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A sign-by-sign assessment by the Group of Experts
I. Attendance

1. The Group of Experts on Road Signs and Signals (GE.2) held its sixth session in Geneva from 1-2 February 2016, chaired by Mr. Karel Hofman (Belgium). Representatives of the following UNECE member States participated: Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Italy, Russian Federation, Sweden and Switzerland.

2. The representatives of non-ECE member States also participated: Kuwait and Nigeria. The following non-governmental organizations were represented: Forschungsgesellschaft Strasse-Schiene-verkehr, Easa Husain Al-Yousifi & Sons Company and an independent consultant from the United States of America (A-Mazing Designs) also participated as an Observer.

II. Adoption of the Agenda (agenda item 1)

3. The Group of Experts adopted the session’s agenda (ECE/TRANS/WP.1/GE.2/11).

III. Programme of Work: Taking Stock of National Legislation (agenda item 2)

4. The Group of Experts continued to discuss the information collected via a web based Road Signs Management System. At this session, the experts assessed the signs from E, 2 to E, 8 d as well as C, 10 to C, 12 (see Annex) by using the methodology agreed upon at the second session, i.e. sign-by-sign assessment focusing on deviation identification and description, deviation evaluation, recommendations and assignment of “in-conformity indicators” for both images and definitions.

5. The experts of Denmark, Finland, France, Kuwait, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Nigeria, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, and Switzerland, who had not yet presented their preliminary analysis, will be invited to do so for the signs, E, 9 a to G, 24 c at the next session. The Group did not discuss the C, 13 to C, 20 signs. Kuwait volunteered to assess these signs for the next session.

6. A-mazing Designs made a presentation about C, 5 and C, 6 signs. The Group agreed that no symbol changes to these signs are needed.

7. The experts from Nigeria and Switzerland made a proposal for coding D, 1 a, D, 2 and D, 10 signs (Informal document No. 3). The Group of Experts took note of this information and agreed that a new number coding should be developed for Annex 3; that Annex 3 should contain all sign images with all possible variations of the same sign; that where possible, road sign “models”, with the symbols to be superimposed, should be utilized in Annex 3, and that (reversed) symbols/signs meant for left-hand traffic be also available in Annex 3.

8. The Group of Experts also requested the secretariat to prepare cost estimates for developing an openly accessible, internet based Road Signs Management System (which utilizes the information already provided by Contracting Parties) and for creating an e-CoRSS (i.e. electronic Convention on Road Signs and Signals) which is internet-based, interactive and searchable.
9. An expert from Kuwait presented his proposal (presentation available on the website) on the use of the pedestrian symbol such as D, 5, D, 11a and D, 11 b as well as pedestrian symbols used in other sign categories. The Group of Experts took note of this proposal and underlined the importance of using modern and uniform symbols of humans on the road signs. The Group, at a later date, will make a decision regarding specific symbol attributes such as the number of persons, gender, and presence of safety devices such as helmets.

10. The Group expressed its appreciation to the experts from Nigeria and Switzerland as well as to Ms. M. Pronin (A-mazing Designs) and Mr. Al-Yousifi (Kuwait) for their substantive contributions at this session.

11. The secretariat presented Informal document No. 2 which contains a number of preliminary observations made by the secretariat when reviewing road “non-Convention” signs inserted into the Road Signs Management System by Contracting Parties to the 1968 Convention on Road Signs and Signals and to the 1971 European Agreement Supplementing the Convention.

12. In particular, the Group of Experts noted that road signs may be defined in the Convention but not described in Annex 1 (e.g. place identification signs); that signs may be described in Annex 1 but not reproduced in Annex 3; that there is lack of consistency in illustrating sign models; that the Convention allows signs of different subclasses/classes to look the same; and that there is no consistent number-coding. The Group of Experts on Road Signs and Signals was invited to consider these observations and provide comments in writing to the secretariat. In the meantime, the secretariat will finalize its preliminary sign-by-sign analysis of the “non-Convention” signs and will post its findings as Informal document No. 4 by mid-February.

13. The Group of Experts requested the secretariat to table Informal document No. 2 (February 2016) as a formal document at the next session.

