25. PROTOCOL ON ROAD MARKINGS, ADDITIONAL TO THE EUROPEAN AGREEMENT SUPPLEMENTING THE CONVENTION ON ROAD SIGNS AND SIGNALS

Geneva, 1 March 1973

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 25 April 1985, in accordance with article 4(2).

REGISTRATION: 25 April 1985, No. 23345.


TEXT:


Note: Drawn up by the Inland Transport Committee of the Economic Commission for Europe at its thirty-second session held at Geneva from 2 January to 2 February 1973 on the basis of a text prepared by the Working Party on Road Transport on its forty-sixth and fiftieth extraordinary sessions (doc. W/TRANS/SCI/450 and Add.1).

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

AUSTRIA

"Paragraph 6 of the Annex to the Protocol on Road Markings Additional to the European Agreement Supplementing the Convention on Road Signs and Signals (referring to article 29 of the Convention) is applied with the exception of the provision under paragraph 2 according to which road markings have to be white."

AZERBAIJAN

"The Republic of Azerbaijan declares that it is unable to guarantee implementation of the provisions of the Protocol in its territories occupied by the Republic of..."
Armenia, until the liberation of those territories from the occupation and complete elimination of consequences of that occupation..."

"In relation to Article 11, the Republic of Azerbaijan declares that it does not consider itself bound by Article 9 of this Protocol."

BELARUS

The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 9 of the Protocol on Road Markings of 1 March 1983, additional to the European Agreement of 1971 supplementing the Convention on Road Signs and Signals of 1968.

The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, considers that the provisions of article 3 of the Protocol on Road Markings of 1 March 1983, additional to the European Agreement of 1971 supplementing the Convention on Road Signs and Signals of 1968, concerning the extension by States of the applicability of the Protocol to territories for the international relations of which they are responsible, are outdated and contrary to the Declaration of the United Nations General Assembly on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (United Nations General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960), which proclaimed the necessity of bringing to a speedy and unconditional end colonialism in all its forms and manifestations.

CYPRUS

"... the Government of the Republic of Cyprus makes the following declarations and reservations in relation to article 9 and the technical provisions of the Protocol on Road Markings, additional to the European Agreement supplementing the 1968 Convention on Road Signs and Signals done on 1st March 1973:

1. The Republic of Cyprus does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 9 of the Protocol on Road Markings of 1973, additional to the European Agreement of 1971 supplementing the Convention on Road Signs and Signals of 1968.

2. The Republic of Cyprus declares that the diagrams can be inverted as appropriate.


   The Republic of Cyprus reserves the right to interpret the use of continuous or broken line on the kerb or on the edge of the carriageway for parking purposes.


   The Republic of Cyprus does not consider itself bound by the provision that the road markings shall be white.

5. Annex (of the Protocol on Road Markings), paragraph 7. Ad. Annex 8 to the Convention (Road Markings) – Chapter II (Longitudinal markings) Paragraph 6.

   The Republic of Cyprus does not consider itself bound by the provision that the zigzag lines showing places where parking is prohibited shall be yellow."

CZECH REPUBLIC

DENMARK

[ Same reservations as those under chapter XI.B-20. ]

FINLAND

"With respect to Annex, paragraph 6 (amendment to Article 29 paragraph 2 of the Convention), Finland reserves the right to use yellow colour for the continuous line between the opposite directions of traffic."

"Whereas Finland has taken into use a danger warning line before the barrier line, which also is yellow; [The Government of Finland declares] that the reservation made by Finland also applies to the barrier line.".

GERMANY

(Article 29, paragraph 2, of the Convention): The Federal Republic of Germany does not consider itself bound by the provision that the zigzag lines showing places where parking is prohibited shall be yellow.

HUNGARY

[Same reservation and declaration, mutatis mutandis, as those made in respect of the European Convention supplementing the Convention on Road Traffic done at Geneva on 1 May 1971 (chapter XI.B-23).]

