



**Economic and Social
Council**

Distr.
GENERAL

TRANS/WP.1/2001/33/Add.1
5 July 2001

ENGLISH
Original: FRENCH

ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE

INLAND TRANSPORT COMMITTEE

Working Party on Road Traffic Safety
(Thirty-seventh session, 10-14 September 2001,
agenda item 5 (f))

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

Roadworks signing

Transmitted by Switzerland

Vehicles equipped with amber warning lights

Re 1. General requirements

Re 1.6: Proposal by the Russian Federation

“Vehicles to be used for roadworks shall be equipped with special amber warning lights.”

Vehicles for winter service and vehicles assigned to special tasks (for example, sweepers, machines used for road marking and vehicles which, general traffic rules notwithstanding, frequently have to use the middle or the left side of the roadway). Vehicles used in roadworks, such as lorries, wheeled excavators, etc. may only be equipped with amber warning lights when in movement in the performance of special work. Otherwise, their presence may be indicated or their safety ensured by means of the usual signalling devices, such as beacons, barriers, roadworks trailers with flashing lights, signs or other appropriate devices. As at present, vehicles should be equipped with amber warning lights in a minimum number of situations so that the warning light will continue to be fully effective as a means of indicating danger.

For all the above reasons, Switzerland proposes that the mandatory formula should be replaced by a rule from which it is possible to depart.

Retroreflective road signs

Re 2. Technical requirements

Re 2.2: “The minimum requirements regarding the photometry of retroreflective materials used on road work signs should be those of Class II materials described in the above-mentioned CIE document.”

Class II means HIG, i.e. highly retroreflective

Switzerland is of the opinion that the requirement should be corrected and the mandatory formula replaced by a non-mandatory formula. The authorities should be left a margin of discretion (margin for decision). This takes specific circumstances into account. A non-mandatory formula makes it possible to take decisions adapted to the case in question, which is not possible with a mandatory formula. It should not be laid down as binding that HIG materials are to be used on every worksite. Local conditions sometimes make it possible to use road signs which are less retroreflective (Class I, CIE). For example, the following conditions could be imagined: a road with little traffic, a perfectly clear traffic situation, relatively limited roadworks, etc. In Switzerland’s opinion, it does not seem advisable to adopt a measure as stringent as that for which paragraph 2.2 provides; we therefore propose the replacement of the mandatory formula by a rule from which it is possible to depart.

Sign supports

Re 3: Advance warning signs

3.4: “Should several signs be used at the same time and should they have to be grouped on the same support, not more than two messages at a time shall be shown.”

Switzerland proposes the possibility of putting three signs on each support. Drivers should be informed as fully as possible of obstacles ahead (in the case of roadworks). Their attention should be drawn to how to adapt their driving to the circumstances and to the restrictions or events they should expect. Three signs per support are a better guarantee of conveying this range of information and ensuring the fluidity and safety of traffic. In Switzerland, the supports are often equipped, for example, with the following three signs (from top to bottom): 1. Roadworks (A,16); 2. Traffic lights (A,17^a); 3. Maximum speed (C,14).
