

Distr.: General  
9 February 2018

Original: English only

---

## **Economic Commission for Europe**

Inland Transport Committee

**Global Forum for Road Traffic Safety**

**Group of Experts on Road Signs and Signals**

**Fourteenth session**

Geneva, 15-16 February 2018

Item 2 (d) of the provisional agenda

**Programme of Work: Taking Stock of National Legislation**

**Review of recommendations on A through F signs**

### **I. Introduction**

This document presents responses to the questionnaire (ECE/TRANS/WP.1/GE.2/2018/1) related to road signs of A to F sections. A commentary by the secretariat is provided, which may also suggest an action for the Group of Experts (text marked in bold).

The following countries provided responses: Belgium, Chile, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Kuwait, Lithuania, Slovakia and Sweden

## **II. Responses and commentary**

### **General question**

#### **1.A. Question**

G.1. Should the sign name-coding be changed to a more user friendly one in the Convention?

#### **1.B. Responses**

1. YES – Belgium, Denmark, Estonia, Finland (the coding should be uniform), Lithuania, Kuwait, Slovakia, Sweden (keep, A, B, C system but develop it further and make consistent throughout the Convention)
2. NO – France (not necessarily)
3. No answer – Chile

#### **1.C. Commentary**

It appears that changing the number coding to one that is more uniform and consistent but keeps reference to classes/sub-classes receives support from experts. The secretariat believes to have developed such a coding system. It is provided in eCoRSS, on the detailed sign page of every sign under the term “new code”.

**The Group of Experts may wish to agree on the new sign name code.**

### **A section – Danger Warning**

#### **2.A. Question**

Q.A.1. Should the rim of the diamond shape of the danger warning sign be always black or should it also be dark blue when the symbol colour is dark blue?

#### **2.B. Responses**

1. Black – Chile (uses black), France
2. Dark blue with dark blue – Belgium, Denmark, Lithuania, Slovakia
3. Rethink colour options for symbols – Lithuania (General remark: When it comes to the amendments of the Convention on Road Signs and Signals, it would be wise to think about the changes to some fundamental principles of the visualization of road signs (colours, shapes, etc.), which are being rarely or even never used. This means that for the sake of having a world-wide road sign system, Contracting Parties should think about approaching a more consolidated and exact road sign system by leaving only the most standardized and frequently used road sign principles and by waving some of the rarely used principles of visualization (for example, by leaving only the black colour and waving the possibility to use the dark blue colour)), Kuwait (same idea as Lithuania), Sweden (only black symbol with black rim)

- 
4. No opinion – Estonia, Finland

## **2.C. Commentary**

A number of experts suggests to limit the number of colour variants, ie. remove colour variants from the Convention that are not used (are not widely used), e.g. to remove the variant of dark blue coloured symbol, or to list a specific colour instead of referring to light or dark coloured variants. The secretariat supports this suggestion.

**The Group of Experts should reflect on this issue.**

## **3.A. Question**

Q.A.2. Certain signs of this section have a provision in the Convention saying that the symbol of these signs may be reversed, if appropriate. In the understanding of the secretariat, this provision is included when these specific signs should be reversed for use on the other side of the carriageway if local conditions are such that this sign would/might not be seen by drivers if only placed at the side of the traffic. Do you agree with this understanding?

## **3.B. Responses**

1. YES – Chile, Estonia, Lithuania
2. NO – Belgium (reversing should be done only if side of traffic changes), Denmark and Finland (signs could be reversed in countries with left hand traffic), France (not necessarily), Kuwait (reversing should be done only if side of traffic changes), Slovakia (like Kuwait, and disagree with reversibility option for A, 12, A, 13, A, 14, A, 15, A, 16, A, 24, A, 30 and A, 31), Sweden (reversing could be done if side of traffic changes),

## **3.C. Commentary**

It appears that the majority of experts only support reversing symbols on signs used for left-hand traffic. The only signs which should differ in A class depending on which side of the road they are placed should be A, 29 signs. Any other A sign should be the same regardless its placement on the side of the road (right or left) for the same side of traffic. The text of the Convention needs to be changed so as to delete provisions that may suggest otherwise.

The signs of A class that should be developed in eCoRSS with reserved symbols for left-hand traffic are listed under point 16.C.

**The Group of Experts may wish to confirm on the approach to reversing of symbols.**

## **4.A. Question**

Q.A.3. Regarding sign A, 4 b, the option presenting the carriage way narrowing at the right side was not depicted in the Convention. The secretariat added this option. Do you endorse it? Do you believe that this sign should be referred as A, 4 b or rather as A, 4 c in the Convention (please note that the new system code assigns different number codes to these signs)?

#### **4.B. Responses**

YES – Belgium (as A, 4 c), Chile, Denmark (A, 4 c), Estonia, Finland (as A, 4 c), France, Lithuania, Kuwait, Slovakia (as A, 4 c), Sweden (as A, 4 c)

#### **4.C. Commentary**

No commentary

#### **5.A. Question**

Q.A.4. Regarding signs A, 26 a and A, 27, should these signs be reversible (for placement on the left side of the carriageway) in the Convention similar to other A signs, in which case the text of the Convention should be amended?

#### **5.B. Responses**

1. YES - Chile
2. NO – Belgium, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France (not necessarily), Lithuania (there is no point in doing so), Kuwait, Slovakia, Sweden (reversed only for left hand traffic)

#### **5.C. Commentary**

Reference to commentary 3.C.

#### **6.A. Question**

Q.A.5. Do you believe sign A, 8 and A, 11 should be reversible to show the side of the carriageway from where the danger comes from? Should the text of the Convention be better clarified in this regard?

#### **6.B. Responses**

1. YES – Belgium, Chile, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Kuwait, Slovakia, Sweden (for A, 11, no real need for A, 8)
2. NO – France (not necessarily)
3. No opinion – Lithuania

#### **6.C. Commentary**

It appears that expert support to introduce a provision in the Convention that the symbol on these signs may be reversed to show the side of the carriageway from where the danger comes from. The reversing is independent from the placement of the sign on the carriageway.

## 7.A. Question

Q.A.6. Regarding signs A, 12 and A, 13, at the request of the Group of Experts , the symbols on these signs have been modernized. Do you endorse the new symbol design?

## 7.B. Responses

1. YES – Chile, Estonia, Kuwait
2. NO – Belgium (improve the symbols), Denmark and Finland (improve the symbols), Slovakia (improve the symbols), Sweden (make the symbol more abstract, would prefer to have A, 12 a and b deleted)
3. No opinion – France, Lithuania (have not seen the images)
4. Examples from countries:
  - Belgium for A, 12 and A, 13



- Finland:



- Slovakia for A, 13:



- Sweden for A, 13:



- Sweden for walking people



## 7.C. Commentary

The secretariat will further improve the image for these signs taking into account the suggestions and examples from experts.

**The Group of Experts should decide if a danger warning sign for walking people (as suggested by Sweden) be introduced in addition to the Convention.**

### **8.A. Question**

Q.A.7. Regarding sign A, 12 (new name code A-12.3), this sign was developed and added at the advice of the Group of Experts. Do you maintain this advice (which requires an amendment to the Convention)? Do you endorse this new design?

### **8.B. Responses**

1. YES – Belgium (improve symbol), Chile, Denmark, Finland (improve symbol, decrease number of stripes to 4-5), Estonia, Lithuania, Kuwait, Slovakia (improve symbol and keep the same design approach), Sweden (improve symbol)
2. No opinion – France,

### **8.C. Commentary**

The secretariat will further improve the image for this sign taking into account the suggestions from experts.

### **9.A. Question**

Q.A.8. Regarding sign A, 14, as per the Group of Experts' recommendations, the symbol was altered/simplified to show only the bicycle. Do you endorse the new design?

### **9.B. Responses**

1. YES – Chile, Denmark, Estonia, Finland (further improve the symbol), France, Slovakia
2. NO – Belgium (keep the cyclist), Lithuania (the road sign is more understandable with a cyclist on a bicycle), Kuwait (with a cyclist having a helmet on), Sweden (keep the cyclist)
3. Examples from countries:
  - Finland:



### **9.C. Commentary**

**The Group of Experts should decide if the symbol should include a cyclist.**

Accordingly, the secretariat will further improve the image for this sign.

## 10.A. Question

Q.A.9. Regarding signs A, 15 a and A, 15 b, additional symbols for other most commonly encountered domestic or wild animals have been developed. Do you endorse these additional symbols? Do you see a need for other symbols to be also added?

