirty-seventh session had considered a feasibility study on possibilities of harmonizing road signs and signals with respect to regulatory and danger warning signs, prepared by IRF and AIT/FIA (TRANS/WP.1/201/35) and backed by a computerized programme (available on CD-ROM). The Working Party had also been able, through a demonstration of the 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 RightWay Group). Copies of these studies on CD-ROM had subsequently been sent to delegations which had so requested with an invitation to send in their comments and reactions.

36. Since the studies had not given rise to any negative reactions (cf. TRANS/WP.1/2002/17), the representative of IRF said that his organization was intending to continue its efforts in pursuit of further harmonization and reiterated the proposal by PRI (cf. para. 17) to devote half a day's consideration to defining WP.1's strategy in the sphere of road signs and future directions.

37. Following on from this proposal, WP.1 decided to group the questions concerning road signs (siting, black spots and harmonization) and to devote half a day to a general debate on the subject at a future meeting.

(h) Visibility and legibility of road signs

Documents: TRANS/WP.1/2001/41; TRANS/WP.1/2002/11 and informal document No. 4

38. The Working Party, at its thirty-seventh session, after considering a proposal put forward by the International Road Safety Organization (PRI) concerning the improvement of the visibility and legibility of road signs (TRANS/WP.1/2001/41), had asked the representative of that organization to prepare a new version of the document taking into account the comments made by delegations and including road markings. The new proposal could be found in document TRANS/WP.1/2002/11.

39. The Working Party decided to postpone consideration of the question until its thirty-ninth session since the Russian version of the document was not available.

**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)

Document: TRANS/SC.1/294/Rev.5

(a) Assistance to victims of road accidents

Document: TRANS/WP.1/2002/7

40. The Working Party was invited to consider the five proposed recommendations submitted by FEVR and IFRC contained in the above document. Putting the proposals in context, the representative of FEVR recalled that they had resulted from a workshop held in Budapest on 30 and 31 August 2001 and could supplement the recommendation on assistance to victims of road accidents adopted by the Working Party at its thirty-sixth session.

41. After studying the five recommendations, WP.1 decided to keep only the first three, since it considered that the last two did not come within its competence. The small group on assistance to road victims (France, Israel, FEVR and IFRC) was invited to develop the three recommendations adopted and to submit a new proposal for the thirty-ninth session. The two recommendations which were not retained gave rise to the following comments:

- As regards the fourth recommendation, it was suggested that FEVR and IFRC could develop additional arguments on the basis of relevant national legislation.
- As regards the fifth recommendation, these two organizations could put forward a proposal to the World Health Organization (WHO).

(b) Skateboarders, roller skaters, etc.

42. The Working Party at its thirty-seventh session questioned the benefits of continuing discussion of the subject. It had decided, however, to raise the matter again when the 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, was available. The representative of IFP said that the report could not be ready before 2003.

(c) Use of daytime running lamps

Documents: TRANS/WP.1/2002/12; TRANS/WP.1/2002/14

43. At the thirty-seventh session the secretariat had presented an analysis of the replies to the questionnaire on the use of daytime running lamps. At the request of WP.1, the secretariat had converted the informal documents into a formal document which was distributed with the symbol TRANS/WP.1/2002/12 and contained the latest information transmitted by the States.

44. In view of the latest Community developments (TRANS/WP.1/2002/14) introduced by the secretariat, WP.1 decided to suspend discussion of the subject pending consideration of the technical issues by WP.29. It invited countries that had not yet done so to submit their data for the table contained in document TRANS/WP.1/2002/12.

45. The representative of Italy said that his country had made it mandatory for all vehicles travelling on motorways to turn on their headlamps during the day. The representative of the Czech Republic said for his part that both light and heavy vehicles in his country were required to use their lights during the day in winter. The representative of Israel said that the use of headlamps on interurban roads had been mandatory for six years for lorries, motorcycles and public transport vehicles, but that the results obtained had not been outstanding. He specified that daytime running lamps were mandatory in town for motorcycles and buses between 1 November and 31 March. Lastly, the representative of Switzerland said that all vehicles had been recommended to use dipped headlamps during the day as from 1 January 2002 and that at the request of Parliament a study was being prepared to assess the results on road safety. IMMA for its part informed WP.1 of an agreement concluded by the European motorcycle industry to introduce the automatic lighting up of dipped headlamps on two-wheeled vehicles when the engine was turned on.

(d) Mobile phones

Document: TRANS/WP.1/2001/31

46. To supplement the decisions taken under item 4 (c) (iii) above, WP.1 stated that it intended to adopt a provision for the Vienna Convention before developing a more elaborate recommendation for R.E.1 on the basis of document TRANS/WP.1/2001/31.

(e) Dangerous vehicle accessories

Document: TRANS/WP.1/2002/12

47. The Working Party at its thirty-seventh session had evoked the dangers to which certain accessories mounted on vehicles could give rise, and bull-bars in particular, and had considered that it was an important question that merited investigation in greater depth.

