

Distr.: General  
2 March 2020

Original: English

---

## **Economic Commission for Europe**

Inland Transport Committee

### **Global Forum for Road Traffic Safety**

#### **Eighty-second session**

Geneva, 8-12 March 2021

Item 7 of the provisional agenda

#### **Sustainable Development Goals:**

#### **Potential contribution by WP.1**

### **Sustainable Development Goals: Potential contribution by WP.1**

This document, submitted by Brazil, Sweden, and Road Safety Institute “Panos Mylonas”, proposes that WP.1 voluntarily use the impact assessment to increase support for the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) and the ITC-strategy until 2030. The document revises Informal document No. 3/Rev.1 (March 2020).

## **The Sustainable Development Goals: Potential contribution by WP.1**

1. This informal document proposes through WP.1 to voluntarily use the concept of impact assessments to increase support for the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) and the ITC-strategy until 2030<sup>1</sup>. The contracting parties in WP.1 need to be informed about the rationality, the likely consequences of proposed projects, plans, policies and regulations in relation to the SDGs and ITC-strategy as early as possible before they are decided in the forum. Through this it will be possible to better understand and prioritize from among different suggested solutions and to assess whether the chosen solution is likely to achieve the desired objectives. An impact assessment will also:

- Inform other policy makers about potential health, economic, social, and environmental ramifications from WP.1 outcomes
- Improve transparency within WP.1 and between different WPs in UNECE so that WP.1 contributions to sustainability and the ITC-strategy are evidenced.
- Increase other WPs understanding of WP.1 chosen solutions and thereby verifying and endorsing the legitimacy of WP.1
- Clarify how WP.1 achieves its goals and priorities
- Contribute to WP.1's continuous learning and make the work more effective

### **A strong support towards sustainability by road traffic safety**

2. The Global Forum for Road Traffic Safety (WP.1) is the only permanent body in the United Nations system that focuses on improving road traffic safety. Its primary function is to serve as guardian of the United Nations legal instruments aimed at harmonizing traffic rules.

3. Road traffic safety is an SDG-target (3.6) that has connection to and a positive effects on many other SDGs (see text from the Stockholm Declaration<sup>2</sup> below). The use of road safety is an important enabling factor of achieving many of the other goals in the Agenda 2030. The WP.1 focus on improving road traffic safety drives its contribution towards an even more sustainable world. Thus, there is a future need for seeing road traffic safety as a powerful corresponding enabler and underpinning strategy for the SDGs, and not a standalone goal. In accepting this premise, WP.1 will assume an ever more important role as a global actor for both road traffic safety and related SDGs. This shift in focus is mandated by several key policy decisions including the adoption of the Stockholm declaration by the United Nations General Assembly<sup>3</sup> and the ITC-strategy until 2030. The challenge for WP.1 will be to decide how and where to support better road safety while also effectively supporting the connected SDGs.

### **The Stockholm declaration**

4. The third Global Ministerial Conference on Road Safety: Achieving Global Goals 2030 Stockholm, 19–20 February 2020, welcomed in its Declaration, the United Nations General Assembly Resolution A/RES/70/1 of 25 September 2015, entitled “Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development”, and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) as a framework to integrate road safety in other policy areas, especially policy areas relating to SDG targets for Climate Action, Gender Equality, Health and Well-Being, Quality Education, Reduced Inequalities, Sustainable Cities and

---

<sup>1</sup> ECE/TRANS/288/Add.2

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.roadsafetysweden.com/about-the-conference/stockholm-declaration/>

<sup>3</sup> The United Nations General Assembly adopted on 31 September 2020 the Stockholm Resolution 74/299 on improving global road safety.

Communities, Infrastructure and Responsible Consumption and Production for mutual benefits for all.

5. To Achieve the Global Goals to 2030, the Stockholm declaration states, in paragraph 7, that road safety and a safe system approach should be included as an integral element of land use, street design, transport system planning and governance, especially for vulnerable road users and in urban areas, by strengthening institutional capacity with regard to road safety laws and law enforcement, vehicle safety, infrastructure improvements, public transport, post-crash care, and data.