## 10.B. Responses

1. YES – Chile (more symbols), Estonia (use elk symbol from Estonia), France, Kuwait (eCoRSS should allow countries using their own animals), Slovakia (no reversibility needed for this sign), Sweden (use other animals too)
2. NO – Belgium (symbol should be more abstract), Denmark, Finland (these signs should have two categories: A,15a for domestic animals and A,15b for wild animals; there is a big difference of danger in these; the e-CoRSS symbols have too many unnecessary details; in Finland, we only warn of wild animals.)
4. No comment – Lithuania (have not seen the images)
5. Countries suggestions for improvements:

- Belgium:



- Chile:



- Estonia:



- Slovakia:



## 10.C. Commentary

The secretariat will further improve the images for these signs taking into account the examples provided from countries. The additional symbols will be added to eCoRSS.

### 11.A. Question

Q.A.10. Regarding sign A, 16, do you maintain your advice as the Group of Experts that this sign should be reversible (for placement at the left side of the carriageway)? The symbol has also been modernized at the request of the Group of Experts. Do you agree with the new symbol design?

### 11.B. Responses

1. YES- Belgium (no need for helmet), Chile, Denmark, Kuwait, Sweden (but no need for the helmet – this is too detailed)
2. NO – Estonia, Finland (this sign should not be reversible) Slovakia (symbol should be improved, sign can be reversed)
3. No opinion – France, Lithuania
4. Countries suggestions for improvements:

Belgium:



- Finland:



- Slovakia:



- Sweden:



### 11.C. Commentary

The secretariat will further improve the image for this sign taking into account the examples provided from countries. For reversibility refer to 3.C.

## **12.A. Question**

Q.A.11. Regarding sign A, 18 d, following the recommendation by the Group of Experts that all possible options depicting different nature of intersections should be made available in the Convention, the secretariat developed two more options for this sign available in eCoRSS as A, 18d (A-18.6 and A-18.7 as per new number code). Which number code(s) should these new signs have in the Convention?

## **12.B. Responses**

1. YES – Chile, Estonia (as A, 18 E and A, 18 F, and there is no need for further options), Kuwait (each sign should have its own code, so the Experts Group should decide on the code to be used, no other options should be added), Slovakia
2. NO – Belgium (it does not seem necessary to have all these options in the Convention, the fact that in point 18, b) of the convention is mentioned that the symbol may be altered in relation to the nature of the crossing seems sufficient. In eCoRSS they can all be mentioned as variant of A18d as proposed), Denmark, France (not necessarily), Finland and Sweden (why not to use only A, 18 a or b not matter what the layout of the intersection is)
3. No comment – Lithuania (but no more options)

## **12.C. Commentary**

It appears sensible to follow the suggestion from Belgium, Finland and Sweden and include only sign A, 18 a and A, 18 b in the Convention. This should be followed with a provision that the general symbol can be replaced by symbols showing the nature of the intersection, however without referring to specific examples. On the other hand, eCoRSS will or may show additional examples.

**The Group of Experts may wish to reflect on this issue.**

## **13.A. Question**

Q.A.12. Regarding signs, A, 19 c, similar to sign A, 18d, following the same recommendation, the secretariat developed two more options for this sign available in eCoRSS as A, 19c (A-19.4 and A-19.5 as per new number code). The secretariat also developed two more options available in eCoRSS as A, 19c (A-19.8 and A-19.9 as per new number code). Do you maintain your recommendation to have these signs added to the Convention? Which number code(s) should these new signs have in the Convention?

## **13.B. Responses**

1. YES – Estonia (as A, 19 c), Kuwait (each sign should have its own code, so the Experts Group should decide on the code to be used, no other options should be added), Slovakia
2. NO – Belgium (not necessary to have all possible variants in the Convention), Denmark and Finland (same as for question Q.A.12), France (not necessarily)
3. No comment – Lithuania (but no more options), Sweden

### **13.C. Commentary**

Same as comment 12.C.

### **14.A. Question**

Q.A.13. Regarding signs A, 22 and A, 23, following a recommendation by the Group of Experts, the symbols have been altered by increasing the size of arrowheads. Do you endorse the new design?

### **14.B. Responses**

1. YES – Belgium, Chile, Denmark, Estonia, Lithuania, Kuwait
2. NO – Slovakia (further improve the symbols), Finland and Sweden (further increase the size of the arrowheads)
3. No opinion – France
4. Examples from countries:

Finland for A, 22 and A, 23:



- Slovakia for A, 22 and A, 23:



- Sweden for A, 22:



### **14.C. Commentary**

The secretariat will further improve the image for these signs taking into account the examples provided from countries.

### **15.A. Question**

Q.A.14. Regarding signs A, 29 a, A, 29 b and A, 29 c, they have been reproduced as per the Group of Experts' recommendation to have stripes placed in the upper part of the panel or centered. Do you maintain this recommendation?

## 15.B. Responses

1. YES – Belgium, Chile, Denmark, Estonia, France, Lithuania (but the centered option seems to be better, because there is no need to put the stripes in the upper part of the panel), Kuwait (strongly recommend the stripes should be placed only in the upper part of the panel), Sweden
2. NO – Finland (the A,29 a with three stripes should always be centered and only the versions with one or two stripes should have the two options, these signs should be reversed if additional signs are used on the left side of the road), Slovakia (do not see a need for two options – countries should choose whether centered or upper part depending on road environment situation)

## 15.C. Commentary

There appears to be a difference of opinions. **The Group of Experts may reflect on this issue again.** Choosing one variant appears to be more sensible.

## 16.A. Question

Q.A.15. Where appropriate, signs have been developed with symbols reversed for left-hand traffic in eCoRSS. Do you see any sign in this class missing or any sign whose symbol should not be reversed?

## 16.B. Responses

1. YES – Belgium (A, 3, A, 5 and A, 6 to be reversed), France (perhaps), Kuwait (A, 5 and A, 6), Sweden (A, 3, A, 5 and A, 6 to be reversed), Finland (For most A-signs there is no need to reverse the sign - the danger can come from both directions and in these cases the sign should definitely not be reversed on the left side of the road. Some signs as the A,2 and the A,3 signs must be reversed if used in a country with left hand traffic, but shall not be reversed in any other case. Only a few A-signs should be reversed if placed on the left side of the road. Maybe the A,29 signs are the only ones where this is really needed. Someone probably thinks that there is a need for reversing the A,12, A,13 and A,14 signs but we think that they should not be reversed. A pedestrian always may enter the road from both directions. However, we do reverse the E,12a sign so that the pedestrian is always walking towards the road. There are only a few signs where the danger may be specified on a certain side of the road. A,8 and A,11 are examples where the danger may only be on the other side of the road and therefore there might be a need to reverse the sign if appropriate. Signs like A,19 should always show the actual situation and shall never be reversed on the left side of the road)
2. NO – Chile, Denmark (follow the Convention), Estonia, Lithuania, Slovakia

## 16.C. Commentary

As per comment 3.C. reversibility of symbols is to be applied only to side of traffic (exception signs A, 8 and A, 11 as per 6.C.). It is proposed that only signs as listed below will be provided in eCoRSS with symbols reversed for left-hand traffic in A class: A, 10, A, 12, A, 13, A, 14, A, 15, A, 22, A, 23, A, 24, A, 26 a, A, 27.

### 17.A. Question

Q.A.16. Do you have any other comments to A signs?

### 17.B. Responses

1. YES – Estonia (sign A, 18b should be deleted. concerning sign A, 9 and A, 16 we recommend using the Estonian design for easier readability)
2. NO – Belgium, Chile, Denmark, Finland, France, Lithuania, Kuwait, Slovakia, Sweden
3. Countries suggestions for improvements:
  - Estonia



### 17.C. Commentary

The secretariat will further improve the images for these signs taking into account the examples provided from countries.

### 18.A. Question

Q.A.17. Regarding the definition/description for signs, such as A, 2 a through A, 3 d, certain text of the sign description is redundant when there are images of complete signs rather than just symbols provided (redundant text: *the left-hand part of the symbol A, 2 a shall occupy the left-hand corner of the sign panel and its base shall extend over the whole width of the panel*). The secretariat believes that such text should be deleted from the Convention by means of an appropriate amendment. Do you agree?

### 18.B. Responses

1. YES – Belgium, Chile, Estonia, France (perhaps), Lithuania, Kuwait, Slovakia, Sweden
2. NO – Denmark (keep as it is), Finland (clarified but not removed)

### 18.C. Commentary

The secretariat will clarify this provision.

