



**Economic and Social
Council**

Distr.
GENERAL

TRANS/WP.1/2002/31
1 July 2002

ENGLISH
Original: FRENCH

ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE

INLAND TRANSPORT COMMITTEE

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

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

Siting of traffic signs

Transmitted by France

The Working Party on Road Traffic Safety (WP.1) at its thirty-eighth session 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 the subject of the siting of traffic signs should not be continued and presenting directions that could be envisaged for future work on the question.

In reply to WP.1's request, the Chairman of the small group gave the following information:

“At its thirty-sixth session WP.1 confirmed its decision to make the relevant small group (Czech Republic, Denmark, Israel, Spain, AIT/FIA, IRF, PRI) responsible for the preparation of a feasibility study on the harmonization of the siting of traffic signs. France agreed to chair the group.

The feasibility study was based in particular on the work of the ECMT Group on Road Traffic Signs and Signals (CCSR) to be found in document TRANS/SC.1/WP.1/R.140/Add.4.

The small group decided to concentrate initially on priority signs and on that basis to ask member States to complete a questionnaire enabling information to be collected on current national practices in that regard. The examination of the replies to the questionnaire was to make it possible to judge whether the objective of the study, the harmonization of the siting of traffic signs, was timely.

At the thirty-seventh session of WP.1, the small group presented informally a draft questionnaire in French and English. The French and Danish delegations then noted that it was impossible to summarize the national rules for the siting of priority traffic signs in a simple and subsequently useful form.

In France, there are 38 instructions for siting sign boards for the following cases:

- in the open country: intersection of two roads which do not have priority (5 instructions), intersection of two roads of which one has priority (9), intersection of two priority roads (11);
- in built-up areas: intersection of two roads which do not have priority (5), intersection of two roads of which one has priority (4), intersection of two priority roads (4).

In Denmark, there are three levels of regulations: mandatory, optional and variable depending on the case, which give rise to many different situations.

It should therefore be asked whether it is advisable to simply concentrate on the main principles.

It also seems necessary for WP.1 to redefine more carefully its role in the work it is doing on road signs and signals. Joint reflection on this question with precise objectives in mind (for example: inventory, updating of the Convention, secondary priority topics to be discussed ...) is a prerequisite for the continuation of the work.”