48. In the light of the most recent Community developments to which the aforementioned document referred, WP.1 considered that although the question of bull-bars on new vehicles came within the competence of WP.29, the question of vehicles in current use fitted with these devices came within its own competence. It therefore decided to prepare a recommendation to WP.29 and to the administrations, the text of which, drafted jointly by IMMA and Israel, appears below:

To WP.29: “WP.1 is deeply concerned by evidence that rigid bull-bars create danger for all road users, particularly pedestrians. It therefore requests WP.29 to intensify its work on introducing a ban on these devices in construction regulations for new vehicles. Bull-bars should be used only in off-road situations.”

To national administrations: “WP.1 is deeply concerned by evidence with rigid bull-bars create danger for all road users, particularly pedestrians. It therefore urgently requests the national authorities to take all possible steps to have these devices removed from all vehicles currently in use. They should be permitted only in places not open to public traffic.”

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

Document: TRANS/SC.1/295/Rev.3

(f) Road works signing

Documents: TRANS/WP.1/2001/33 and Add.1; TRANS/WP.1/2002/16

49. The Working Party at its thirty-seventh session had considered a new proposal concerning road works signing submitted by Denmark and the Russian Federation (TRANS/WP.1/2001/33) and had requested the representatives of PRI and IRF to submit a new version of paragraph 2.2 of the document in question.

50. In view of the various opinions expressed, WP.1 decided to postpone the discussion until its thirty-ninth session and, in order to facilitate the taking of a final decision, asked the secretariat to prepare a consolidated document. With reference to paragraph 2.2 of document TRANS/WP.1/2001/33, WP.1 said that it would take into consideration the proposals by PRI and IRF (TRANS/WP.1/2002/16) and the Russian Federation.

**PREPARATION OF THE FOURTH ROAD SAFETY WEEK IN THE UN/ECE REGION
(agenda item 6)**

Documents: TRANS/WP.1/2002/5; TRANS/WP.1/2002/18

51. During the special day devoted to the evaluation of the results of the Third Road Safety Week in the UN/ECE region (1-7 May 2000), organized in the context of its thirty-seventh session, WP.1 took decisions concerning future campaigns (TRANS/WP.1/78, paras. 5 to 8), in particular on the organization of a Road Safety Week every four years, the next to be scheduled in 2004.

52. In view of this latter decision and in accordance with practice which required the road safety week to be initiated by an Inland Transport Committee resolution, WP.1 considered various possible themes for the Fourth Road Safety Week, such as safety after dark (TRANS/WP.1/2002/18), road rage, safety in tunnels, distance between vehicles, speeding, driving under the influence of alcohol, the use of seat belts and night driving. It decided, however, to postpone the final choice of theme until its thirty-ninth session and invited delegations to inform the secretariat of additional subjects which they would like to add to the above list. The secretariat for its part recalled the urgent need to submit the relevant draft resolution to the Committee for adoption at its February 2003 session.

53. The secretariat further informed WP.1 that all the results of the Third Road Safety Week listed in the various communications it had received had been grouped in document TRANS/WP.1/2002/5.

FOLLOW-UP OF THE CONFERENCES IN VIENNA (TRANSPORT AND THE ENVIRONMENT) AND LONDON (TRANSPORT, ENVIRONMENT AND HEALTH) (agenda item 7)

Document: ECE/AC.21/2001/5

54. The Working Party was informed by the secretariat that since its thirty-seventh session the first meeting of the Joint UN/ECE-WHO Ad hoc Expert Group on Transport, Environment and Health had met in Geneva on 26 and 27 November 2001. The report of the meeting can be found in document ECE/AC.21/2001/5.

The secretariat recalled the specific priority actions for implementation which had been decided during the meeting, namely:

- (a) Integration of environmental and health aspects into transport policy;
- (b) Promotion of demand for transport beneficial to health and the environment, including in particular the internalization of external costs;
- (c) Urban transport, involving in particular the promotion of public transport, cycling and walking.

55. It noted that the second meeting of the Expert Group (18-19 March 2002) was being held concurrently with the WP.1 session and said that the second high-level meeting scheduled for 5 July 2002 in Geneva would, inter alia, take a final decision on whether or not a framework convention should be drafted and would publish a ministerial declaration for the Rio + 10 Summit to be held in Johannesburg in September 2002.

56. The Working Party asked the secretariat to keep it informed of future developments in the follow-up to those conferences and to indicate all those which might have an impact on WP.1's work. It was recalled that all the documents concerning the follow-up to those conferences could be consulted on the UN/ECE web site at the following address: www.unece.org/poja.

COLLECTION AND DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION (agenda item 8)

(a) National road safety requirements

Documents: TRANS/WP.1/73 and Add.1; TRANS/WP.1/80; TRANS/WP.1/71/Rev.1; TRANS/WP.1/2002/1

57. Since this question was considered only once a year, at the Working Party's spring session, the secretariat informed delegates that the latest information concerning national

legislation on road safety could be found in document TRANS/WP.1/73 and Add.1, information concerning road safety requirements in document TRANS/WP.1/80 and information concerning national training and follow-up methods for driving permits A and B in document TRANS/WP.1/71/Rev.1.