LIECHTENSTEIN

"The Principality of Liechtenstein implements article 27, paragraph 5, of the Convention, but not in the manner provided for in item 4 of the annex.

"The Principality of Liechtenstein does not consider itself bound by article 29, paragraph 2, 1st and 2nd sentences, of the Convention, in the version given in item 6 of the annex."

"The relevant reservations of the Principality of Liechtenstein on the [Convention of 1968 on Road Signs and Signals and the European Agreement of 1971 supplementing the Convention on Road Signs and Signals] also apply to this Agreement."

POLAND

All the road markings provided for in item 6, paragraph 2, of the Annex to the said Protocol shall be white.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

[ Same declaration as the one reproduced under Belarus. ]

SLOVAKIA

SWEDEN

"The reservations of Sweden to the Convention on Road Signs and Signals and the European Agreement supplementing that Convention also apply to this Protocol."

SWITZERLAND

Switzerland implements article 27, paragraph 5, of the Convention, but not in the manner provided for in number 4 of the annex.

Switzerland does not consider itself bound by article 29, paragraph 2, 1st and 2nd sentences, of the Convention, in the version given in number 6 of the annex.

TÜRKIYE

1. In relation to paragraph 1 of Article 11 of the Protocol on Road Markings, the Republic of Türkiye declares that it does not consider itself bound by Article 9 of the Protocol.

2. With respect to point 6 of the Annex of the Protocol on Road Markings (amendment to Article 29, paragraph 2 of the Convention), the Republic of Türkiye does not consider itself bound by the provisions that “The road markings shall be white” and “zigzag lines showing places where parking is prohibited shall be yellow”. The
Republic of Türkiye reserves the right to use yellow colour for the road markings and white colour for the zigzag lines showing places where parking is prohibited. Türkiye’s decision to become a party to the Convention on Road Signs and Signals, and its supplements, should in no way be construed as implying any form of recognition of the Greek Cypriot Administration’s pretention to represent the “Republic of Cyprus”, nor as implying any obligation on the part of Türkiye to enter into any dealing with authorities or institutions of the so-called “Republic of Cyprus” within the framework of the activities specified in the said Convention and its supplements.

Ukraine

[Same declaration as the one reproduced under Belarus.]

Objections
(Unless otherwise indicated, the objections were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

Cyprus

“The Republic of Cyprus has examined the Declaration deposited by the Republic of Türkiye on 17 May 2023, upon accession to the Protocol on Road Markings, additional to the European Agreement supplementing the Convention on Road Signs and Signals (1973), and notes that such a declaration is not in conformity with the Protocol. By means of the submitted Declaration, Türkiye purports to release itself of the obligation to cooperate with other States Parties within the framework of the Protocol on Road Markings, additional to the European Agreement supplementing the Convention on Road Signs and Signals. Moreover, in its Declaration Türkiye puts forward, once again, the untenable position concerning the non-recognition of the Republic of Cyprus, a member of, among others, the United Nations and the European Union. In the view of the Republic of Cyprus, the Declaration of Türkiye is compatible neither with Article 11 of the Protocol on Road Markings, additional to the European Agreement supplementing the Convention on Road Signs and Signals nor the object and purpose thereof given that the allegations contained therein are irrelevant to the content of the Protocol. In light of the above, it is the position of the Republic of Cyprus that the content and purported effect of this Declaration submitted by the Republic of Türkiye is in contravention of the Protocol on Road Markings, additional to the European Agreement supplementing the Convention on Road Signs and Signals.

The Republic of Cyprus, therefore, rejects the aforementioned Declaration made by the Republic of Türkiye, which cannot in any way affect the obligations of the Republic of Türkiye towards the Republic of Cyprus both under general international law and the said Protocol and considers it null and void. The objection of the Republic of Cyprus shall not preclude the entry into force of the Protocol on Road Markings, additional to the European Agreement supplementing the Convention on Road Signs and Signals, in its entirety, between the Republic of Cyprus and the Republic of Türkiye.”