### 19.A. Question

Q.A.18. The description for signs A, 12 refers to signs E, 12. Do you believe that with the changes proposed to signs E, 12, there should be a provision under A, 12 signs that there should be a consistent use of the model of the symbols on signs A, 12 and E, 12?

## 19.B. Responses

1. YES – Belgium, Chile, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Lithuania, Kuwait, Slovakia, Sweden
2. No opinion – France

## 19.C. Commentary

A consistent use of symbol, unless otherwise specified for a particular symbol, will be applied throughout the sign classes.

## 20.A. Question

Q.A.19. Do you believe the description to be placed on the detailed sign page should be copied 1:1 from the Convention or adjusted as necessary for a better read? Should it contain references to sign name code or rather refer to the names of signs (what if you recommended the name codes to be changed?). E,g, should the description say:

### Option with text copied 1:1

1. The "A" DANGER WARNING signs shall be of model Aa or model Ab both described here and reproduced in Annex 3, except signs A, 28 and A, 29 described in paragraphs 28 and 29 below respectively. Model Aa is an equilateral triangle having one side horizontal and the opposite vertex above it; the ground is white or yellow and the border red. Model Ab is a square with one diagonal vertical; the ground is yellow and the border, which is only a rim, is black. Unless the description specifies otherwise, the symbols displayed on these signs shall be black or dark blue.
2. The size of the normal sized sign of model Aa shall measure approximately 0.90 m; that of the small sized sign of model Aa shall measure not less than 0.60 m. The size of the normal sized sign of model Ab shall measure approximately 0.60 m; that of the small sign of model Ab shall measure not less than 0.40 m.

Vs

### Option with adjusted text

DANGER WARNING signs, except signs to be placed in the immediate vicinity of level-crossings and additional signs at approached to level-crossings or swing bridges, shall be of two models. Model one (Aa) is an equilateral triangle having one side horizontal and the opposite vertex above it; the ground is white or yellow and the border red. Model two (Ab) is a square with one diagonal vertical; the ground is yellow and the border, which is only a rim, is black. Unless the description specifies otherwise, the symbols displayed on these signs shall be black or dark blue. The size of the normal sized sign of model one (triangle) shall measure approximately 0.90 m; that of the small sized sign of model one shall measure not less than 0.60 m. The size of the normal sized sign of model two (square with one diagonal vertical) shall measure approximately 0.60 m; that of the small sign of model two shall measure not less than 0.40 m.

Or alternatively, the definitions and descriptions contained in Annex should be revised (appropriate amendments to be proposed) to make them consistent in terms of information they provide for each A sign and possibly consistent with the way definitions/descriptions are written in other signs classes/sub-classes?

## **20.B. Responses**

YES – Belgium (to the alternative), Chile, Denmark, Estonia (to the alternative), Finland (always refer to name-code), France (to the alternative), Lithuania (to simplification), Kuwait (should be adjusted), Slovakia (to the alternative), Sweden (to the alternative)

## **20.C. Commentary**

The secretariat is willing to make a proposal for a revision of the sign definitions and descriptions for A section (A class). When elaborating such a proposal, the secretariat will take into account the Group's agreed views with regard to other relevant points in A signs, among others, such as limitation of colour options, reversibility of symbols, or general point such as the change to a new sign name coding. This new proposal will also include proposal of changes already agreed upon.

## **B section – Priority signs**

### **21.A. Question**

Q.B.1. Regarding sign B, 2 b, the Group of Experts is still expected to make a recommendation whether or not to keep this sign in the Convention. To this end, do you agree to keep it or you would like that this particular sign is deleted from the Convention and a relevant amendment proposal is done to that end?

## **21.B. Responses**

1. Delete it – Belgium, Chile, Denmark (unless somebody uses it), Estonia, Finland, Lithuania, Kuwait, Slovakia, Sweden
2. No opinion – France

## **21.C. Commentary**

The responses confirm the initial agreement to delete sign B, 2 b from the Convention.

### **22.A. Question**

Q.B.2. Regarding sign B, 3 and B, 4, shall these signs have either yellow or orange grounds of the center square or just yellow?

## **22.B. Responses**

1. Only yellow – Estonia, France, Lithuania, Kuwait (in line with the idea to remove from the Convention sign colour variants not widely used), Slovakia
2. Two colours – Belgium and Sweden (one version in the Convention, two in eCoRSS), Denmark, Finland (eCoRSS seems to have only the yellow variants of the signs B,3 and B,4. The colour seems to be the same than e.g. in the sign B,1 with yellow background. Orange, like e.g. in the C,3h and D,10 signs is not needed in B,3 and B,4 signs. - It is very important to be precise with the names of the colours. There are materials

that are called lime-yellow and orange-yellow but the latter is not the same as orange. A "warm yellow" is not orange.)

3. No comment - Chile

## **22.C. Commentary**

**The Group of Experts may wish to reflect if only the yellow option can be agreed upon.**

## **23.A. Question**

Q.B.3. Regarding sign B, 6, following the Group of Experts' recommendation, this sign of the Convention was changed by adding a white rim around the red arrow to separate the red colour of the arrow from the blue colour of the ground. Do you endorse this new sign design?

## **23.B. Responses**

1. YES – Belgium, Chile, Estonia, Lithuania, Kuwait, Slovakia (but increase the size of arrowhead), Sweden,
2. NO – Denmark, Finland (the white rim is a good improvement but the arrow heads of these signs are still poor), France
3. Suggestions from countries:  
- Finland:



## **23.C. Commentary**

The secretariat will further improve the image for this sign taking into account the comments and examples provided from countries.

## **24.A. Question**

Q.B.4. Where appropriate, signs have been developed with symbols reversed for left-hand traffic in eCoRSS. Do you see any sign in this sub-class missing or any sign whose symbol should not be reversed?

## **24.B. Responses**

1. NO – Belgium, Chile, Denmark (follow the Convention), Estonia, Finland, Lithuania, Kuwait, Slovakia (refer to note on reversibility in Annex 1), Sweden,
2. No opinion – France

## 24.C. Commentary

It is proposed that only signs as listed below will be provided in eCoRSS with symbols reversed for left-hand traffic in B class: B, 5 and B, 6.

## 25.A. Question

Q.B.5. Do you have any other comments to B signs?

## 25.B. Responses

1. YES – Chile (signs B, 3 and B, 4 are confusing), Finland (in some languages the STOP-text might be e.g. STOPP with two Ps. That is probably the only need for editing in this sign group. But again: E-CoRSS is not to be developed as a sign drawing tool. It should be the best way to read the Convention and to find the definitions, possibilities and the restrictions of the signs), Lithuania (change design of B, 5 and B, 6), Kuwait (stop sign should be uploaded to eCoRSS with stop inscriptions in other languages)
2. NO – Belgium, Denmark, Estonia, France, Slovakia, Sweden
3. Suggestions from countries:
  - Lithuania



## 25.C. Commentary

The suggestion from Lithuania should be covered under the question Q.B.3. The Convention allows to use the 'STOP' inscription in local language. ECoRSS can provide other language versions in use.

## 26.A. Question

Q.B.6. Do you believe that the definitions and descriptions contained in Annex should be revised (appropriate amendments to be proposed) to make them consistent in terms of information they provide for each B sign and possibly consistent with the way definitions/descriptions are written in other sign classes/sub-classes? Do you believe the text defining the sign and describing it in terms of colours and shape should be separated?

## 26.B. Responses

YES – Belgium (the definition could be shortened, as the signs are reproduced in the annex it is not necessary to state in the definition that it is a triangle pointing to the ground; the only thing we should say is that it may also be yellow, all the rest is redundant), Chile, Denmark, Estonia, Finland (some signs have more options of the colors than others. E.g. the sign B,2a is always red and that shall be said in the main definition of the sign. But where color options are possible, the sub-sign definition should include the color definitions), France (perhaps), Lithuania, Kuwait, Slovakia, Sweden

## **26.C. Commentary**

The secretariat is willing to make a proposal to further revise (revision proposal partly done in ECE/TRANS/WP.1/GE.2/2018/3) the sign definitions and descriptions for B section (B sub-class). When elaborating such a proposal, the secretariat will take into account the Group's agreed views with regard to other relevant points in this section, among others, such as deletion of signs, or on general points such as the change to a new sign name coding.

### **C section – Prohibitory/restrictive signs**

## **27.A. Question**

Q.C.1. Regarding sign C, 3 b, the symbol has been changed to remove the rider from the symbol (so as to be consistent with the approach for the symbol depicting bicycle A, 14). Do you endorse the new symbol design?