IV. Other Business (agenda item 3)

14. The secretariat informed the Group about its consultations with the secretariat of WP.15 (Working Party on the Transport of Dangerous Goods) about a possible use of symbols utilized in the C, 3 m and C, 3 n signs of the 1971 European Agreement in D, 10 signs (of the 1968 Convention on Road Signs and Signals). There does not appear to be any obstacles to use the symbols present in the C, 3 m and C, 3 n signs of the 1971 European Agreement in D, 10 signs (of the 1968 Convention on Road Signs and Signals). The Group of Experts took note of this information.

15. Ms. Pronin (A-mazing Designs) informed the Group about her participation in the annual meeting of the National Council of Uniform Traffic Control Devices and the annual meeting of both the United States of America National Academy of Sciences’ Transportation Research Board where the importance of harmonized road signs in the context of new technologies (e.g. driverless/autonomous vehicles, scanning technologies) was discussed, in particular by vehicle manufacturers. The Group of Experts stressed that uniformity of definitions and images of road signs used across Contracting Parties to the 1968 Convention are crucial for the successful future use of modern vehicle technologies.

1 Available from www.unece.org/trans/roadsafe/eg_road_signs_signals_06.html).
V. Date and Place of Next Meeting (agenda item 4)

16. The secretariat informed the Group of Experts that the next meeting is scheduled to take place on 30-31 May 2016 in Geneva.

VI. Adoption of the Report (agenda item 5)

17. The Group of Experts adopted the report of its sixth session.
Annex

I. A sign-by-sign assessment by the Group of Experts

1. The Group of Experts on Road Signs and Signals analysed the implementation of the 1968 Convention on Road Signs and Signals on the basis of information provided by 28 Contracting Parties (Albania, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Greece, Hungary, Islamic Republic of Iran, Italy, Kuwait, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Montenegro, Netherlands, Nigeria, Poland, Russian Federation, Serbia, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukraine, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam) in the Road Signs Management System.

A. General recommendations/observations

2. The Group recommended adopting a schematic approach (i.e. by striving to remove unnecessary details such as hats and clothing) for all symbols used in the signs in the 1968 Convention. This will promote a universal understanding of road signs around the world.

3. The Group recommended that when units such as tonnes, meters, etc. follow a digit or a number, there should be a space separating them to increase legibility.

Aa Danger warning signs

4. A few countries appear to use a rim, rather than a border. It is necessary to consider definitions of rims and borders.

Convention sign: Examples from countries:

Ab Danger warning signs

5. The Group noted that very few Contracting Parties use this sign.

Secretariat to rectify an erroneous entry (to not applicable)

A, 1a Dangerous bend or bends

6. All signs examined appeared to convey the danger of “left bend” message.

7. A few countries use a strong curved (90 degree angle) bend and an arrowhead, not a curved pointed bend. The Group was divided as to whether it was worth considering matching the extent of the bend indicated on the sign to the local road conditions.

8. There was no agreement regarding whether the symbol used for C,11a should not also be used for A,1a.
A, 1b Dangerous bend or bends

9. All signs examined appeared to convey the danger of “right bend” message.

10. A few countries use a strong curved (90 degree angle) bend and an arrowhead, not a curved pointed bend. The Group was divided as to whether it was worth considering matching the extent of the bend indicated on the sign to the local road conditions.

11. There was no agreement regarding whether the symbol used for C,11b should not also be used for A,1b.

A, 1c Dangerous bend or bends

12. No comment.

Kuwait to rectify its input.

A, 1d Dangerous bend or bends

13. No comment.

Secretariat to delete the extra signs from Kuwait.

A, 2a Dangerous descent

14. A few countries use the image of a vehicle in addition to a percentage within the sign. A few countries use an arrow instead of a vehicle. Both approaches appear to contravene the Convention.
The Group did not agree on the most appropriate symbol or combination of symbols to indicate how dangerous the descent is and its direction (percentage, vehicle with or without a driver, arrow). However, the Group believed that indicating the direction of the descent was as important as indicating the degree of the descent.

**Convention sign:** Examples from countries:

1. **A, 2b Dangerous descent**

   No comment.

