

**Economic and Social Council**Distr.: General  
19 September 2018

Original: English

---

**Economic Commission for Europe****Inland Transport Committee****Global Forum for Road Traffic Safety****Group of Experts on Road Signs and Signals****Sixteenth session**

Geneva, 4-5 September 2018

**Report of the Group of Experts on Road Signs and Signals on its sixteenth session****I. Attendance**

1. The Group of Experts on Road Signs and Signals (GE.2) held its sixteenth session in Geneva on 4-5 September 2018, chaired by Mr. K. Hofman (Belgium). Representatives of the following ECE member States participated: Belgium, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Sweden and Switzerland.

2. The representatives of a non-ECE member State also participated: Nigeria. The following non-governmental organizations were represented: A-Mazing Designs, Easa Husain Al-Yousifi & Sons Company and Forschungsgesellschaft Strasse-Schiene-Verkehr (FSV).

**II. Adoption of the Agenda**

3. The Group of Experts adopted the session's agenda (ECE/TRANS/WP.1/GE.2/31).

**III. Programme of Work: Taking Stock of National Legislation****A. Sign to communicate the need to crash through gates (barriers) by a vehicle when trapped at a level crossing**

4. The Group of Experts had agreed at its fifteenth session that a sign to crash through gates (barriers) should be developed, preferably as a G-section indication sign, following the format of emergency exit sign (G, 23). At the current session, experts reviewed suggestions for the "crash through gates" sign as provided by Italy (Informal document No.3, September

2018), FSV (Informal document No. 4, September 2018), Amazing Design and the secretariat. It selected the FSV design depicting a broken barrier, rear-view vehicle put on the white crash symbol on the rectangular sign of green ground. It further agreed that the sign should depict a barrier with white and red stripes.

5. The definition of the sign should inform that the colours of the barrier on the sign match the colours of barrier installed at the level crossing in accordance with the Article 35, paragraph 1. The sign should be considered for inclusion in the convention following the G, 24 signs indicating emergency exit. A provision on the placement of the “crash through gates” sign on the inside of the second gate (the one to be crashed through) in the direction of traffic should be developed. Moreover, a provision allowing for adding an additional panel containing an inscription in the national language indicating the need for crashing through the gate as well as on the placement of that additional panel should also be developed.

6. The representatives of Denmark and the Russian Federation disagreed with the inclusion of the crash through gate sign in the convention. They suggested that this sign be placed in the Consolidated Resolution on Road Signs and Signals instead. They believed it should be included in the convention only once there is evidence this sign has served its intended purpose.

## **B. Review of recommendations on A through F signs**

7. The Group of Experts continued to review its earlier recommendations for the A through F signs, based on Informal document No. 4 (February 2018) which reflects expert’s responses to ECE/TRANS/WP.1/GE.2/2018/1.

8. In the review, the Group agreed or confirmed its earlier recommendations or made new recommendations, as follows:

- (a) Rim on the mandatory signs: the width of the rim should be further increased;
- (b) Mandatory direction signs: eight signs for mandatory directions should be included in the convention (left, forward left, forward left and straight, straight, right, forward right, forward right and straight, left and right); the design of arrows should be further improved, the sign referred to as ‘direction left or right to be followed’ should be further improved to clearly show directions to left and right – Amazing Designs will propose a design for this sign;
- (c) Compulsory roundabout: the distance between arrows should be slightly increased;
- (d) Compulsory footpath: the symbol should be further improved to make it more gender neutral, the position of the symbol consisting of an adult and a child should be changed to be more forward-facing;
- (e) Compulsory track for riders on horseback: the symbol should be further improved, in particular, the leg of the rider should be removed from the symbol;
- (f) Ends of compulsory path or track: the signs for end of compulsory cycle track, footpath, track for riders on horseback, shared track or path and end of compulsory snow chains should be included in the convention;
- (g) D-section signs reversibility: D, 3 should include reversibility provisions only due to left hand direction of traffic (mandatory reversibility);
- (h) Compulsory minimum speed: the provision on the use on the sign of the unit of measurement for speed should be clarified. That clarified provision should be copied to sign C, 14 (speed limit) and G, 17 (advisory speed);