## **27.B. Responses**

1. YES – Belgium, Chile, Estonia, Slovakia (General principle should be that vehicles are depicted in a more abstract way showing their basic characteristics and thus would be time- and future-design proof),
2. NO – Denmark, Kuwait (with rider and rider with helmet), Finland and Sweden (with the rider)
3. No opinion – France, Lithuania

## **27.C. Commentary**

**The Group of Experts should decide if the symbol should include a motorcyclist.**

Accordingly, the secretariat will further improve the image for this sign.

## **28.A. Question**

Q.C.2. Regarding signs C, 3 e, C, 3 f and C, 3 g, they have been developed with the optional inscription of tonnage over the symbol. The signs are editable, ie. inscription can be either changed or deleted.

## **28.B. Responses**

1. Agree – Belgium, Chile, Estonia (there should be an option to add tonnage), Lithuania, Kuwait, Slovakia (space should be put between figure and “t”), Sweden
2. Disagree – Denmark, Finland (the legibility of the inscriptions is not good when placed on the vehicle symbol.)
3. No opinion – France

### **28.C. Commentary**

The secretariat will further improve the image for these signs taking into account the comments provided.

### **29.A. Question**

Q.C.3. Regarding sign, C, 3 f, its symbol has been altered to depict trailer other than a semi-trailer or a single axle trailer. Do you endorse the new design?

### **29.B. Responses**

1. YES – Belgium, Chile, Estonia, Kuwait, Slovakia, Sweden
2. NO – Denmark
3. No opinion – Finland, France (not used in France), Lithuania

### **29.C. Commentary**

No commentary.

### **30.A. Question**

Q.C.4. Regarding signs, C, 3 i and C, 3 k, their symbols have been changed to bring them in line with the symbol design of sign A, 12. Do you agree?

### **30.B. Responses**

1. YES – Belgium (symbols to be more abstract), Chile, Denmark, Estonia, Finland (further improve the symbols), France , Lithuania, Kuwait, Slovakia, Sweden (though symbols should be more abstract)
2. Examples from countries:
  - Belgium:



### **30.C. Commentary**

The secretariat will further improve the images for these signs taking into account the comments and examples provided from countries.

### **31.A. Question**

Q.C.5. Regarding sign, C, 3 1, its symbol has been altered by removing the tractor operator from the symbol. Do you endorse the new design?

### **31.B. Responses**

1. YES – Belgium (symbol to be more abstract), Chile, Denmark, Estonia, Finland (improve the symbol), France, Lithuania, Kuwait, Slovakia (but the symbol to be more abstract), Sweden (though the symbol should be more abstract)

2. Countries suggestions for improvements:

- Belgium:



- Estonia:



- Slovakia:



### **31.C. Commentary**

The secretariat will further improve the image for this sign taking into account the examples and comments provided from countries.

### **32.A. Question**

Q.C.6. Regarding signs C, 5, C, 6, C, 7 and C, 8, two options have been developed for each of these signs, option one is with whole number and option two is with decimal number. Do you agree? Do you further believe that the text of the Convention should clarify the depiction of the digit number, including use of comma or dot?

### **32.B. Responses**

1. YES – Belgium (it would be better if “m” is put above the digits), Chile, Estonia (there should be 2 option, the Convention should clarify the depiction and including the use of comma or dot), Lithuania (like Estonia), Kuwait, Sweden (in C, 5 m could also go under the digit)

2. NO – Denmark, Finland (the design of these signs should be so that the inscription can be made as big as possible to improve the legibility; the decimal number is always needed in the signs C,5 and C,6 but usually not needed in the signs C,7 and C,8; there is no need for a different code with or without the decimal number), France (not necessarily), Slovakia (not necessarily)

3. Examples from countries:

- Belgium:



- Finland:



### **32.C. Commentary**

The secretariat will further improve the images for these signs taking into account the comments and examples provided from countries.

### **33.A. Question**

Q.C.7. Regarding signs C, 7, C, 8 and C, 9, symbols adjustments have been made as per the Group of Experts' recommendations. Do you endorse the new symbols?

### **33.B. Responses**

1. YES – Belgium, Chile, Denmark, Estonia (but the character spacing should be more expanded for easier readability), Finland (the figure should be increased), France, Kuwait, Slovakia (put space between the figure and “t”), Sweden

2. Lithuania (have not seen the images)

### **33.C. Commentary**

The secretariat will further improve the images for these signs taking into account the comments from countries.

### **34.A. Question**

Q.C.8. Regarding signs C, 18, C, 19, C, 20 a and C, 20 b, following the Group of Experts' recommendation, these signs have been changed by adding a white rim to separate red and blue colours on these signs. Do you endorse this new sign design?

### **34.B. Responses**

1. YES – Belgium, Chile, Estonia, Finland (the rim/narrow strip could also be of other light colour), France (C, 20 not used in France), Lithuania, Kuwait, Slovakia, Sweden
2. NO – Denmark

### **34.C. Commentary**

**The Group of Experts shall reflect on the approach to adding a rim (or rather a narrow strip) when discussing the Informal document No.3 (February 2018).**

### **35.A. Question**

Q.C.9. Regarding signs C, 20 a and C, 20 b, these signs are available only with white symbol or inscription. Should however the Convention allow these symbol and inscription to be also yellow?

### **35.B. Responses**

1. YES – Chile
2. NO – Belgium (unless Q.D.1 allows yellow), Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Kuwait, Slovakia, Sweden (unless Q.D.1 allows yellow)
3. No opinion – France (signs not used in France), Lithuania

### **35.C. Commentary**

It appears that only white colour should be permitted for this symbol. This should be taken into account in the review of descriptions and definitions of C section (C sub-class).

### **36.A. Question**

Q.C.10. Where appropriate, signs have been developed with symbols reversed for left-hand traffic. Do you see any sign in this sub-class missing or any sign whose symbol should not be reversed?

### **36.B. Responses**

1. YES – Belgium and Sweden (perhaps C, 15)
2. NO – Estonia, Chile, Denmark (follow the Convention), Finland, Lithuania, Kuwait, Slovakia (refer to the note on reversibility in Annex 1)
3. No opinion – France

### **36.C. Commentary**

It is proposed that only signs as listed below will be provided in eCoRSS with symbols reversed for left-hand traffic in C sub-class: C, 13 aa, C, 13 ba and C, 13 bb.

### 37.A. Question

Q.C.11. Do you have any other comments to C signs?

### 37.B. Responses

1. YES – Finland (nationally they will improve the arrow heads in the signs C,11 and C,12), Kuwait (C, 18, the design with P should be with a red oblique bar), Slovakia (Signs C,3 – C, 9 are derived from C, 2 and therefore their names should be changed to reflect this fact - e. g. “close to ---”; C, 11 and C, 12 should have the same shape and size of arrows as D signs)
2. NO – Belgium, Chile, Denmark, Estonia, France, Lithuania, Sweden
3. Suggestions from countries:
  - Finland:



### 37.C. Commentary

The secretariat would like to note that initially there was no agreement to make any changes to the symbols used on C, 11 and C, 12 signs. **This can however be revisited.** The C, 18 design with the P symbol will be corrected.

**The Group of Experts may further decide if names of C, 3 to C, 9 signs should be adjusted as per the comment from Slovakia.**

### 38.A. Question

Q.C.12. Do you believe that the definitions and descriptions contained in Annex should be revised (appropriate amendments to be proposed) to make them consistent in terms of information they provide for each C sign and possibly consistent with the way definitions/descriptions are written in other sign classes/sub-classes?

### 38.B. Responses

YES – Belgium, Chile, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Lithuania, Kuwait, Slovakia, Sweden

### 38.C. Commentary

The secretariat is willing to make a proposal for revision of the sign definitions and descriptions for C section (C sub-class). When elaborating such a proposal, the secretariat will take into account the Group's agreed views with regard to other relevant points in this section, among others, such as deletion of signs, or on general points such as the change to

a new sign name coding. This proposal will also include proposal of changes already agreed upon.

## **D section – Mandatory signs**

### **39.A. Question**

Q.D.1. The secretariat developed all variants for the mandatory signs, ie. apart from (i) blue ground and white symbol, also (ii) blue ground and other light color (yellow) symbol, and (iii) white ground with red rim and black symbol. Do you believe that options (ii) and (iii) should be available for the mandatory signs, or that both or any of them (which one?) should be deleted from the Convention, for which the Group of Experts should propose relevant amendment?

### **39.B. Responses**

1. Keep only option i – Belgium (white rime should be added), Estonia, Finland, Kuwait, Slovakia, Sweden (white rim should be added)
2. Delete option iii – Lithuania (no opinion on option ii)
3. Delete option ii – Chile
4. Keep the other options – Denmark (follow the Convention), France (perhaps)

### **39.C. Commentary**

It appears that only one variant (blue ground and white symbol and inscription) should be permitted by the Convention.

