



**Economic and Social  
Council**

Distr.  
GENERAL

TRANS/WP.1/1999/8  
22 January 1999

Original: ENGLISH

---

ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE

INLAND TRANSPORT COMMITTEE

Working Party on Road Traffic Safety  
(Thirty-second session, 13-16 April 1999,  
agenda item 4)

**REVISION OF THE CONSOLIDATED RESOLUTIONS ON ROAD TRAFFIC (R.E.1) AND ON  
ROAD SIGNS AND SIGNALS (R.E.2)**

Transmitted by the Government of Norway

Note: At its thirty-first session, the Working Party requested Governments to transmit to the secretariat any remarks or proposals regarding the consolidated text of R.E.1 as set out in TRANS/SC.1/294/Rev.5. It also agreed that delegations would transmit written proposals concerning the amendment of the consolidated text of R.E.2 as set out in TRANS/SC.1/295/Rev.3 (TRANS/WP.1/62, paras. 29-34).

The secretariat reproduces below proposals transmitted by the Government of Norway.

\* \* \*

**I. Revision of the Consolidated Resolution on Road Traffic (R.E.1)  
(TRANS/SC.1/294/Rev.5)**

1. When the structure of R.E.1 is amended according to the decision of WP.1 at its thirtieth session it is suggested to renumber annexes 2 and 3 (annex 2 becomes annex 3 and vice versa), since the present annex 3 will be related to a recommendation with a lower number (future number 2.5.1) than the present annex 2 (future number 2.7).

2. Ad recommendation 3.6 (2). According to notes taken at the twenty-sixth session of WP.1 it was agreed to delete paragraph 2, recommending motor cycles to be fitted with at least one rear-view mirror. This was not, however, reflected in the report. Since the obligatory fitting of rear-view mirrors for motor cycles is now included in the Convention on Road Traffic (Annex 5, paragraph 47), it seems appropriate to delete recommendation 3.6 paragraph 2 from R.E.1.

**II. Revision of the Consolidated Resolution on Road Signs and Signals (R.E.2)  
(TRANS/SC.1/295/Rev.3, TRANS/SC.1/WP.1/1997/9)**

3. Ad recommendation 1.1. The text should be simplified and the Norwegian Government offers the following proposal:

*"In cases where drivers of tramways, trains or trolleybuses are not required to comply with road signs other road users should, where necessary, be informed of this exemption by an additional panel in accordance with Annex 1 Section H of the Convention on Road Signs and Signals."*

4. Ad former recommendation 1.2. Most of the former recommendation 1.2 is now included in the Convention. As for the part relating to signs indicating additional lanes for slow-moving vehicles (1.2.5) this is not the case, however. Although the principle of creating a slow lane by sign G, 3b 1/ is in the Convention, the options for indicating the end of the slow lane (1.2.5.2) and the end of the minimum speed limit (1.2.5.3) are not. Since the principle of slow lanes is no longer in effect in Norway, the question of keeping the former recommendation 1.2.5 (updated) in R.E.2 is left for the Working Party's consideration.

5. Ad present recommendation 1.2.

(a) It is suggested to make a reference to section E in the text, in the following manner:

*"Where, at the approach to an intersection at which the traffic is channelled, sign E,4 of annex 1 section E to the convention .... etc."*

(b) It seems unnecessary to include figure 3 in annex 1, since figure 3 is not mentioned in recommendation 1.2 (or elsewhere in R.E.2) and figure 3 is identical to sign E,4 in the Convention (which is mentioned in the recommendation).

---

1/ Note by the secretariat: Former sign G,3b of R.E.2 (TRANS/SC.1/295/Rev.2/Annex 1) was renamed sign E,1b of the Convention, as amended on 30 November 1995 (E/CONF.56/17/Rev.1/Amend.1).

6. Ad recommendation 1.3. The text of the recommendation on confirmatory direction signs should be simplified and corrected. Paragraph (a) is not necessary, since the sign and the shape of the sign are described in the

Convention (annex 1 section G). Paragraph (b) should be corrected as proposed below. As for paragraph (c) it seems that it may not be up to date and it is suggested that WP.1 should consider deleting or updating it. If paragraph (c) is deleted, as well as paragraph (a), only the principle of colour is left, and one might be tempted to delete the whole recommendation. However, Norway considers this as an important principle. If paragraph (c) is not deleted, the first sentence should in any case be corrected as indicated below. The following proposal is submitted:

Delete paragraph (a), renumber paragraphs (b) and (c) as (a) and (b), and amend to read:

(a) Colour of the sign - The colour *should be the same as those used for direction signs.*

(b) Dimensions of the sign - The dimensions depend on the amount of information to be given and the dimensions adopted for *signs* on the road in question. If, in addition .... etc."

7. Ad recommendation 1.5.

(a) It is suggested to amend the first sentence as follows:

"Where a road is *temporarily* closed ..... etc.

(b) In paragraph (d) "annex 3" should be corrected to "annex 2" in the first sentence and "annex 1" should be amended to "annex 1 (G) " in the second sentence.