   **Convention sign:** Examples from countries:

   - No examples from countries

2. **A, 2c Dangerous descent**

   The Group did not agree on the most appropriate symbol or combination of symbols to indicate how dangerous the descent is and its direction (percentage, vehicle with or without a driver, arrow). However, The Group believed that indicating the direction of the descent was as important as indicating the degree of the descent.

   **Convention sign:** Examples from countries:

3. **A, 2d Dangerous descent**

   No comment.

   **Convention sign:** Examples from countries:

4. **A, 3a Steep ascent**

   A few countries use the image of a vehicle in addition to a percentage within the sign. A few countries use an arrow instead of a vehicle. Both approaches appear to contravene the Convention.

   The Group did not agree on the most appropriate symbol or combination of symbols to indicate how dangerous the ascent is and its direction (percentage, vehicle with or without a driver, arrow). However, The Group believed that indicating the direction of the ascent was as important as indicating the degree of the ascent.
A, 3b Steep ascent

21. No comment.

A, 3c Steep ascent

22. The Group did not agree on the most appropriate symbol or combination of symbols to indicate how dangerous the ascent is or its direction (percentage, vehicle with or without a driver, arrow). However, The Group believed that indicating the direction of the ascent was as important as indicating the degree of the ascent.

A, 3d Steep ascent

23. No comment.

A, 4a Carriageway narrows

*Kuwait to replace its input and include an additional non-Convention sign.*
A, 4b Carriageway narrows
25. No comment.

Convention sign: Examples from countries:

A, 5 Swing bridge
26. The Group noted slight differences in the symbol of the bridge, the direction of the bridge opening (right side), the water underneath the bridge (waves replaced by solid half circles), and the use of two different colours on the same symbol (black and blue). Notwithstanding, the Group believed that the essential characteristics of the symbol have been retained.

Convention sign: Examples from countries:

A, 6 Road leads on to a quay or river bank

Russian Federation to indicate that the black rim around all of its signs is not part of the symbol in the Aa “Comments” box.

27. The Group noted that a few countries used two different colours on the same symbol (black and blue). Notwithstanding, the Group believed that the essential characteristics of the symbol have been retained.

Convention sign: Examples from countries:

A, 7a Uneven road
28. No comment.

Convention sign: Examples from countries:
A, 7b Uneven road

Belgium to replace its input.

29. The Group agreed that the definition of 7b requires elaboration.

Convention sign: Examples from countries:

```
[Images of uneven road symbols]
```

A, 7c Uneven road

30. No comment.

Convention sign: Examples from countries:

```
[Images of uneven road symbols]
```

A, 8 Dangerous shoulders

Secretariat to check the symbol of Uzbekistan

31. The Group noted slight differences in the symbols used and agreed that gravel should be clearly made part of the symbol.

Convention sign: Examples from countries:

```
[Images of uneven road symbols]
```

A, 9 Slippery road

32. The Group noted that most countries used a slightly different symbol and that one country had an upright vehicle. Notwithstanding, the Group believed that the essential characteristics of the symbol have been retained.

Convention sign: Examples from countries:

```
[Images of slippery road symbols]
```

A, 10a Loose gravel

France to rectify numbering.

33. The Group noted that most countries used a slightly different symbol and that the loose gravel was not clear in some symbols. The Group agreed that the loose gravel should be clearly shown in the symbol and that for the countries which drive on the right hand side
of the road, that the vehicle should be on the left hand side given that the danger will come from the left.

Convention sign:  Examples from countries:

A, 10b Loose gravel

34. No comment.

Convention sign:  Examples from countries:

A, 11a Falling rocks

35. The Group noted that some countries included rocks on the carriageway which provide additional warning that fallen rocks are the main hazard. The Group agreed that having the rocks on the carriageway do not alter the essential characteristics of the symbol. The symbol as it presently is in the Convention should be retained.

Convention sign: Examples from countries:

A, 11b Falling rocks

36. No comment.

Convention sign:  Examples from countries:

A, 12a Pedestrian crossing

Secretariat to move current Lithuanian sign to non Convention signs.