58. The secretariat recalled that the Transport Division had sent a letter to Governments in January 2002 inviting them to update the tables contained in TRANS/WP.1/80 and said that this update would be available for the spring 2003 session of the Working Party. It invited countries which had not yet done so to send in their information as rapidly as possible.

59. The information transmitted by the Government of the Russian Federation was to be found in document TRANS/WP.1/2002/1.

60. The representative of Italy informed WP.1 of his country's adoption of a new Highway Code; among the new provisions it introduced were the points permit, simplified regulations for driving mopeds, much heavier fines, increased speed limits on motorways (from 130 to 150 km/h on motorways with more than two lanes), express ways (from 90 to 110 km/h) and urban motorways (from 50 to 70 km/h). The Working Party was also informed of steps taken by the Netherlands, Poland and Ireland to prohibit the use of mobile phones, other than hands-free models, while driving. The representative of Norway said that his Government had introduced new provisions for driving permits. The representative of the United States of America cited measures implemented in her country to cut down road accidents, particularly drink-related accidents. The representative of the Czech Republic announced the entry into force of legislation on technical inspections of vehicles.

(b) Exchange of experiences in the field of road safety

Document: TRANS/WP.1/2002/2

61. The secretariat reminded the meeting that in order to follow up the requests put forward when the results of the Third Road Safety Week were evaluated it had faxed Governments on 8 January 2002 to request them to provide:

- (i) media addresses (press, radio, television), including e-mail addresses, to which UN/ECE press releases and other road safety documents could be sent;
- (ii) summary information on national road safety campaigns, using the form prepared for the purpose by the secretariat, which can be downloaded from the Transport Division web site at the following address:
<http://www.unece.org/trans/roadsafe/rsquest.html>.

62. The Working Party took note of the resolution on improving road safety submitted by the Government of Finland, to be found in document TRANS/WP.1/2002/2.

**APPLICATION OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY IN ROAD SAFETY
(agenda item 9)**

Documents: TRANS/WP.1/2001/15; TRANS/WP.1/2001/37; TRANS/WP.1/2002/9

63. The Working Party at its thirty-seventh session had begun discussion of document TRANS/WP.1/2001/14 transmitted by the delegation of Germany by bringing to the fore the problems of Intelligent Speed Adaptation (ISA) system vis-à-vis the rules of the Vienna Convention on Road Traffic and had decided to continue the discussion at its thirty-eighth session taking into account the comments by Switzerland (TRANS/WP.1/2001/37) and the document announced by the delegation of the Netherlands and contained in TRANS/WP.1/2002/9. WP.1 thanked the Netherlands for presenting this document which described the situation in the Netherlands and other countries, described the various possible ISA systems and listed questions to which the introduction of Intelligent Speed Adaptation devices gave rise.

64. On the basis of these documents, the Working Party considered that despite being a technical matter it should be kept on the agenda because of its very considerable consequences for road safety and related legal and political aspects, and that it was important that WP.1 should itself be associated with WP.29's work on the subject. As a first stage, the representative of IMMA suggested that delegates to WP.1 should make contact with their colleagues in WP.29 in order to discuss the effects of introducing Intelligent Transport Systems (ITS).

ELECTION OF OFFICERS (agenda item 10)

65. In the absence of the Chairman, the election of officers was postponed until the thirty-ninth session of WP.1. The Working Party thanked the two Vice-Chairmen for having taken the chair in turn during the thirty-eighth session.

OTHER BUSINESS (agenda item 11)

66. The representative of the TEM, referring to problems in connection with temporary signing, considered that it was necessary to make progress in that area. The Working Party invited him to submit a note outlining the situation.

67. The secretariat invited delegates to reflect on the follow-up to be given to the requests put forward at the start of the meeting, concerning the taking into account of safety aspects (cf. para. 6) and the setting of goals to cut down the number of road victims (cf. para. 2).

68. The Working Party was informed that the Ad hoc Legal Expert Group would hold two meetings on either side of that of WP.1 scheduled from 23 to 26 September 2002, on 20 and 27 September 2002.

ADOPTION OF DECISIONS (agenda item 12)

69. The list of decisions taken by WP.1 at its thirty-eighth session, prepared by the secretariat, was adopted.

Annex

DEFINITIONS OF MOPEDS AND MOTORCYCLES

Questionnaire

Country:

1. Do you agree to separate “tricycles” from the “motorcycle” category?

Yes No

and use the EU definition (see document TRANS/WP.1/2001/34)?

Yes No

Comments:

.....

.....

.....

.....

2. Do you want to include “quadracycles” and “light quadracycles” in the European Agreement supplementing the Vienna Convention on Road Traffic?

Yes No

3. If the answer to question 2 is yes,

(a) Do you agree that quadracycles are “motor vehicles” for the purposes of the Agreement and the Convention, e.g. for vehicle registration, driver permits, rules of the road and technical requirements?

Yes No

(b) How do you want “light quadracycles” to be treated in the European Agreement supplementing the Vienna Convention?

(i) as “motor vehicles” (e.g. requiring vehicle registration, driver permits, etc.)?

Yes No

(ii) or, as if they are “mopeds” (e.g. in line with EU legislation, i.e. no vehicle registration, no driver permit, etc.)?

Yes No