Greece

“The Hellenic Republic has examined the declaration made by the Republic of Türkiye upon accession, on 17 May 2023, to the Protocol on Road Markings, Additional to the European Agreement supplementing the Convention on Road Signs and Signals (1973) (“the Protocol”).

The Republic of Türkiye inter alia declares that its accession to the Protocol does not imply any obligation on the part of Türkiye to enter into any dealing with authorities or institutions of the Republic of Cyprus within the framework of the activities specified in the said Protocol.

The Government of the Hellenic Republic reiterates its view that the above declaration amounts to a reservation, as it purports to exclude the application of the Protocol in its entirety between Türkiye and another State Party, i.e., the Republic of Cyprus. In addition, the untenable position put forward by Türkiye concerning the non-recognition of the Republic of Cyprus, a member of, among others, the United Nations and the European Union, is neither relevant to nor compatible with the content of the Protocol, its object and purpose.

Therefore, the Hellenic Republic objects to the declaration in question.

This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Protocol between the Hellenic Republic and the Republic of Türkiye.”

Notifications
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

Azerbaijan

“In accordance with Article 6 (8), the Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Republic of Azerbaijan (address: AZ1005, Baku city, Azerbaijan avenue 7) is the administration competent in the matter of agreement as contemplated in Article 6 (7) of the above-mentioned Protocol.”

Liechtenstein

“The administration competent in the matter of agreement as contemplated in paragraph 7 of Article 6 shall be:

National Road Office
Gewerbeweg 2
9490 Vaduz
info.asv@llv.li”

Notes:
Amendments were proposed by various States and adopted as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object of the amendment</th>
<th>Proposed by:</th>
<th>Date of circulation and Entry into force:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

* In this regard, communications were received by the following States on the dates indicated hereinafter:

**Switzerland (26 September 2005):**

"... Switzerland has no objection to the proposed amendments transmitted on 28 September 2004.

**Finland (28 September 2005):**

"... Finland has no objection to the proposed amendments transmitted on 28 September 2004.

The Government of Finland furthermore informed the Secretary-General of the following:

"... the Government of Finland wishes to recall that the acceptance of the amendments shall not affect the reservations made by the Government of Finland to the said Protocol".

2 The former Yugoslavia had acceded to the Protocol on 6 June 1977. See also note 1 under “Bosnia and Herzegovina”, “Croatia”, “former Yugoslavia”, “Slovenia”, “The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia” and “Yugoslavia” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

3 Czechoslovakia had acceded to the Protocol on 7 June 1978, with the same reservation and declaration, *mutatis mutandis*, as those made in respect of the European Agreement supplementing the Convention on Road Traffic of 1 May 1971 (chapter XI.B-23). For the text of the reservation and declaration, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1137, p. 416. See also note 2 under “Germany” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

4 On 5 September 1995, the Government of Finland informed the Secretary-General that the reservation made upon accession to the Protocol should be modified as indicated. In keeping with the practice followed in similar cases, the Secretary-proposed to receive the modification in question for deposit in the absence of any objection on the part of any of the Contracting States, either to the deposit itself or to the procedure envisaged. Non of the Contracting Parties to the Protocol having notified the Secretary-General of an objection within a period of 90 days from the date of its circulation (on 20 December 1995), the said modification was accepted for deposit upon the expiration of the above-stipulated 90 period, that is on 19 March 1996.

5 The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Protocol on 18 August 1975 with the same reservation and declarations as those made in respect of the European Agreement supplementing the Convention on Road Traffic of 1 May 1971 (chapter XI.B-23). For the text of the reservation and declarations, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1137, p. 416. See also note 2 under “Germany” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

6 See note 1 under “Germany” regarding Berlin (West) in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

7 See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

8 For the Kingdom in Europe.

9 On 16 October 1997, the Government of Poland notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its reservation with regard to article 9 of the Protocol made upon accession. For the text of the reservation see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1394, p. 263.