37. The Group noted that many countries used a symbol of a person and a zebra crossing (stripes).

38. The Group recommended that a new A, 12c symbol comprised of a person and zebra crossing be added to the existing symbol in the Convention, and is the preferred symbol to be used. The expert group also recommended using the symbol of a person already existing in E, 12c to replace the symbol in A, 12a.
A, 12b Pedestrian crossing

Secretariat to move current Lithuanian sign to A, 12a, and remove current Albanian sign (as it replicates the current Albanian one in A, 12a).

39. The Group recommended using the symbol of a person already existing in E, 12c to replace the symbol in A, 12b.

A, 13 Children

40. The Group suggested modernizing the children symbol.

A, 14 Cyclists entering or crossing

41. The Group noted that some countries did not include a person as part of the symbol.

42. The Group also noted that there was a possibility that a symbol without a person sitting on the bicycle could be used. The Group recommended that the relevant text in the Convention be amended to stipulate that symbol without a person sitting on the bicycle could be used.

43. The Group recommended that a Contracting Party should use this symbol consistently (i.e. with or without a cyclist such as in the C,3c and D,4 symbols).

Convention sign: Examples from countries:
A, 15a Domestic animal crossing

Swedish to replace the current “moose” sign.

44. No comment.

Convention sign: Examples from countries:

A, 15b Wild animal crossing

45. No comment.

Convention sign: Examples from countries:

A, 16 Road works

46. The Group recommended modernizing the symbol and that within each Contracting Party, the same symbol should be used consistently.

47. The Group also recommended that the relevant text in the Convention be amended to allow for the reversal of this symbol.

Convention sign: Examples from countries:

A, 17a Light signals

48. No comment.

Convention sign: Examples from countries:

A, 17b Light signals

49. No comment.

Convention sign: Examples from countries:

No examples from countries
A, 17c Light signals

50. No comment.

Convention sign:  Examples from countries:

A, 18a Intersection where the priority is prescribed by the general priority rule

51. One country uses a “plus” symbol instead of the “X” shaped symbol but under the Convention, the “plus” symbol is to be used with the Ab model. The Group agreed that the current “X” shaped symbol should be the only symbol used with Aa model.

Convention sign:  Examples from countries:

A, 18b Intersection where the priority is prescribed by the general priority rule

52. No comment.

Convention sign:  Examples from countries:

A, 18c Intersection where the priority is prescribed by the general priority rule

Secretariat to remove the symbols from Albania, Lithuania and Montenegro. It will also request France and Hungary to modify their current symbols.

53. The Group stressed that all Contracting Parties must ensure that their general priority rule symbol should be indicated by the same width of all of the elements comprising the symbol.

Convention sign:  Examples from countries:
A, 18d Intersection where the priority is prescribed by the general priority rule

*Secretariat to remove the symbols from Lithuania, France and Serbia (or verify if it is one of the A,19 symbols).*

54. No comment.

Convention sign:  
Examples from countries:

---

A, 18e Intersection where the priority is prescribed by the general priority rule

*Secretariat to remove the symbol from Albania.*

55. No comment.

Convention sign:  
Examples from countries:

---

A, 18f Intersection where the priority is prescribed by the general priority rule

*Secretariat to remove the symbol from Albania.*

56. No comment.

Convention sign:  
Examples from countries:

---

A, 18g Intersection where the priority is prescribed by the general priority rule

*Secretariat to remove the symbols from Albania and Ukraine (to be moved to A, 19 symbol). Kuwait will move its current symbol to A, 19.*

57. No comment.

Convention sign:  
Examples from countries:

---

A, 19a Intersection with a road the users of which must give way

58. Some countries do not use the arrow head or the “V” shape at the bottom. The Group recommended using the symbol in the Convention without altering it (that is, having
the arrow head and the “V” shape at the bottom). The Group clarified that the arrow head and the “V” shape at the bottom, and the differences in the proportion of the line widths, are essential characteristics of the symbol.

59. The Group suggested that the Convention should have as many examples of symbol A,19 as it does for symbol A,18.

Convention sign: Examples from countries:

A, 19b Intersection with a road the users of which must give way

60. Some countries do not use the arrow head or the “V” shape at the bottom. The Group recommended using the symbol in the Convention without altering it (that is, having the arrow head and the “V” shape at the bottom). The Group clarified that the arrow head and the “V” shape at the bottom, and the differences in the proportion of the line widths, are essential characteristics of the symbol.