### **40.A. Question**

Q.D.2. Regarding sign D, 1 a, at the advice of the Group of Experts, the secretariat developed all possible options for this sign (please note that each of these signs should have its specific number code)? Do you believe any of the options is inappropriate or any other is missing?

### **40.B. Responses**

1. YES – Chile (confused with different colour variants but the same meaning), Finland (It is impossible to create all the possible variants that some country might need), Kuwait (strongly believe D, 1a (D-01.3 & D-01.7) signs should be deleted from convention. A direction symbols should not be in a Mandatory shape signs. These symbols should be put in a rectangle shape panels. Some people may see the two new signs created in e-CorSS (D-01.8 & D-02.3) as directions signs as in (D-01.3 & D-01.7), but we do not agree on this, as the new signs actually order the drivers to avoid a collision with oncoming barrier and they must choose to take the right side of the road or to the left. May we also suggest that sign D-02.3 be used where choosing either side of the road will lead to the same direction as it is in UK standards. And D-01.8 to be used when taking one side of the road, will not lead the driver to the direction of the other side.)

2. NO – Belgium (arrows should be more straight), Denmark, Estonia (it is fine after the change), Slovakia
3. No opinion – France, Lithuania (have not seen the images), Sweden

#### **40.C. Commentary**

There appears to be a difference of opinions. **The Group of Experts may wish to reflect on this issue again.**

#### **41.A. Question**

Q.D.3. Regarding sign D, 2, the secretariat has developed this sign with the arrow pointing to left and right and left (all possible options for this sign). Do you agree?

#### **41.B. Responses**

1. YES – Chile, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France , Lithuania, Kuwait, Slovakia, Sweden
2. NO – Belgium (not needed)

#### **41.C. Commentary**

No commentary.

#### **42.A. Question**

Q.D.4. Regarding sign D, 3 the secretariat has changed the design of the symbol by increasing the arrowheads. Do you endorse this new design?

#### **42.B. Responses**

1. YES – Chile, Denmark, Estonia, Lithuania, Kuwait
2. NO – Belgium, Finland, Slovakia and Sweden (all suggest improvements),
3. No opinion – France
4. Suggestions from countries:
  - Belgium:



- Finland:



- Slovakia



- Sweden



## 42.C. Commentary

The secretariat will further improve the image for this sign taking into account the examples provided from countries.

## 43.A. Question

Q.D.5. Regarding sign D, 5, the secretariat has changed the symbol, as per a recommendation of the Group of Experts. Do you endorse the new design?

## 43.B. Responses

1. YES – Chile, Estonia, Kuwait, Slovakia
  2. NO – Belgium and Sweden (preference for a more abstract symbol), Belgium (This sign should not refer to a foot path, but to a road reserved for pedestrians. A footpath always has to be followed, without it having to be signposted (=rule). Art. 20.2. convention on road traffic, If, at the side of the carriageway, there are pavements (sidewalks) or suitable verges for pedestrians, pedestrians shall use them. Nevertheless, if they take the necessary precautions: (a) Pedestrians pushing or carrying bulky objects may use the carriageway if they would seriously inconvenience other pedestrians by walking on the pavement (sidewalk) or verge; (b) Groups of pedestrians led by a person in charge or forming a procession may walk on the carriageway), Denmark, Finland (this sign should have a symbol depicting an adult and a child)
  3. No opinion – France, Lithuania (have not seen the image)
  4. Examples from countries:
- Belgium for two options of the symbol on D, 5:



- Finland:



### 43.C. Commentary

The secretariat would like to note that in fact there were two contradictory recommendations, one that the symbol should not be of one person, and another to follow the symbol for pedestrian, which is now one person. **The Group of experts may therefore revisit its earlier recommendations and also reflect on the comment provided by Belgium.** The secretariat will improve the sign accordingly.

### 44.A. Question

Q.D.6. Regarding signs D, 4, D, 5, D, 6, D, 9, D, 11 a and D, 11b the secretariat has introduced signs to inform of an end of a compulsory track/use as introduced with the original sign. These 'end of' signs are not referred in the Convention at the moment. Do you agree that these signs are introduced in the Convention by means of an appropriate amendment?

### 44.B. Responses

1. YES – Chile, Estonia, Finland, Lithuania, Slovakia, Belgium and Sweden (and make the symbols more abstract)

2. NO – Denmark

3. No opinion – France

4. No answer – Kuwait

5. Suggestions from countries:

- Belgium:



- Sweden:



#### **44.C. Commentary**

It appears that there is support to introduce these signs into the Convention with an amendment. The secretariat will further improve the image for these signs taking into account the comments and the examples provided from countries.

#### **45.A. Question**

Q.D.7. Regarding sign D, 10, there is only one example sign developed. The colours of ground and shape of this sign should possibly be clarified in the Contention by the means of an appropriate amendment (see as example the provision available for zonal validity signs) as this sign is not falling under the usual D sign shape and colour category. Do you agree?

#### **45.B. Responses**

1. YES – Belgium, Chile, Estonia, Finland (it would be enough if the text clarifies the possible options for this sign. It should be recommended to use only such versions of the D,1a that shows one regulatory direction.), Lithuania, Slovakia, Sweden
2. No opinion – France
3. No answer – Denmark, Kuwait

#### **45.C. Commentary**

It appears that there is support to clarify the text of the Convention with an appropriate amendment. It then appears sensible - following the comment from Finland - that only signs of D, 1 a group showing one direction should be permitted on D, 10 sign.

#### **46.A. Question**

Q.D.8. Where appropriate, signs have been developed with symbols reversed for left-hand traffic. Do you see any sign in this sub-class missing or any sign whose symbol should not be reversed?

#### **46.B. Responses**

1. NO – Belgium, Chile, Denmark (follow the Convention), Estonia, Finland, Lithuania, Kuwait, Slovakia (refer to note on reversibility in Annex 1), Sweden
2. No opinion – France

#### **46.C. Commentary**

It is proposed that only signs as listed below will be provided in eCoRSS with symbols reversed for left-hand traffic in D sub-class: D, 3.

#### **47.A. Question**

Q.D.9. Do you have any other comments to D signs?

#### **47.B. Responses**

1. YES – Belgium and Sweden (all new D, 1 a signs should be allowed for inclusion in D, 10), Chile (find confusing that signs such as D 11a indicating segregated users can be used only in the case of paths but not in a street where there is a need to segregate users), Finland (improve symbols),
2. NO – Denmark, Estonia, France, Lithuania, Kuwait, Slovakia

#### **47.C. Commentary**

The secretariat will further improve the images for D signs taking into account the examples and comments provided from countries. Other comments are addressed under other points.

#### **48.A. Question**

Q.D.10. Do you believe that the definitions and descriptions contained in Annex should be revised (appropriate amendments to be proposed) to make them consistent in terms of information they provide for each D sign and possibly consistent with the way definitions/descriptions are written in other sign classes/sub-classes?

#### **48.B. Responses**

1. YES – Belgium, Chile, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Lithuania, Kuwait, Slovakia, Sweden
2. No opinion – France

#### **48.C. Commentary**

The secretariat is willing to make a proposal for a revision of the sign definitions and descriptions for D section (D sub-class). When elaborating such a proposal, the secretariat will take into account the Group's agreed views with regard to other relevant points in this section, among others, clarification of certain provisions, introduction of additional signs, or on general points such as the change to a new sign name coding. This new proposal will also include proposal of changes already agreed upon.

### **E section – Special regulation signs**

#### **49.A. Question**

Q.E.1. Regarding signs E, 1 a, b and c, the secretariat has altered them, to include as examples, signs with two, three and four arrows (standing for lanes). Do you agree with this change that will require an amendment in the Convention? Do you believe that for these signs, when the sign panels have yellow symbols/arrows (other light colour but not white),

the ground of superimposed signs from the class A or sub-class C should be also yellow or they can have a white ground on the example signs? Do you then believe that these signs can be used with different ground colour depending on the classification of road on which they are used?