- (i) Compulsory direction for vehicles carrying dangerous goods: the colour of the ground should be limited to white. The symbols from signs C, 3 m and C, 3 n should also be permitted for use on this sign. Only the D, 1 a sign showing one mandatory direction should be permitted for use on D, 10 sign.
- (j) Revised definitions for mandatory signs: mandatory reversibility provision should be added as part of the definition for D, 3 (compulsory roundabout), the definition for D, 9 (compulsory snow chains) should be clarified by mentioning the situation in which chains should be used and such would be when the carriageway is covered by snow or ice.
- (k) Arrows on E signs: the arrows should be redesigned, the arrows shape shall be more standardised, the arrow edges should be sharp rather than rounded, the bottom of the arrow leg should be flat;
- (l) Lane reserved for buses: the H panel depicting the bus symbol should be moved to the arrow placed right on the sign. This sign should be seen when non-convention signs are reviewed;
- (m) Preselection of lanes: The definition for this sign should include a provision that the sign may include road marking separating lanes indicated by arrows;
- (n) One-way: square should be retained as shape for the sign placed perpendicular to the axis of the carriageway, the arrow leg should be made in such a way that it can contain inscription on the sign placed parallel to the axis of the carriageway;
- (o) Motorway and road for motor vehicles: the ground should be blue or green and the symbol white for these signs. The provision for the way to warn about the beginning of the motorway and the road for motor vehicles should be retained in the European Agreement and not moved to the convention. The symbol for the front view of the motor vehicle should have a more visible grill;
- (p) Build-up and end of build-up area: the inscription should be made in lower case with first capital letter, it should be centred horizontally and vertically on the sign panel; the parallel lines for the end of regulation should be improved – same width of the line and the distance between the lines;
- (q) Zonal validity: the definition of the sign should suggest the preferred use of the inscription ‘Zone’ or its equivalent in the national language. The time inscription should be done with a colon between hour and minutes indication, full hours should be inscribed without minutes. The design for end of zonal validity should follow the same principles as in the current version of the convention (no change of the colour to red of the band), the inscriptions on the end of zonal validity should remain in black or dark blue;
- (r) Tunnel: the symbol for stone arch should be further improved;
- (s) Pedestrian crossing: the variant depicting the zebra type of crossing should be the only variant retained in the convention (both for E, 12 and A, 12). Paragraph 4 of Article 27 should be amended to delete the word ‘preferably’. The symbol for the person and the number of zebra stripes on the pedestrian crossing should be selected from the examples proposed by the secretariat and the signs from Denmark and the Russian Federation. The expert views should be sent to the secretariat before the next session. The black ground variant option should be removed;
- (t) Hospital: the white strip between the cross and the blue ground should be increased;
- (u) Parking: the letter P should be improved;

(v) Bus and tram stop: the definition for these signs should include a mention of special traffic rules applying with this sign. The signs should be redesigned for the convention to fit the characteristics for E signs;

(w) Lithuania and the Russian Federation opposed the design change to the bus and tram stop signs;

(x) Residential area: the colours should be limited to blue ground and white symbol. The definition for this sign should not refer to another international agreement but list the special traffic rules referred to. The symbol of the house included in the sign should not be cut off and its silhouette can be changed to the style of houses in the applying country;

(y) Red bar on C-signs: the sign with the red bar placed behind the symbol should be included in the convention for C, 3, C, 4 and C, 15 signs, and the other variants placed in eCoRSS.

9. The Group has reached the review until point 63 of Informal document No.4.

10. The Group requested the secretariat incorporate the changes agreed in the draft final report.

11. The Group of Experts, due to time constraints was not able to discuss comments to ECE/TRANS/WP.1/GE.2/2018/4, suggesting amendments to Annexes 1 and 3 of the convention and the Informal document No. 1 consolidating comments from experts. The secretariat was requested to table ECE/TRANS/WP.1/GE.2/2018/4/Rev.1 at the next session, which contains the latest changes.

12. The Group of Experts decided to seek the expert's views on the preferred symbols for motorcycle and moped.

13. The Chair of the Group of Experts will submit the draft preliminary version of the new structured report to the Global Forum for Road Traffic Safety (WP.1) at its seventy-seventh session to seek preliminary comments and feedback. The draft preliminary version of the new structured report should be tabled at the next session (ECE/TRANS/WP.1/GE.2/2018/5).

### **C. Evaluation of the non-Convention signs and related observations**

14. The Group was not able - due to time constraints - to discuss this agenda item. The document tabled for this agenda item will be discussed at the next session.

## **IV. e-CORSS**

15. The secretariat informed the Group of Experts that e-CoRSS has been developed at the IT level and that it needs to be populated with the updated images and the text proposed for the revised Annex 1 as well as the suggested amendments for the provisions of the convention and the 1971 European Agreement. The work will be done pending the finalization of the report of the Group of Experts on the convention's signs.

## **V. Other Business**

16. The Group of Experts thanked Mr. L. Wyrowski for his splendid contribution and wished him all the best in his new endeavour.

17. The Group requested WP.1 to have its mandate extended through 31 December 2019.

## **VI. Date and Place of Next Meeting**

18. The next meeting of the Group of Experts will take place on 22 and 23 November 2018 in Geneva.

## **VII. Adoption of the Report**

19. The Group of Experts adopted the report of its sixteenth session.

**Annex**

**A sign to crash through gates (barriers)**



---