

# InterChange

The Newsletter of  arts m  
ASSOCIATION FOR ROAD TRAFFIC SAFETY AND MANAGEMENT

## Issue 003 April 2019

What's in this edition?

Welcome to New Members

Details of The AGM

Update on business plan

Network Group plans

Traffex

BREXIT & CE Marking – a cynic's view, Article

The cost of Safety, Article

Prevention is better than Cure, Article

When is a Sign not a Sign?– a look at SIDs, Article

What the Working Groups are currently undertaking

Vacancy

### New Members:

We are pleased to welcome :  
Morelock Installations Ltd – who re-join us this year; Tennants (UK) Limited who join WG2 and PTC Limited as our first SME Consultancy Class B Member.

We are hoping to gain more members as a result of our presence at TRAFFEX this year. May I continue to urge you to act as ambassadors for your Association.

Venue: TBC      Date: 28/11/19

Time: 10.00 arrival 10.30 start –  
apologies for the delay of info.

## Update on Business Plan

Following the AGM in November we are continuing to implement our business plan, beginning with the change of membership structure and fees. We have also introduced a new audit process which brings us in line with the Construction industry, using PAS91 and are pleased to have become supporter members of SSIP – Safety Schemes in Procurement. In addition, we have also become supporter members to Safer Highways. °

**Our website:** We are continuing to update our website and trying to make it

more accessible, but it is not always the best place for information sharing so for the next few months we are also trialling a bullet mail – this will come out at the end of each month listing everything that has been posted and shared over the course of the month in the hope that you will be able to catch up on anything missed. We do of course recognise that for many responding to emails can also be fraught with time issues. The best way to contact the general secretary however is via email or telephone, I endeavour to answer emails within seven day at the latest.

## Key Industry Issues under discussion

Our Network Group have thrashed out the many suggestions of what we should raise as a whole industry and we are now putting into place the meeting of Industry voices. This will be a gathering of representatives from the Executive Teams across all our industry Associations to reflect on what we know, what we don't know, and what we want to know. This will take place on 31<sup>st</sup> May and we are expecting a very good turn out.

We shall be initially looking at the two main areas of 'funding and strategy' and 'specifications and standards' – which are overarching areas underpinning everything from changes in infrastructure to training programmes. I anticipate there will be many different perspectives from the different Associations to these focus areas, but I hope that we will be able to encompass these to create specific questions concerning industry wide problems to the people who can give positive answers and actions back.

This meeting will be followed by an invitation to significant and relevant people to attend a further meeting in the hope we can establish some dialogue, and improve liaison and understanding between industry, users and government bodies going forward in this considerable time of change. We shall keep you posted. Meanwhile a big thank you to those who have given their time for the Network Group. If anyone wishes to be involved please email me at and let me know. °



This year saw my first attendance at Traffex. Having never been before I had no idea what to expect – was it going to be like the Ideal Home Exhibition – which I recall literally heaved with visitors and took so long to get round that by the end you just wanted to buy a tent and live in a field?! Or, the local craft fair at Westpoint with over 100 stands where they all blur into one and you leave feeling totally swamped by the amount of ideas you have had on what you can do with all your wonderful purchases that then don't come out of their bags for at least another six months only to be forgotten in a cupboard.

Well it was actually a pleasant surprise. I wandered round the whole event chatting to members and non members, visited stands, wandered into Parkex to find nowhere to park but noting stands that I should return to, the 'parking area' in my own zone was perfect for a quick coffee without the need to queue for ever. There was even a "ladies' breakfast" apparently, but I didn't quite get to that. Unfortunately, I didn't get to any of the talks, but am pleased to see they are all up on the web to view at my leisure.

I was chuffed to bits with the number of members who stopped by to say hello and we received some excellent feedback – always good to get – on how we are doing for our members. Drop ins from those engaged in the TOPAS process was also

beneficial. It was great to put faces to all the names.

The production of our guidance notes went down well – we ran out of some of them. I am hopeful that we have encouraged some new members – we had a visit from Hampshire police who were full of praise for ARTSM and may even become members at some point.

Apologies to anyone who I missed whilst I was wandering. I also had the pleasure of working alongside Andy Pledge from REMA at periods throughout the three days, in the “dark area”, which I hope you were able to visit and come out unscathed!

I managed to pick up a few bits from other stands to take home – although I did seem to miss almost every opportunity to partake in any of the delicious refreshments that I glimpsed on your stands – perhaps next time I will put in an early order and arrange a Deliveroo to follow me around!