#### **49.B. Responses**

1. YES – Belgium (no change to the Convention, then the colour of signs used, and one ground colour), Chile (both colours, and should be possible), Denmark, Estonia (then white and no), Finland (other colour used for better legibility, changing of ground colour should be allowed depending on class of road), Lithuania (then preferably the same colour and no), Kuwait (simplify the number of colours, A, 1 b is not a good example), Slovakia (then the colour of signs used,), Sweden (no change to the Convention, then the colour of signs used, and different colour on motorway)
2. No opinion – France

#### **49.C. Commentary**

There appears to be a difference of opinions. **The Group of Experts may reflect on this issue again.**

#### **50.A. Question**

Q.E.2. Regarding signs E, 2 a and b, the blue signs containing the bus symbols as superimposed on E, 2 a and b signs are not included anywhere else in the Convention. Do you reckon they should be included respectively under D and E signs? What about the new E, 15 sign (bus stop) which after it was redesigned as per the advice of the Group of Experts looks like the sign placed on E, 2 b sign, just has a different meaning? In addition, what about the D type of sign with a bus depicted, how should it be defined? The secretariat wishes to indicate that signs such as D, 4, D, 5 and D, 6 are referred to in the Convention as signs applying to tracks or paths and not to lanes of a carriageway. If so, a sign with a bus depicted on a mandatory type of sign, as per the system of the Convention, would be defined as compulsory bus track, and not lane reserved for bus. To this end, the secretariat believes that signs such as E, 2 a and E, 2 b should have only symbol of a bus directly superimposed on the arrow. Do you agree with the secretariat's view?

#### **50.B. Responses**

1. YES – Belgium (for bus symbol only), Chile (for adding these signs to D and E class), Denmark (add also symbol for light rail), Estonia (for bus symbol only, the bus sign should not be produced separately), France, Kuwait, Sweden (bus symbol only, or other symbols depending on what is the vehicle the lane is reserved for)
2. NO – Finland (symbol should have a frame, however if the symbol is alone, the sign is easily misunderstood as being only informative, so in that way the old E,2a of the Convention is put up is more clear: it shows clearly that the bus lane is for buses only), Lithuania (no separate bus sign as D or E class of sign, has not seen the E, 2 a and b signs so no view on the use of the symbol only), Slovakia (A black pictogram on the white ground with a black rim is a better solution for sake of legibility)

## 50.C. Commentary

There appears to be a difference of opinions. **The Group of Experts may reflect on this issue again.**

## 51.A. Question

Q.E.3. Regarding sign E, 4, it was altered at the request of the Group of Experts by removing the road markings. Do you endorse the new design?

## 51.B. Responses

1. YES – Belgium (wider arrows), Chile, Denmark, Estonia, Finland (this sign is typically needed if the lanes do not continue the usual way - that is why the original example is a case where the left lane is the one to choose if one continue straight ahead), France, Lithuania (but usage of road marking should be optional), Kuwait (width of arrow should be bigger), Slovakia
2. NO – Sweden (preference for the existing sign)
3. Examples from countries:
  - Belgium:



## 51.C. Commentary

The secretariat will further improve the image for this sign taking into account the examples and comments provided from countries.

## 52.A. Question

Q.E.4. Regarding signs E, 3 a and b, the secretariat developed them only with blue ground. To keep this ground colour only, the secretariat believes that the permitted ground colour should be clarified for this sign in the Convention by means of an appropriate amendment. Do you agree?

## 52.B. Responses

1. YES – Belgium (larger arrowhead), Chile, Denmark, Estonia, Finland (should there be a yellow arrow or only a white one? these signs should always have the rectangular shape that is not a square; the E,3b signs in the e-CoRSS are probably too wide while the E,3a should be higher), Lithuania, Kuwait (arrowheads should be bigger), Slovakia (same as Kuwait)
2. No opinion – France

3. To reconsider – Sweden (suggestion below):  
One-way road



Additional panels



### 52.C. Commentary

**The Group of Experts, following the comments provided, should reflect on the shape and symbol colours for these signs. The secretariat will improve these sign images accordingly.**

### 53.A. Question

Q.E.5. Regarding signs E, 5 and E, 6, do you think the provisions of the warning of the beginning of the motorway and of the road for motor vehicles should be also introduced in the Convention, as it is now available in the European Agreement?

### 53.B. Responses

1. YES – Chile, Denmark, Estonia, France
2. NO – Slovakia (not necessarily), Belgium and Sweden (no need to do it, the same result can be achieved by using panel H, 1), Finland (the distance inscription is a possibility that is needed but it may also be placed in an additional panel; the "basic" picture of the sign should be the one without the inscription)
3. No opinion – Lithuania (not clear what the warning is about), Kuwait (same as Lithuania)

### 53.C. Commentary

There appears to be a difference of opinions. **The Group of Experts may wish to look into this issue also taking into account its discussion on additional panels and the Informal document No.2 (February 2018).**

### 54.A. Question

Q.E.6. Regarding signs E, 7 and E, 8, the secretariat has developed three options for these signs each containing four colour variants (as such the current E, 7 d and E, 8 d do not need to be referred to in the Convention anymore, since signs E, 7/8 a and E, 7/8 d are variants of the same sign). The text of the Convention would need to be amended to delete

reference to E, 7 d and E, 8 d or alternatively to refer to the new number coding. Do you agree?

#### **54.B. Responses**

1. YES – Belgium, Chile, Estonia, France, Kuwait, Slovakia, Sweden (though the red band should be thinner)
2. NO – Denmark, Finland (the thing to discuss should first be that there is a need for a place identification sign that is not the beginning of a built up area; and that sign should be defined in a way that is understood to be another sign; in Finland the place identification sign looks the same as the e-CoRSS sign E,7a with blue background; there is an error in the pictures of the E-07.2 and E-07.4: there is no need for a white rim between a red bar and a yellow background).
3. No comment – Lithuania (have not seen these images)

#### **54.C. Commentary**

**The Group of Experts may wish to look into this issue also taking into account its discussion on place identification signs and the Informal document No.1 (February 2018).**

The design errors will be corrected.

#### **55.A. Question**

Q.E.7. Regarding signs E, 9 and E, 10, there is only one example for each of these signs developed, each with variants for white and yellow ground in combination with (i) no inscription, (ii) inscription in black, and (ii) inscription in dark blue. Do you agree? Should these signs be now referred to as E, 9 and E, 10 only? Would you then like (see the report of the group of experts) that the possibility of using the zone validity sign without the “ZONE” inscription is removed from the Convention?

#### **55.B. Responses**

1. YES – Belgium (I recall that Sweden wanted to keep the possibility to use the sign without the word “Zone”; maybe as a compromise we could say that “the group recommends that the convention should state that the sign should preferably be used with the inscription of the word “zone”. In the convention only the sign with the word “zone” should be put (as is the case now), but in E-corss also the variant without this inscription should be foreseen), Chile (with zone inscription is clearer), Denmark (follow the Convention), Finland (the time zones may be shown in an additional panel, not only on the sign itself), Sweden (they use the sign without the “Zone” inscription, also other countries with several languages have a need to use this sign without the inscription. The sign is unique and there must be the possibility for the countries to use the sign without the inscription. For a foreign driver who doesn’t understand the language it is still the sign characteristic which help him understand the sign as a zone sign)
2. NO – Estonia (there should always be a zone inscription, an option without zone inscription should be removed from the Convention, and yes regarding reference to E, 9 and E, 10), France (used a lot in France), Lithuania (only with zone inscription in black),

Kuwait (inscription in dark blue should be deleted), Slovakia (without inscription should be deleted)

### **55.C. Commentary**

There appears to be a difference of opinions. **The Group of Experts may wish to look into this issue also taking into account the comment from Belgium.**

### **56.A. Question**

Q.E.8. Regarding signs E, 11 a and b, at the request of the Group of Experts, the symbol of a tunnel has been redesigned. Do you endorse the new design? Moreover, the secretariat developed them only with blue and green ground. To keep these ground colours only, the secretariat believes that the permitted ground colour should be clarified for this sign in the Convention by means of an appropriate amendment. Do you agree?

### **56.B. Responses**

1. YES – Chile
2. NO – Belgium (clarify colour), Denmark, Estonia (colours should be clarified), Finland (clarify colours), France, Kuwait (colours to be clarified), Slovakia (the symbol is too abstract, moreover, signing of a tunnel with a visible end seems not to be necessary), Sweden
3. No opinion – Lithuania (have not seen the image, question the green colour variant)

### **56.C. Commentary**

It appears that the Group of Experts wishes to revisit its earlier recommendation and not to change the tunnel symbol. The Group of Experts appears to also agree that ground colours for this sign should be clarified in the Convention. **The Group of Experts may wish to decide on which should be the permitted ground colours for this sign.**

### **57.A. Question**

Q.E.9. Regarding sign, E, 12 a, at the request of the Group of Experts, the symbol has been altered. The symbol of a pedestrian is the same as on sign A, 12 a. Furthermore, a new sign has been developed to depict pedestrian crossing with zebra stripes. Do you endorse the new design and the new sign?