61. The Group suggested that the Convention should have as many examples of symbol A,19 as it does for symbol A,18.

Convention sign: Examples from countries:

A, 19c Intersection with a road the users of which must give way

62. Some countries do not use the arrow head or the “V” shape at the bottom. The Group recommended using the symbol in the Convention without altering it (that is, having the arrow head and the “V” shape at the bottom). The Group clarified that the arrow head and the “V” shape at the bottom, and the differences in the proportion of the line widths, are essential characteristics of the symbol.

63. The Group suggested that the Convention should have as many examples of symbol A,19 as it does for symbol A,18.

Convention sign: Examples from countries:

A, 20 Intersection with a road to whose users drivers must give way

Secretariat to delete the incorrect images for the A,20 symbol. The B,1 symbol with additional panel is the equivalent of the A,20 symbol. There are many reservations by Contracting Parties to article 10 paragraph 6 (which are now covered by the European Agreement).

64. The Group recommended creating a subgroup (comprising of France, Italy, Latvia and the Russian Federation) to consider the apparent repetition of the relevant articles in the
Convention and the European Agreement, and to propose a solution to the Group at the next session as to the continued validity of the A,20 symbol.

Convention sign: Examples from countries:

A, 21a Intersection with a road to whose users drivers must give way

Secretariat to delete the incorrect images for the A,21a symbol. Same issue as A,20 symbol.

65. The Group made the same recommendation as for symbol A,20.

Convention sign: Examples from countries:

A, 22 Roundabout

Switzerland, Belgium, Kuwait and Montenegro to rectify their current symbols.

66. The Group recommended that the symbol in the Convention be modified by providing greater space between the arrows and enlarging the arrow heads.

Convention sign: Examples from countries:

A, 23 Two-way traffic

67. The Group recommended that the symbol in the Convention be modified by enlarging the arrow heads.

Convention sign: Examples from countries:

A, 24 Traffic congestion

Italy to move their current sign to the non Convention sign category.

68. The Group noted that many countries used slightly different symbols and in some cases, more than three vehicles were included in the symbol and the vehicles have red lights. Nevertheless, the Group believed that the essential characteristics of the symbol have been retained.
Convention sign: Examples from countries:

A, 25 Level crossings

Secretariat to advise the Group regarding preliminary feedback from the expert group on improving safety at level crossings at the next session.

69. The Group anticipates receiving feedback from the Group of Experts on Improving Safety at Level Crossings (GE.1) to modernize the current symbol.

Convention sign: Examples from countries:

A, 26a Other level crossings

Secretariat to advise the Group regarding preliminary feedback from the expert group on improving safety at level crossings at the next session.

70. The Group anticipates receiving feedback from GE.1 to modernize the current symbol.

Convention sign: Examples from countries:

A, 26b Other level crossings

71. No comment.

Convention sign: Examples from countries:

A, 27 Intersection with a tramway line

72. No comment.

Convention sign: Examples from countries:
A, 28a Signs to be placed in the immediate vicinity of level-crossings

*Secretariat to advise the Group regarding preliminary feedback from the expert group on improving safety at level crossings at the next session.*

73. The Group anticipates receiving feedback from GE.1 on the continuing validity of the current symbol.

Convention sign: Examples from countries:

A, 28b Signs to be placed in the immediate vicinity of level-crossings

*Secretariat to advise the Group regarding preliminary feedback from the expert group on improving safety at level crossings at the next session.*

74. The Group anticipates receiving feedback from GE.1 on the continuing validity of the current symbol.

Convention sign: Examples from countries:

A, 28c, A, 29a, A, 29b and A 29c

*Discussion to be deferred pending outcome of the work of GE.1 on this aspect.*

Convention sign: Examples from countries:

A, 20, A, 21a and A, 21b

75. When the analysis of the subgroup on this topic is completed, its findings will be included under, and adapted for these signs. A recommendation that an additional panel stop with an indication to the distance of the stop sign is anticipated.
A30 Airfield

76. The Group also noted that some countries have the airplane symbol in a downward direction. Nevertheless, the Group believed that the essential characteristics of the symbol have been retained.