Thanks go to Mark Pleydell and Sean Coffey who kindly produced a couple of articles to put out at the event. These can both be found on our website under ‘Articles from our Members’ both on the main page and in the members area. Finally, thank you all for displaying the ARTSM logo on your stands. Becoming ambassadors for our Association can only benefit the industry. Better to be a standard bearer with many followers, urging procurers to act with integrity for the benefit of all, than engage in races to the bottom, especially at this time of significant change. Time does however pass quickly, and we need to keep up and be innovative, getting procurement teams

actively engaged in ARTSM seems a good way round the obstacles ahead. °



**Dates for your Diaries :** As it was such a successful event ARTSM Executive have now decided that we will also be attending the following events, which I hope you will also be able to attend – as I will be on the stands.

- JCT Symposium – Nottingham Trent University – 16<sup>th</sup> – 18<sup>th</sup> September
- Safer Highways – Silverstone – 11<sup>th</sup> September
- HAUC – Wolverhampton – 12<sup>th</sup> November (attendee only)
- Highways UK – NEC – 6<sup>th</sup> – 7<sup>th</sup> November – Speaker presentation
- A long holiday in December subject to BREXIT – oh wait – sod it – I will go somewhere hot! °

**Looking forward :** The Executive have decided that we should have an Association get-together each year to network, discuss, chat, and eat some time mid-year. However, we are already in April so this wont be happening until 2020. Possibly with WG meetings in the morning, lunch then an afternoon of discussion and healthy debate – an outlet for innovation but also an outlet to be heard. We are hoping to find a suitable venue and will keep you posted °



## **BREXIT and the CE Marking debacle:**

### **An Article by Kealie Franklin, General Secretary**

The Executive have agreed that until such time things become clearer, they cannot give a direction to our members. However, many of you do have concerns so I thought I would share my experience on the question, which goes like this:

Rumour has it that on the day of BREXIT if we have a deal, negotiations will take place for a transition period including arrangements for the transfer of CE Marking on goods identified under the CPR (Construction Products Regulations) to create a separation from CE and UKCA. The intention is for goods manufactured in the UK to be identified as not part of Europe, regardless of the standard that is used. However, the standards which apply in respect of CPR on the date of BREXIT will all be harmonised and applicable in all remaining 27 countries and the UK, provided they appear within the Official Journal of the European Union (according to the CE Marking Association), and there is a transition period during this lengthy OJ process where several versions of the standard can be used in addition to any transition period agreed between the UK and EU.

Clear as mud so far? It gets better. A no deal BREXIT:

Allegedly, according to notified bodies – CE Marking will cease to apply in its

present form on the day BREXIT happens. Notified Bodies are stating that the 27 remaining EU states will not accept products from the UK with a CE Mark which has been granted in the UK, only those that have been given from one of the “remainder” States.

In the UK we must also identify products as being CE Marked under a new system to be known as UKCA because 0120 will be an insufficient identifier because we will no longer be state 0120. (Who knew!)

However, the UK is currently offering to receive products with European and UK CE Marks for an unknown period of transition.

If UK manufacturers want to sell products manufactured in the UK to the UK market after the BREXIT no deal day, we must display UKCA. If we want to sell in the EU we must also display CE granted from a remainder state. Some notified bodies (soon to become approved bodies) are recommending manufacturers apply now and have two concurrent CE Approval Certificates AND they should pay for the privilege (although I state not all are currently insisting on payment if it is done now).

So, liking a good debate, I had the following recent conversation with those experts in the know:

“May I enquire why you are suggesting that manufacturers of products under CPR should transfer their CE Mark certificates to a remainder state NOW and at cost?”

“Because the CE mark will be revoked if we have a no deal and so its best to have two concurrent certificates now to be able to continue to trade.”

“Can I speak to someone who has a more coherent answer than we can use a UK CE mark the day after BREXIT please?”

“Hello, I am .... (the designated expert).”

“Can you advise me, if I have a product which is stuck in transit at BROC on 30<sup>th</sup> October due to the enormous surplus of vehicles who will be unable to move on that day, and that product has been purchased and paid for by a company in an EU state, but because of the delays on the UK motorways due to the apparent thousands of HGVs and other vehicles (except perishables like holiday makers) it will not arrive at its destination until 2<sup>th</sup> November (assuming that isn't a Sunday since lorries don't travel in the EU on Sundays), will my product be totally useless by the time it reaches the customer on the far side of Europe because it has a UK granted CE Mark?”