### **The Inland Transport Committee Strategy until 2030**

6. In the ITC-strategy, special attention is given to WP.1 as ITC look on WP.1 as a core global ECE/ITC competence and strength for the progress towards the implementation and fulfilling of the strategy in which WP.1 is assigned for priority actions which are supposed to increase safety and sustainability until 2030:

- on behalf of ITC to contribute as a leader in on the road safety: helping the global community meet global road safety targets with a particular focus on the SDG targets 3.6 and 11.2<sup>4</sup> as the key targets for WP.1<sup>5</sup>
- further expand global participation in, and cooperation between, WP.1 and WP.29 to be part of regional and global platforms for digitalization, automated driving and intelligent transport systems<sup>6</sup>
- enhance support to automated vehicles from 2019, including continuation of amendments to the existing legal instruments and standards, and possible development of new agreement(s), both if necessary<sup>7</sup>

### **The use of Impact Assessment by the WP.1 will be one important step for the strengthening of the forum activities in line with the ITC-strategy and towards the SDGs.**

7. To be able to understand the rationality behind and reflect upon how different suggested WP.1 actions support the SDGs and the ITC-strategy it is important that WP.1 can demonstrate its understanding of the problem, know the magnitude and can explain the nature of the inherent challenges and potential solutions and how they relate to what is the WP.1 responsibility.

8. Below are suggestions of questions that can be answered so all contracting parties and other WPs are able to understand how the problem relates to WP.1's responsibility and what proposed WP.1 solutions are. The process should allow for the identification of one (or more) preferred options and to describe how the final proposal is linked to the SDGs and the ITC-strategy. The following is a process which can be used as a checklist if doing an impact assessment in WP.1.

1. What is the problem and why is it a problem?
2. Why should WP.1 act?
3. What should be achieved?
4. What are the various options to achieve the objectives?

<sup>4</sup> Target 3.6: "Reduce Road Injuries and Deaths" and 11.2 "By 2030, provide access to safe, affordable, accessible and sustainable transport systems for all, improving road safety, notably by expanding public transport, with special attention to the needs of those in vulnerable situations, women, children, persons with disabilities and older persons"

<sup>5</sup> ECE/TRANS/288/Add.2 table 2

<sup>6</sup> ECE/TRANS/288/Add.2 table 1

<sup>7</sup> ECE/TRANS/288/Add.2 table 1

5. What are their impacts according to the responsibility for WP.1 in the ITC strategy and who will be affected?
6. How do the different options compare according to the responsibility for WP.1 in the ITC strategy (effectiveness, efficiency and coherence)?
7. How will monitoring and subsequent retrospective evaluation be organised?
9. Using the checklist above and share the answers with the forum will be one important step for the strengthening the forum activities to support the ITC-strategy and the SDGs and its targets. Each step in the proposed use of an impact analysis are described in further detail in annex 1

## Annex 1

Each step in the proposed use of an impact analysis described in further detail

### *What is the problem and why is it a problem?*

There can be different reasons why a change is needed. In this part of an impact assessment it is important to give the reader an opportunity to understand the reasons and the rationale behind the change needed and connect the change to the SDGs and the ITC strategy, the rationale need only to be understandable in a general and informatively descriptive way. An impact assessment starts by verifying the existence of a problem, identifying who is affected, estimating the problem's scale, analysing its causes and consequences, and assessing its likelihood to persist in the absence of (further) WP.1 intervention. The answer to this question should give the working parties in WP.1 the information needed to decide whether there is a problem for which a response may be warranted. In this part of the process, it is important to use facts so as to have a well-grounded evidence based problem formulation. The problem formulation should not contain any historical background, aim(s) or possible solutions.

### *Why should the WP.1 act?*

Having established the existence of a problem, its size and scale and the causes, the impact assessment analysis should verify whether states alone could resolve it sufficiently and whether the WP.1 has the competence and/or the legal basis, and would be best placed to do so. The answer to this question should give the WP.1 contracting parties the information needed to decide why and whether a response from WP.1 is needed.

### *What should be achieved?*

The aim in this part of the impact assessment is to describe what should be achieved, i.e. the supposed result in relation to support of the SDGs and the ITC-strategy. To gain understanding of how the problem can be reduced or made to disappear, it is important to formulate the aim as specific as possible. The more specific the aim is formulated, the easier to find solution to solve the problem and through this support the SDGs and the ITC strategy. A clear and a specific aim will also support the quality of forthcoming evaluations. The impact assessment should set out what WP.1 should achieve with a legal or non-legal intervention. The objectives of the action should be clearly identified, including the level of the ambition and the criteria against which alternative options would be compared and the possible success of any initiative assessed.