8. Ad recommendation 1.6. It is questioned if this recommendation should be kept as it is mainly because the application of this recommendation, related to the principles adopted in domestic legislation for use of the sign C,6, is not quite clear. This could be solved by deleting the exact limit of 4.30 m. In that case the last part should also be deleted (the part starting with "however, if the domestic legislation ....."). Also it seems unnecessary to use diversion signs, in addition to sign C,6, in connection with every civil engineering works (with less clearance than prescribed), in particular permanent works. The following text is proposed:

"Where the minimum clearance *of* civil engineering works above the carriageway is less than a *height prescribed by domestic legislation* suitable markings *should* be prescribed."

9. Ad recommendation 1.8. The three signs showing the direction to car-sleeper trains, trains or ferries are direction signs and should according to the structure of signs in the Convention be regarded as "G-signs". It follows that there should be a choice between dark colour symbols on a light ground, as prescribed in the present text of recommendation 1.8 (and the Convention) and white or light-coloured symbols on a dark ground, as prescribed as one of the options in the Convention. The following proposal is submitted:

Amend the last sentence in recommendation 1.8 to read:

"The symbols shall be of dark colour on a *white or light-coloured ground or white or light-coloured symbols on a dark ground, according to annex 1 section G of the 1968 Convention on Road Signs and Signals.*"

10. Ad recommendation 1.9. In the last sentence "annex 3" should be amended to "annex 1 (G)".

11. Ad recommendation 1.10. This recommendation should include all three options for signing "end of a built-up area" (E,8a, E,8b and E,8c). Paragraph (a) prescribes that the G,10 sign must be above the E-signs. Norway feels that this prescription has no significance for road traffic safety. Paragraph (b) should be deleted. Such details can be determined by domestic legislation. Paragraph (c) is unnecessary. The colour of the signs is described in the Convention. The following proposal is submitted:

Amend recommendation 1.10. to read:

"1. 10. Combination of the signs E,8a, E,8b or E,8c (end of built-up area) and G,10 (confirmation sign) 2/

The confirmation 2/ sign G,10 and the sign indicating the end of a built-up area E,8a, E,8b or E,8c may be used on the same support, either separately or combined on one panel."

12. Ad recommendation 1.12 (e) - blind pedestrians. The symbol (sun-glasses), intended for an additional panel, should be reconsidered, since the meaning of the symbol is not evident. Norway proposes the deletion of recommendation 1.12 paragraph (e).

13. Ad former recommendation 1.14. The sign "advisory speed" is now included in the Convention (sign G,17). However, the former recommendation 1.14 also contained the sign "end of recommended speed". This was, for unknown reasons, not included in the Convention. It is proposed to maintain the text relating to the end of advisory speed, in the following manner:

"1.13. Sign to indicate end of advisory speed

*The sign shown in annex 6 to this Consolidated Resolution shall mean that the advisory speed, indicated by sign G,17 of the 1968 Convention on Road Signs and Signals, is no longer in effect."*

14. Signs for recommended route for vehicles carrying dangerous goods. At its twenty-second session (April 1994), the Working Party adopted a recommendation describing signs for recommended route for vehicles carrying dangerous goods, at the time numbered as 1.21 (TRANS/SC.1/WP.1/44, paragraph 19 and annex). This recommendation is not included in the Convention or the European Agreement. The secretariat is asked to inform WP.1 if this recommendation was in fact endorsed by the Principal Working Party on Road

---

2/ Note by the secretariat: In the text of the Convention the term "Confirmatory sign" is used (See Annex 1, Section G iv).

Transport and, possibly, why this recommendation should not be included in R.E.2. In any case it seems that WP.1 at present is the relevant subsidiary body of the Inland Transport Committee to decide on this question. 3/

15. Ad recommendation 2.3. It is questioned whether this recommendation is necessary, in addition to article 3 paragraph 1 (b) and article 8 paragraph 1 bis of the Convention. If the recommendation is kept it is suggested to change "special light signals" to "variable message signs" in the heading and paragraph (a). Paragraph (b) should be deleted. It does not seem to be in harmony with the Convention to say that the signals should be adapted as far as possible to the prescriptions of the Convention, since article 8 paragraph 1 bis in the Convention describes and limits the possibilities for variable message signs.

---

---

3/ Note by the secretariat: Indeed, the Principal Working Party on Road Transport at its eighty-eighth session endorsed the reports of the Working Party on its twenty-second and twenty-third sessions (TRANS/SC.1/WP.1/44 and TRANS/SC.1/WP.1/46 respectively) and adopted a draft recommendation concerning signs for recommended routes for vehicles carrying dangerous goods (TRANS/SC.1/WP.1/44, annex) to be included in the Consolidated Resolution R.E.2 ... "(TRANS/SC.1/355, para 30). The Working Party may wish, therefore, to decide to restore the text of recommendation 1.21 as set out in TRANS/SC.1/WP.1/44, annex in R.E.2.