“Well, no, not if it was purchased before BREXIT day>”

“So, if I have been paid its ok?”

“Yes.”

“What if I haven't been paid, but I have a purchaser order and its stuck in the loory on a no sale or return contract – will it be ok?”

“Yes, if the product has completed its manufacturing stage then it will be fine.”

WAha, so what if, because it costs just as much to produce a run of 500 as it does to produce 50, that I now have 450 completed products in my stock with the intention of selling them to the EU with the CE mark from the UK already on them?”

“Well, you could give a valid argument that they were really to be placed on the

market and therefore they would be ok to sell to the EU.”

“So, if I have finished the manufacturing process and I have products that are ready to go to market even if they have not yet been sold, they will be ok?”

“More than likely, yes, provided they are no longer regarded as in the manufacturing stage.”

“Thank you, and this applies to all products or only new products to market?”

“First time to market only.”

“Thank you. How will I identify when a product has completed the manufacturing state so that one can state the CE mark from the UK will still apply?”

“....”

“Will that CE mark be valid after BREXIT day?”

“Yes.”

“So, if someone comes from Europe across to my bargain basement of signs on a cost cutting exercise from an EU state with financial difficulties in 2021 and they see I have 450 products in my stock, manufactured in the UK, all CE Marked from the UK notified bodies and a production date before BREXIT, then they can buy them, take them home and use them without any difficulties?”

“Well I suppose it might be possible.”

“So, why am I buying my second CE certificate from the EU now?”

I would urge everyone to attend the BSI standards meeting on 25<sup>th</sup> April. Although I would really love to be there myself to ask these questions and more again, in a

public arena, sadly I am unable to make it but please feel free to raise these and many more questions and let me know the responses you get. I would emphasise the conversation above did not take place with a member of the BSI. °



## **An Article by Mark Pleydell, Executive Committee & WG4 Member and WG4**

There is usually some truth behind clichés and adages like the title.

For the ARTSM it is particularly relevant to the activities of our members.

Why is this?

Consider the following situation.

A specification for an item of traffic signage or control equipment is published by some Body or Authority. It is sufficiently well publicised or mandated that it becomes a necessary requirement for the sale of such equipment. That is, the user community will only accept equipment that can demonstrate that it meets this specification.

This seems straightforward enough but does not allow for the ingenuity and wit of manufacturers. Each manufacturer acquires a copy of the specification. Their designers are given the task of making a product to meet the specification.

But each designer brings to their reading all their own experience, both of technology and of language and logic, and

what emerges is a range of interpretations of the specification and thence, a range of products which are perhaps incompatible one with another, or which do not align with the users' reading and understanding of the same specification.

The result is discord, argument and wasted effort. By the time these disputes emerge money has been spent, time used, and someone will have to back down or compromise. Hardly a cure.

So how can we minimise the chances of this happening?

Early and thorough engagement with specification development can substantially reduce the problems identified above.

Consider a group of manufacturers united within a trade body, all contributing to the development of new specifications.

All can bring some awareness of user needs, or technology capabilities and limitations. Without compromising individual intellectual property or market advantage a group can inform the development of a new specification. As that specification takes form they can be confident that their own interpretation of the intent as well as the word is well aligned with the community of manufacturers, and via the anonymity that the trade body provides, they can challenge users, policy makers and others to help with the emergence of realistic achievable specifications.

Their early engagement with the specification development means their development teams can move promptly to implement a solution.

The detailed awareness that is associated with the review and discussion of a product's performance encourages innovation, so that manufacturers can deliver a core product meeting the specification but may enhance this with facilities and features which they consider to be beneficial or that integrate well with other products or services in their portfolio.

The ARTSM through its working groups, its representation on BSI shadow committees and its close involvement with TOPAS ([www.topasgroup.org.uk](http://www.topasgroup.org.uk)) brings these opportunities to its members.

This early and shared engagement is the prevention, and while it does not guarantee an absence of conflict or argument, divergence or disagreement it does minimise the probability of these emerging and minimise their effects when they do.

It is important that the manufacturers alone do not steer the direction, and that policy makers and users contribute to specification development. Participation in these activities then gives insights into the needs and aspirations of these other important parties in the signage, traffic control and related sectors.

Even with all these parties involved the process can still fall down.

By way of example, back in the mid-1990s puffin crossings were being promoted, and the necessary items of technology were being specified.

During the development of the nearside pedestrian signal specification a

discussion at a meeting did not fully address, agree or appreciate the effects of a clash between the light output distribution and phantom rejection criteria. In effect it wanted to prevent light entering the face of these signals while requiring it to exit them in the same direction. This is at best poor physics.