### **57.B. Responses**

1. YES – Chile, Denmark, Estonia, Finland (decrease the number of zebra stripes, and further improve the symbol), France, Lithuania (with the principle, as they have not seen the image), Kuwait, Slovakia (improve the symbol as for A, 12)
2. NO – Belgium and Sweden (E, 12 a should be deleted)

### **57.C. Commentary**

The secretariat will further improve the image for this sign taking into account the comments provided from countries. **Following the comment from Belgium and Sweden, the Group of Experts may wish to decide whether to delete the sign E, 12 a from the Convention.**

### **58.A. Question**

Q.E.10. Regarding the current signs E, 12 b and E, 12, c, do you maintain your recommendation to delete signs E, 12 b and E, 12 c from the Convention?

### **58.B. Responses**

1. YES – Belgium, Chile, Denmark (unless used somewhere), Estonia, Finland, France, Lithuania, Slovakia, Sweden (use only E, 12 with zebra, and maybe one that does not have any marking, and make the symbol more abstract),
2. NO – Kuwait (believe E, 12b should be in the convention as countries using diamond shape warning signs uses this sign like USA and Japan; further recommend that the experts reconsider their decision on deleting E, 12c as they believe it is better than E, 12a.)

### **58.C. Commentary**

**Considering the comment from Kuwait, the Group of Experts may wish to decide whether or not to delete the sign E, 12 b.**

### **59.A. Question**

Q.E.11. Regarding sign E, 13 a and E, 13 b, these signs have been developed with blue ground only in eCoRSS. Do you consider that the definition of the Convention for these signs is clear enough with regard to defining the colour of the ground limiting it to blue only? Alternatively, do you think that the ground's colour should be clarified with means of an amendment or, on contrary, these signs should be developed also with other E-class permitted ground colours?

### **59.B. Responses**

1. YES – Belgium (all four variants are possible, show blue in the Convention and other in eCoRSS), Denmark (all four variants should be possible), Estonia (the permitted colour should be blue only), Finland (use blue ground), Lithuania (like Estonia)
2. NO – Chile (ground colour to be clarified), Kuwait (the definition is not clear, the only colour should be blue), Slovakia (blue is sufficient), Sweden (use only blue colour)
3. No opinion – France,

### **59.C. Commentary**

It appears that only blue ground should be permitted for these signs in the Convention, for which the text of the Convention be clarified.

### **60.A. Question**

Q.E.12. Regarding the sign E, 13 b, at the request of the Group of Experts, the bed symbol has been altered. Do you endorse the new design?

### **60.B. Responses**

1. YES – Belgium (other colour combination should be also possible), Chile, Estonia, Kuwait, Slovakia, Sweden
2. NO – Denmark, Finland (the design of the E,13b in the e-CoRSS should be improved; the white rim between the red cross and the blue background is missing and the bed is too complex)
3. No opinion – France, Lithuania (have not seen the image)

### **60.C. Commentary**

The secretariat will further improve the image for this sign taking into account the suggestions from experts.

### **61.A. Question**

Q.E.13. Regarding signs E, 14 b or c, at the request of the Group of Experts, the secretariat has developed P+R sign. Do you endorse this design?

### **61.B. Responses**

1. YES – Belgium, Chile, Estonia (as E, 14 d), Finland (in addition E,14b and E,14c should also have an option to use the symbol of a train and a bus connection), Lithuania, Kuwait, Slovakia, Sweden
2. NO – Denmark
3. No opinion – France

### **61.C. Commentary**

Symbols of a train and bus will be added in eCoRSS.

### **62.A. Question**

Q.E.14. Regarding signs E, 15 and E, 16, at the request and guidance of the Group of Experts, the secretariat has redesigned these signs. Do you endorse the new design?

## 62.B. Responses

1. YES – Belgium, Chile, Denmark (also a symbol for light rail), Finland (the shape rectangular rather than square, further improve the symbols), Kuwait, Sweden (use this chance to limit the ground colour to blue only)
2. NO – Estonia (preference for the old version), Lithuania (disagree with the recommendation on E, 15 and E, 16 signs “The Group believed that the design of these signs should be changed to be of blue ground and a white symbol of the public transport means or of the light ground and a dark symbol”, ie. disagree with the new E, 15 sign (bus stop) design. There was no consensus regarding the new design during the discussions.), Slovakia (old-fashioned design, not time-proof (same as a steam locomotive); Blue square with white symbol is not a good solution because this combination has different meanings through Convention and may be not clear (B, 6 – E, 3a – E, 13 – E, 14 – G, 17 – G, 18 – G, 20))
3. No opinion – France

## 62.C. Commentary

There appears to be a difference of opinions. **The Group of Experts may reflect on this issue again.** The secretariat will redesign the sign accordingly.

## 63.A. Question

Q.E.15. Regarding signs E, 17 a and E, 17 b, these signs have been developed with blue ground only. Do you consider that the definition of the European Agreement for these signs is clear enough with regard to defining the colour of the ground limiting it to blue only? Alternatively, do you think that the ground's colour should be clarified with means of an amendment or, on contrary, these signs should be developed also with other E-class permitted ground colours?

## 63.B. Responses

1. Be blue – Estonia (text needs to be clarified), Finland, Lithuania (same as Estonia), Kuwait (in favour of limiting colour variants), Slovakia, Sweden
2. Be of light and dark ground colour – Belgium (this appears to be a possible option, such options can be provided in eCoRSS), Denmark
3. No opinion – France, Chile

## 63.C. Commentary

It appears that there is more support to limit the ground colours to only one, ie. blue.

## 64.A. Question

Q.E.16. Regarding sign E, 18 a, do you maintain your recommendation to delete this sign from the Convention?

#### **64.B. Responses**

1. YES – Chile, Denmark (unless other countries use it), Estonia, Kuwait, Belgium and Sweden (E, 18a sign is being referred to in the EU directive on tunnels 2004/54/EG), Finland,
2. NO – France (it is used a lot in France), Slovakia
3. No opinion – Lithuania

#### **64.C. Commentary**

It appears that there is more support to having only one variant for E, 18 sign.

#### **65.A. Question**

Q.E.17. Regarding sign E, 18 b, this sign has been developed with blue ground only. Do you consider that the definition in the Convention for this sign is clear enough with regard to defining the colour of the ground limiting it to blue only? Alternatively, do you think that the ground's colour should be clarified with means of an amendment or, on contrary, this sign should be developed also with other E-class permitted ground colours?

#### **65.B. Responses**

1. Have blue ground – Denmark, Estonia (text needs to be clarified), Finland (symbols of phone and extinguisher decrease legibility, rather use SOS inscription), Lithuania (same as Estonia), Kuwait (simplification on colours, the image in eCoRSS should be without telephone or fire extinguisher symbols), Slovakia (not sure if symbols of phone and extinguisher inside emergency stopping place are a good idea, they are small and unreadable. The white vertical bar should not touch the upper and bottom edge of the sign), Sweden
2. Have light and dark ground – Belgium (this appears to be a possible option, such options can be provided in eCoRSS)
3. No opinion – France
4. Sign not clear - Chile

#### **65.C. Commentary**

It appears that there is more support to limit the ground colours to only one, ie. blue.

#### **66.A. Question**

Q.E.18. Where appropriate, signs have been developed with symbols reversed for left-hand traffic. Do you see any sign in this sub-class missing or any sign whose symbol should not be reversed?

## **66.B. Responses**

1. YES – Estonia (E7b, E7c, E8b, E8c, E13b, E14c, E15 and E, 16 should not be reversed)
2. NO – Belgium, Chile, Denmark (follow the Convention), Finland, Kuwait, Slovakia (refer to the note on reversibility in Annex 1), Sweden,
3. No opinion – France, Lithuania

## **66.C. Commentary**

It is proposed that only signs as listed below will be provided in eCoRSS with symbols reversed for left-hand traffic in the E sub- class: E, 12 and E, 18.

## **67.A. Question**

Q.E.19. Do you have any other comments to E signs?

## **67.B. Responses**

1. YES – Kuwait (the signs are not ordered by symbol: some E, 8 are mixed with E, 7, E, 3 comes after E, 4), Sweden (limit the colour of E signs to blue with exceptions)
2. NO – Belgium, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France , Lithuania, Slovakia
3. No answer – Chile

## **67.C. Commentary**

**The Group of Exerts may wish to consider the suggestion from Sweden to introduce a rule under general characteristics of E section that E signs should be of a blue ground colour (and possibly only a white symbol/inscription colour) unless otherwise specified for specific E signs.** This solution appears sensible to the secretariat. In such a case only signs such as E, 1, E, 2, E, 7 might be permitted to have the ground of light or dark colours, signs E, 5 and E, 6 to have the ground of blue and green while E, 9 and E, 10 of light colour only.

