



# Economic and Social Council

Distr.: General  
7 December 2017

Original: English

---

## 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 (a) of the provisional agenda

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

**Analysis of information collected via the web-based Road Signs**

**Management System: G and H section signs**

### **Questionnaire to reexamine the recommendations made by the Group of Experts on Road Signs and Signals when reviewing road signs of the Convention**

#### **Note by the secretariat**

1. This document contains a questionnaire to reexamine the recommendations made by the Group of Experts on Road Signs and Signals when reviewing road signs of the Convention. The questionnaire provides questions separately to each class or sub-class of signs: i.e. sections A through H of the Annex of the Convention.
2. The responses to questions posed should allow to list and search for a common position on outstanding issues at the 14<sup>th</sup> session of the Group of Experts.
3. Whenever sign images/design are referred to in the questions they are available at <http://constantinfo.net/ecorss/>.

## General questions

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

### A section – Danger Warning

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?

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?

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)?

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?

Q.A.5. Do you believe signs 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?

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?

Q.A.7. Regarding sign A, 12 (also name-coded as A-12.3 in eCoRSS), 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?

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?

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?

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?

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 as A, 18d (also name-coded as A-18.6 and A-18.7 in eCoRSS). Which number code(s) should these new signs have in the Convention? Do you believe there should be other options added?

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 as A, 19c (also name-coded as A-19.4 and A-19.5 in eCoRSS). The secretariat also developed two more options available as A, 19c (also name-coded as A-19.8 and A-19.9 in eCoRSS). 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? Do you believe there should be other options added?

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?

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?

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

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

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?

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?

Q.A.19. Do you believe the description to be placed on the detailed sign page in eCoRSS 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 1 of the Convention 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?

## **B section – Priority signs**

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?

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

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?

Q.B.4. 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?

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

Q.B.6. Do you believe that the definitions and descriptions contained in Annex 1 of the Convention 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?

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

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?

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.

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?

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?

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

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?

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?

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?

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?

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?

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

Q.C.12. Do you believe that the definitions and descriptions contained in Annex 1 of the Convention 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?

## **D section – Mandatory signs**

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?

Q.D.2. Regarding sign D, 1 a, at the advice of the Group of Experts, the secretariat developed other 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?

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?

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?

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?

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?

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 Convention 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?

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?

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

Q.D.10. Do you believe that the definitions and descriptions contained in Annex 1 of the Convention 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?

## E section – Special regulation signs

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?

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?

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?

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?

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 they are now available in the European Agreement?

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?

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 (iii) 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?

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?

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?

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?

Q.E.11. Regarding sign E, 13 a and E, 13 b, these signs have been developed with blue ground only. 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?

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?

Q.E.13. Regarding signs E, 14 b and E, 14 c, at the request of the Group of Experts, the secretariat has developed P+R sign. Do you endorse this design? What name-code should this additional sign have?

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?

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?

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

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?

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?

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

Q.E.20. Do you believe that the definitions and descriptions contained in Annex 1 of the Convention 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?

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

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?

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?



- 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?
- Q.F.4. Regarding sign F, 6, this sign is available with the symbol of the cutlery placed either parallel or crossed on the sign. Do you agree?
- 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?
- 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 sign F, 9 from the Convention, which will require an appropriate amendment?
- Q.F.7. Regarding sign F, 13, this sign can be altered to display on it a tree mostly encountered in the region. Do you agree?
- 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?
- Q.F.9. Do you have any other comments to F signs?
- Q.F.10. Do you believe that the definitions contained in Annex 1 of the Convention 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?

## **G section – Direction, position or indication signs**

- Q.G.1. Do you believe the title of Section G should be changed from 'Direction, position or indication signs' to 'Other information signs' and that this new title for this group of signs should be used across the Convention in a consistent way?
- Q.G.2. Do you think that the Convention should suggest any other types of examples for the advance direction signs than those proposed in ECE/TRANS/WP.1/GE.2/2017/3/Rev.1 and for which the secretariat has developed corresponding images?
- Q.G.3. Do you have any suggestions regarding the images for the advance direction signs or would you like to provide better examples to the secretariat?
- Q.G.4. Do you think that the Convention should suggest any other types of examples for the direction signs than those proposed in ECE/TRANS/WP.1/GE.2/2017/3/Rev.1?
- Q.G.5. Do you have any suggestions regarding the images for the direction signs or would you like to provide better examples to the secretariat?
- Q.G.6. Do you have any suggestions regarding the images for the road identification signs or would you like to provide better examples to the secretariat?
- Q.G.7. Do you have any suggestions regarding the images for the place identification signs or would you like to provide better examples to the secretariat?
- Q.G.8. Do you have any suggestions regarding the images for the confirmatory signs or would you like to provide better examples to the secretariat?
- Q.G.9. Do you agree with the proposal of the secretariat regarding signs indicating temporary conditions due to road works or detours as contained in ECE/TRANS/WP.1/GE.2/2017/3/Rev.1?

Q.G.10. Do you have any suggestions regarding the images for these signs or would you like to provide better examples to the secretariat?

Q.G.11. Do you have any other comments to G signs, in particular to the secretariat suggestion for new images for signs G, 11 a and G, 11 b, G, 12 a through G, 12 c, G, 20 a and G, 20 b as well as G, 21 a and G, 21 b?

### **H section – Additional panels**

Q.H.1. Which kind of ground, rim and symbol/inscription combination should the H panel have? Do you believe that the rim colour, unless red, should match the symbol inscription colour?

Q.H.2. Do you believe that all symbols from signs C, 3, E, 15 and E, 16 should be allowed for use on H, 5 and H, 6 panels?

Q.H.3. Do you believe that the definition for H, 9 is appropriate?

Q.H.4. Do you have any specific comments on the amendment proposal contained in ECE/TRANS/WP.1/GE.2/2018/2?

---