The upshot was that it took manufacturers a lot of effort and money to meet the specification, many years longer than was intended for products to emerge and when they did they were considerably brighter than was wanted and probably more costly.

Even now these items of equipment glow by the roadside – and this was with all the parties at the table developing the spec. Imagine how much worse it could have been without the full range of inputs.

The ARTSM's working groups and members are active in specification development and in sharing knowledge of trends and technologies, work done elsewhere, and other factors. Members are generally aligned on understanding, are quick to market and are well placed to help new products into the market.

It recognises that innovation has to occur, but that rarely will innovation be accepted in isolation, it has to align to the environment where it will operate, good specifications cannot foresee the future, but they can adapt and evolve to support it.

The ARTSM wholeheartedly backs the development of applicable and relevant specifications. °



## The cost of Safety, An Article by Sean Coffey, Executive

### Committee & WG Member

To many in manufacturing, the word “Safety” has become an irritable hurdle. A hurdle that requires additional cost in design, raw material, production, testing and certification. It is a burdensome facet of every product that wasn’t necessary in the “good old days” when what didn’t kill you made you stronger and natural selection was the order of the day.

Building in safety into a product commences at the design stage – where most product design processes involve a form of FMEA (Failure Mode and Effect Analysis) – from the safety aspect, this is basically a process whereby every possible failure of a product is thought out and as the prototype and production processes take place is then tested, verified and if necessary, countermeasures introduced to reduce risk factor or possible damage that could occur.

Take for example, a simple bollard or delineator pole.

In this instance, in the event of a vehicle collision, passive safety would have to be part of the design process for the concern that the pole would break or pop out and hit oncoming traffic. Thought would have to be given as to how to ensure that it would be designed to prevent the pole from being uprooted from its location, or if in the event it was uprooted, that it would not lead to serious damage.

These design considerations might involve deeper screw-ins or plates to spread the load-bearing. It would also consider the materials used. For a simple pole, this could involve stronger alloys to prevent breakage of fixings, stronger fixative or grout to keep the products in the ground. In the case of breakage, weaker

materials that would minimise risk – polymer materials that would bounce off windscreens instead of metals which could penetrate and cause damage to drivers. In addition, softer more pliable polymers like polyurethane or rubber can bend easily and rebound and ideally survive collisions. Because of the nature of flexible polymers, especially those using plasticisers and other additives, issues such as adhesion to reflective materials might arise and other processes might be needed to increase adhesive strength (primers, sandpapering, flame treatment etc etc).

So, from a simple design standpoint, where the designer may have just been focused on visibility of the product, we have now introduced additional unexpected costs before commencing production. The added components that may have been deemed necessary add to the costs of procurement and production especially if new supply chains need to be sought.

Now we get into the costs of testing and certification...

Simulations are the most cost-effective way of proving prototype designs to estimate their safety. For a company wishing to roll out a portfolio of variants on the same product, in-house physical testing might be most valuable to validate different prototypes and models to ensure that confidence can be given before mass production commences. To set up in-house test facilities can be very costly and for small companies, prohibitively expensive.

In order to be placed on the market, Marker posts and delineators fall under the class of Construction Products Regulations and thereby require testing by Technical Assessment Bodies and subsequent CE certification and auditing by Notified Bodies. For passive safety, the applicable standard is EN 12767. These costs are again, quite exorbitant to the extent that to many, it might be a “hurdle” ducking under than jumping over.

However, standards such as EN 12767 are drawn up to enable common products across the industry to be tested to the same test regime (same test parameters, same test conditions), usually categorising the results to simplify the results for ease of understanding for designers, manufacturers, local authorities and all specifiers.

This can aid a road designer to specify a specific category of Energy Absorption or Support Structure based on the nature of the road and the speed limit.

The work done by the manufacturer in designing the product in categorising the product becomes a simplified box-ticking exercise by the specifier. Any specifier or purchasing body should of course, request test results on a periodical basis though, to ensure that due diligence has been carried out and that the manufacturer is not ducking the hurdle...

### **The Price of Safety**

There are not many who do not have a friend, relative or colleague who has not been directly affected by a traffic-related incident.

Traffic-related deaths are now the eighth leading cause of deaths globally. In the UK, it is also the leading cause of “accidental” death of children between 10 and 14.

Between 2003 and 2008, 11 road workers were killed and 104 were seriously injured on motorways and major routes in England. As one can imagine, there is no such thing as “closure” for most of these cases.