## **68.A. Question**

Q.E.20. Do you believe that the definitions and descriptions contained in Annex should be revised (appropriate amendments to be proposed) to make them consistent in terms of information they provide for each E sign and possibly consistent with the way definitions and descriptions are written in other sign classes/sub-classes?

## **68.B. Responses**

YES – Belgium, Chile, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Lithuania, Kuwait, Slovakia, Sweden

## **68.C. Commentary**

The secretariat is willing to make a proposal for a revision of the sign definitions and descriptions for E section (E sub-class). When elaborating such a proposal, the secretariat will take into account the Group's agreed views with regard to other relevant points in this section, among others, such as limitation of colour options, or on general points such as the change to a new sign name coding. This new proposal will also include proposal of changes already agreed upon.

### **F section – Information, facilities or services signs**

## **69.A. Question**

Q.F.1. Regarding sign F, 1 c, do you maintain the recommendation of the Group of Experts, that this sign should be deleted from the Convention?

## **69.B. Responses**

YES – Chile, Denmark, Estonia, France, Lithuania, Kuwait (not used in any country), Slovakia, Belgium and Finland and Sweden (if not used in other countries)

## **69.C. Commentary**

There is full support to delete symbol F, 1 c from the Convention.

## **70.A. Question**

Q.F.2. Regarding sign F, 4, at the request and guidance of the Group of Experts, the secretariat has altered the symbol. Do you endorse the new design?

## **70.B. Responses**

1. YES – Denmark, Estonia and Finland (further improve it), France, Kuwait, Slovakia (add symbols for H<sub>2</sub>, LPG, etc.), Belgium and Sweden (increase the symbol; introduce other variants for charging electricity, H<sub>2</sub>, CNG, LPG using the examples from the resolution)

2. No opinion – Chile, Lithuania (have not seen the image)

3. Suggestions from countries:

- Belgium:



- Estonia



- Sweden



### 70.C. Commentary

The secretariat will further improve the image for this sign taking into account the suggestions and examples from experts.

**The Group of Experts may wish to decide if symbols for other types of stations should be added to the Convention.**

### 71.A. Question

Q.F.3. Regarding sign F, 5, the secretariat has made changes to the symbol of the bed to match it with the symbol on sign E, 13 b. Do you endorse this design?

### 71.B. Responses

1. YES – Chile, France, Lithuania (for the principle, have not seen the image), Kuwait
2. NO – Belgium (not to have a person in a bed), Denmark, Estonia, Finland and Slovakia (the bed should be different as hospital and hotel are different facilities), Sweden
3. Suggestions from countries:
  - Estonia



### 71.C. Commentary

The secretariat will further improve the image for this sign taking into account the suggestions from experts. The bed symbols on the hospital sign and on the hotel sign will be designed to differ one from another, so as not to confuse these two facilities.

## 72.A. Question

Q.F.4. Regarding sign F, 6, this sign can be edited in eCoRSS to have the cutlery symbol placed either parallel or crossed on the sign. Do you agree?

## 72.B. Responses

1. YES – Chile, Denmark, Estonia, France, Lithuania, Kuwait, Belgium and Sweden (and make the definition consistent)
2. NO – Finland (do not see the need for parallel variant), Slovakia (fork design needs to be improved)

## 72.C. Commentary

The secretariat will further improve the image for this sign taking into account the suggestions from experts.

## 73.A. Question

Q.F.5. Regarding sign F, 8, at the request and guidance of the Group of Experts, the secretariat has altered the symbol by adding a ‘person’ to the table element of the symbol. Do you agree?

## 73.B. Responses

1. YES – Chile, Estonia, Lithuania, Kuwait
2. NO – Belgium and Finland (there should be no person), Denmark, France, Slovakia (there should be no person), Sweden (without a person is better, this sign could be also deleted)

## 73.C. Commentary

There appears to be a difference of opinions. **The Group of Experts may reflect on this issue again.** The secretariat will change this sign accordingly.

## 74.A. Question

Q.F.6. Regarding sign F, 9, the secretariat has not developed it, as the sign is recommended to be deleted from the Convention by the Group of Experts. Do you maintain your recommendation to delete signs F, 9 from the Convention, which will require an appropriate amendment?

## 74.B. Responses

1. YES – Belgium, Chile, Estonia, Finland (however, many of the F signs have the same problem: they are not used the same way in the CPs; in this category of signs, there probably will never be an agreement of international sign system), Lithuania, Kuwait,

Slovakia, Sweden (but countries should have a possibility to show where walking paths start)

2. NO – Denmark, France

#### **74.C. Commentary**

It appears that there is more support to remove this sign from the Convention. This however does not mean that countries cannot continue to use it.

#### **75.A. Question**

Q.F.7. Regarding sign F, 13, this sign can be edited to have the tree symbol changed to one mostly encountered in the region. Do you agree?

#### **75.B. Responses**

1. YES – Belgium, Chile, Denmark, Estonia, France, Lithuania, Kuwait, Sweden
2. NO – Finland (mention a different tree possibility only in the text); Slovakia (recommend to delete this sign from Convention, it is unnecessary to distinguish between hotel and youth hostel)

#### **75.C. Commentary**

No commentary.

#### **76.A. Question**

Q.F.8. The secretariat developed multiservice signs. Do you believe such signs should be introduced in the Convention by means of an appropriate amendment?

#### **76.B. Responses**

1. YES – Estonia, Chile, Finland (however, there are more sub-possibilities than these so again we think that we need clarifying text that explains the possibilities; six symbols in one sign might be too many; the arrow in the new version F-12.2 looks like it is a one way road), Lithuania (for the principle, have not seen the images), Slovakia (but amendment of the text of Convention only (no new sign) providing for possibility to combine more symbols of F signs together in one sign)
2. NO – Denmark
3. No opinion – France
4. Not clear – Kuwait (not clear what a multiservice sign is), Belgium and Sweden (it should be clear what could be shown on these signs)
5. Suggestions from countries:
  - Estonia



- Sweden



### 76.C. Commentary

**The Group of experts may wish to reflect on this issue.** Only if there is a common view on this issue, a sign allowing combining together a several symbols for facilities or services should be introduced in the Convention.

### 77.A. Question

Q.F.9. Do you have any other comments to F signs?

### 77.B. Responses

1. YES – Finland (If the distance inscription possibility is included in the e-CoRSS, then the possibility to use an additional panel to do the same thing should also be shown; and naturally additional panels are often needed for some additional text too)
2. NO – Belgium, Chile, Denmark, Estonia, France, Lithuania, Kuwait, Slovakia, Sweden

### 77.C. Commentary

The secretariat wishes to note that the Group of Experts agreed to distinguish between shapes of the F signs depending on whether or not they include additional inscription. The following proposal for amendment was agreed to Section F, I. General characteristics and symbols, point 1:

1 “F” signs with inscriptions shall have a blue or green ground; they shall bear a white or yellow rectangle be a blue or green rectangle with a white or yellow square placed in the centre on which the symbol shall be displayed.

**1bis. “F” signs without inscriptions shall have a blue or green square with a white or yellow square placed in the centre. The area of the white square inside should not be greater than two-thirds of the area of the blue square.**

The combination of additional panel with F sign, taking into account the amendment proposal above, is only sensible with F sign without inscription. Thus there could be two alternative solutions to presenting inscription with F signs. In view of the secretariat, this will need to be clarified in the text of the Convention.

**The Group of Experts may wish to reflect on the above.**

### **78.A. Question**

Q.F.10. Do you believe that the definitions contained in Annex should be revised (appropriate amendments to be proposed) to make them consistent in terms of information they provide for each F sign and possibly consistent with the way definitions are written in other sign classes/sub-classes?

### **78.B. Responses**

1. YES – Belgium, Chile, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Kuwait, Slovakia, Sweden
2. No opinion – France, Lithuania

### **78.C. Commentary**

The secretariat is willing to make a proposal for a revision of the sign definitions and descriptions for F section (F sub-class). When elaborating such a proposal, the secretariat will take into account the Group’s agreed views on other points for this sub-class, among others, such as removal of specific signs/symbols or on a general point regarding a change to a new sign name coding. This new proposal will also include proposal of changes already agreed upon.

---