### *What are the various options to achieve the objectives?*

In this part of the impact analysis is it necessary to describe different potential measures to achieve the aim and how they will influence the SDGs and ITC-strategy, including a zero-alternative. Alternatives which are unlikely to be effective or indeed relevant can be described so as to demonstrate that they have been considered and it is important to describe why some measures not are relevant. Potential measures for WP.1 can be no action (zero-alternative), distribute a request for information, cooperate with another working party, agency, or organization, prepare a presentation, create an informal paper, amend the consolidated resolution on road traffic (R.E.1), amend the consolidated resolution on road signs and signals (R.E.2), amend an existing convention, draft a new protocol, draft a new convention or others. These considered measures can be categorized into zero-alternatives, non-regulatory solutions and regulatory solutions.

One option can also be to do nothing - the non-legal zero-alternative. In order to strive for the ITC-strategy it is not always necessary to use legal measures to obtain the aim. It is therefore important to consider if non-regulatory solutions, measures or another legal instrument can be used. Examples of non-regulatory measures can be: information, guidance, volunteer agreements, distribution of a request for information, cooperation with another working party, agency, or organization, preparation a presentation, creation an informational paper etc. If it is clear that a non-regulatory solution is the best alternative then is it important to describe and explain why it is so. It is important to describe how the fulfilment of the ITC-

strategy or the support for the SDGs will be affected if nothing is done by WP.1. It is necessary to visualize if the problem will be the same, increase or decrease in the future if nothing is done. If possible is it preferable to quantify the complexity of the problem. If this is not possible, a qualitative description can then be used. It might possibly be shown in a later stage of the impact assessment that the zero-alternative is the best solution and this will lead to a decision not to do anything in that particular area.

Regulatory solutions should be measures used as the last option and only if it can be shown that no other solutions will work. It is important to describe the required regulatory solutions and why they are needed to support the ITC-strategy and how they should be constructed so as to best support the ITC-strategy and the SDGs.

*What are their impacts according to the SDGs and ITC strategy and who will be affected?*

When analysing the consequences of the suggested options it is important to analyse their consequences from a social economic perspective. This enables the selection of the best alternative which can most efficiently solve the problem and also fulfil the aim. In this part of the impact assessment it is important to analyse the feasibility, impact on the aim, other benefits, unintended consequences etc. Based on this analysis, the impact analysis should give an answer suggesting what is a preferred measure for WP.1 to support the SDGs and ITC strategy. At the end of this process, the contracting parties in WP.1 should know to what extent different options would meet the objectives, with what benefits, at what cost, with what implications for different stakeholders, and at what risk of unintended consequences.

*How do the different options compare according to the SDGs and the ITC strategy (effectiveness, efficiency and coherence)?*

This part should present to the reader the solution which best promotes the SDGs and ITC-strategy from a WP.1 perspective. In this part it is important to summarize how the suggested WP.1-solutions support the SDGs and ITC-strategy. Based on the assessment of the various impacts and their distribution across affected stakeholders, the impact assessment should compare the different options with regard to their effectiveness, efficiency and coherence towards the ITC-strategy, as well as their compliance with the proportionality principle. At the end of this process, the impact assessment should present the relevant information for WP.1 to make a choice and, where appropriate, suggest and/or decide on a preferred option.

*How will monitoring and subsequent retrospective evaluation be organised?*

Policy-makers and stakeholders, and WP.1 itself, need to be able to check if the decided WP.1-measure is on track, and the extent to which it is achieving its objectives, at what cost and with what benefits. To do so, one should start from a clear idea of how the situation should look like in the future if the initiative is successful and describe how to evaluate if this will be the situation further in time. Having the entire program in scrutiny, the impact assessment should identify monitoring and ex-post evaluation arrangements to track whether the policy measure actually delivers the intended results and to inform any future revisions of the policy. At the end of this process, the WP.1 should know how the measure will be monitored and evaluated, allowing for future adjustments wherever and whenever needed.