We are currently nearing the end of the WHO “Decade of Action for Road Safety” – which I was not aware of when I went to pen this article and I doubt any reader is either...

There is a moral, ethical and professional onus on all those involved in the entire chain of supplier through to procurement to optimise the element of safety that is built-in to our roads and traffic products.

Between the desire of manufacturers to maximise profitability and tenders or procurers to minimise cost, the element of safety can often be an afterthought.

When balanced with costs of over £2,000,000 per road fatality, one would think that it is absurd that there would be a practise of ducking the hurdle and that the “hurdle duckers” can simply tick a box without any evidence to back up their safety claims.

In a field of traffic products, where most products are traffic “SAFETY” products, products that do not meet the required specifications are in effect traffic HAZARDS or worse.

### **The Future of Safety**

The reasons standards such as EN 12767 are in place is because they are established by experts in the industry and are designed to account for real life safety critical events. As design, material and production technologies develop, the standards will also develop to ensure and assure optimal safety. The perennial dilemma here is enforcement of these standards.

We are all taught from an early age that ignorance is not an excuse in the eyes of the law. There is a higher bar for any company involved with traffic that involves public trust.

All local and governmental authorities have 40% KSI reduction targets. Whilst it will not be possible to account for driver error, we have a duty to protect road workers, drivers and pedestrians alike by doing what we can to ensure that our products meet safety requirements. The best way to do that is to incorporate safety in the design phase as early as possible, so that reiterations or redesigns are not necessary. This also needs to be rigorously checked on the procurement end – while it may be difficult to understand, a buyer can save dozens of lives with the stroke of a pen.

So, rather than cheering on the fireman rescuing the baby from the burning house, let's design the house not to burn, and ensure that no planning permission is given until proof of testing is given.

Let's also remind all our operators and administrators that they have a valuable contribution in the prevention of road deaths.

If it can be shown how safety levels can be improved, let's do that, let's raise the bar of existing standards. This sorts the wheat from the chaff from the manufacturer's end and ultimately saves lives.

ARTSM plays a key role in safety, with its key objects being to:

- Improve road safety by promoting compliant quality products supplied by ARTSM
- members.
- Be the informed envoy of members to Government and Standards Bodies and to ensure
- that the standards and specifications produced are credible and practicable.
- Ensure that members are aware of relevant industry standards and policies.
- Engage in the resolution of non-adherence to mandatory standards.

We urge our members to raise awareness of safety issues and bad practice across the industry so that we can support the maintenance of standards and, where necessary, seek to raise them.

Our dispute resolution process is paramount to this and is impartial, thorough and supportive to both claimants and respondents.

We have also added to our membership classes to enable scheme designers, procurers and manufacturers to better work together to ensure safety is no longer regarded as a hurdle but rather as a beneficial advantage for everyone. °



## When is a Sign not a Sign? An article by Kealie Franklin, General Secretary

A recent problem came across the path of the members of the TOPAS Board – made up from ARTSM members, ADEPT on behalf of users, and Government departments for England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland – ‘what to do about SIDs?’

So, for me the first question was trying to ascertain exactly what a SID is. The acronym stands for Speed Indicator Device.



All of the images used in this article could be described as SIDs. The similarities are : they all have Variable Message Signs (VMS), they all have a detector to measure actual speed, they are all activated by a vehicle (VAS).



What is a VAS - this is a Vehicle Activated Sign which is authorised for use under the Traffic Signs Regulations & General

Directions 2016 (TSRGD) and complies with BS EN 12966.

If the message or legend that is displayed is identified in TSRGD then the DfT and the corresponding bodies, will accept the legitimacy of the sign. (There are also occasions when specific site authorisation may be applied for to the DfT, and that sign will also be legitimate and recognised as a Vehicle Activated Sign.)

However, there are other signs, also activated by vehicles, but which do not have legends or texts which are within TSRGD and which the DfT will not authorise. Most commonly SIDs.

TAL 01/03 produced by the DfT Traffic Advisory Unit in March 2003 makes it clear that vehicle activated signs are “an adjunct and are not an alternative to fixed signs.” Moreover, they were developed “to address the problems of inappropriate speed where conventional signing has not been effective.”

Moving on from 2003 to the present day. These types of signs now appear all over the place, installed at the request of the local authority via town councils, parish councils or otherwise and are increasing with greater innovation:

- to warn of excess speeds
- to warn of use of mobile phones
- to warn of high levels of pollution

All of which signs, because they do not have an approved legend or text, must have the authorisation of the Department of Transport to be used on the highway.

The difficulty : DfT state that SIDs are not signs and are not therefore in their remit and they therefore will not only refuse to grant authorisation but go further and state that placing them on the highway has nothing to do with them at all because they are not technically “road signs”.

The problem for TOPAS is that when a product is registered as a VAS it can include a caveat that its message must comply with TSRGD or approval from DfT, when a product is a SID it is not able to be registered.

Should this be the case? All these signs are VAS – clearly considered as long ago as TAL 01/03 hence the statement “signs must not contain non-standard pictograms or messages.”

So now the dilemma : If DfT will not give authorisation for SIDs and TOPAS cannot register then because they are not recognised then they remain completely unregulated.

So, what is the purpose of any non-regulatory VAS? I suspect what we are currently using

them for is a gentle prompt not to break the law – an advisory sign. The issue is therefore not whether they are legal in terms of enforceability, but whether they are fit for purpose. Does it matter that they are unregulated, that they are not monitored by appropriate persons, they are not site specific or put in the most appropriate and beneficial place? What if they don’t work properly or stop altogether? What if they are wrong – does any of this matter?

What risk is there to drivers or other road users and local authorities as a result of potential legal action.

What of the trial by police for notifying drivers to stop using their mobile phones – currently I believe that they can’t tell who is using the phone or for what purpose although apparently it can tell if its hands free. What if the phone is merely being used as a google map satnav?

A decision needs to be made as to whether these innovative devices/signs/whatever’s are (a) beneficial (b) potentially enforceable and (c) should be regulated to ensure they meet appropriate standards for equipment on the highway.

A quick google search reveals studies undertaken in America on the benefits of SIDs [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Radar\\_speed\\_sign](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Radar_speed_sign). A quick informal discussion with road users and village residents reveals anecdotes such as:

“Boy racers try to see how high they can get the number.” “Old people standing by the side of the road get more impact than smiley/frowny faces.” “Villages want the same enforcements as major roads so would prefer enforcement cameras.”



Local authorities remain innovative, manufacturers also. So, can we, or should we, lobby DfT to address the

distinction by an inclusion in TSRGD and authorise the use of such sign faces rather than leave an entire product (which is almost certainly a VAS under a different name), unregulated, unenforceable and in effect, potentially a hazard when it is not placed or used appropriately under TSRGD.

To encourage this change, TOPAS are currently – with the massive support of our ARTSM WG3 members – drafting a procurement specification which will at least enable the SIDs to be regulated, albeit by voluntary registration, if not the sign messages!



However, is it time for the DfT to accept that non-authorisation of these types of signs is now merely a blot on the landscape rather than a prevention?

## Articles:

Anyone who wants to write articles should. There is a lot to be said for the written word. It opens people's minds, it can bring a smile or outrage, or a new interest. Print is not totally dead and 'taking five' to read one of those industry magazines in your busy day is often a necessity to clear your head. How great to see ARTSM stamped all over them with views and opinions. After all, we are the voice of industry – so keep them coming please. °

Finally, we currently have a vacancy on the Executive Committee and would welcome applications from members. This is a valuable opportunity which carries transferrable skills which look great on your CV. We offer a welcoming environment where everyone feels valued and all voices are heard. If you feel you could make a contribution to the ongoing development and enrichment of ARTSM for its members and industry please do consider applying. If you want any further information contact Kealie, Graham, Keith or anyone else on the Executive who would be happy to talk to you about the role. Further information can be found on the members area of the website.

## A quick overview of the Working Groups:

WG1 is currently reviewing the standard BS EN 12767 with a view to creating a robust National Annex which will work for the UK. The meeting in May is postponed pending a clearer BREXIT view.

WG2 is now almost done with BS EN 12899 and looking at general business. They are interested in hearing if anyone has any difficulties with audits by notified bodies and whether there is a lack of robust consistency. The next meeting is 23<sup>rd</sup> May at 3M Offices.

WG3 are enjoying the development of a draft procurement specification on behalf of TOPAS for Vehicle Activated Signs. Interesting to note the police are currently using a sign which is not within TSRGD! Next meeting is 14<sup>th</sup> May hosted by Simmons signs at Telford.

WG4 are continuing to review portable signals through the auspices of TOPAS 2502, 2503, 2537 & 2538 as well as keeping abreast of changes in BS EN standards within EPL 226. Next meeting is on 21<sup>st</sup> May and is hosted by Colas in the Gatwick Offices.