*Switzerland will insert the symbol into the danger sign.*

**Convention sign:**  
**Examples from countries:**

![Symbol Examples](image1.png)

A31 Cross-wind

77. The Group noted that some countries use red colour for the symbol and recommended that the colour used be the same as in the Convention. For the other countries, the Group believed that the essential characteristics of the symbol have been retained.

**Convention sign:**  
**Examples from countries:**

![Symbol Examples](image2.png)

A32 Other dangers

78. The Group noted that some countries do not use an exclamation point and recommended that that country changes its symbol to be the same as in the Convention. For the other countries, the Group believed that the essential characteristics of the symbol have been retained.

*Sweden to consider the Convention in this regard and advise at the fifth session.*

**Convention sign:**  
**Examples from countries:**

![Symbol Examples](image3.png)

B1 “GIVE WAY” sign

79. The Group noted that some countries included the text “Give way” within the sign. The Group noted that, for the countries wishing to include the text “Give way”, there is the possibility that this could be done in an additional panel or within the sign itself (Article 8, paragraph 3).
B, 2a “STOP” sign

80. The Group recommended that, in relation to the signs used by the countries, the size of “Stop” should be in conformity with the size specified in the text of the Convention. The Group also recommended that the sign used in the Convention should be in conformity with the size specified in the text of the Convention.

Convention sign: Examples from countries:

![Stop sign examples](image)

B, 2b “STOP” sign

81. The Group noted that very few countries use this sign (refer to Part IV of the Convention).

*Secretariat to look into the background regarding the earlier history (if this was the case) to remove this little used sign and advise at the fifth session.*

B3 “PRIORITY ROAD” sign

82. The Group noted that some countries do not use the black rim for the yellow square in the centre, and recommended that they do so.

Convention sign: Examples from countries:

![Priority road sign examples](image)

B4 “END OF PRIORITY” sign

83. The Group noted that some countries do not use the black rim for the yellow square in the centre, and recommended that they do so.

Convention sign: Examples from countries:

![End of priority sign examples](image)

B5 Sign indicating priority for oncoming traffic

84. The Group noted that some countries do not use the arrows (ie length, width, positioning) as they appear in the Convention. The Group recommended that the arrowheads in the symbol used in Annex 3 of the Convention be enlarged, and that the
signs of countries be in line with the revised symbol. The Group also recommended that the following additional words be inserted at the start of the article related to sign B,5: “The sign indicating priority for oncoming traffic shall be sign B, 5.”

Convention sign:   Examples from countries:

![Image of signs]

**B6 Sign indicating priority over oncoming traffic**

85. The Group noted that some countries do not use the arrows (ie length, width, positioning) as they appear in the Convention. The Group recommended that the arrowheads in the symbol used in Annex 3 of the Convention be enlarged, and that the signs of countries be in line with the revised symbol. The Group also recommended that the following additional words be inserted at the start of the article related to sign B, 6: “The sign indicating priority over oncoming traffic shall be sign B, 6.” To assist colour-blind drivers, the Group recommended that a white rim should be inserted around the red arrow.

Convention sign:   Examples from countries:

![Image of signs]

**General observation for C signs**

86. The Group discussed whether the oblique bar should be in front or behind the symbol. The Group agreed that further discussion about the note on page 39 (immediately following C, 3 l definition) is required.

**C, 1a “NO ENTRY”**

87. The Group noted that one country included the text “No Entry” within the sign. The Group noted that, for the countries wishing to include the text “No Entry”, there is the possibility that this could be done in an additional panel or within the sign itself (Article 8, paragraph 3).
C, 1b “NO ENTRY”

88. The Group noted that only one sign (C, 1a or C, 1b) could be used (Article 5, paragraph 2(a)).

C, 2 “CLOSED TO ALL VEHICLES IN BOTH DIRECTIONS”

89. The Group noted some visual differences in the width of the border of the red circle, but believed that the essential characteristics of the symbol have been retained.

C, 3a “NO ENTRY FOR ANY POWER DRIVEN VEHICLE EXCEPT TWO-WHEELED MOTOR CYCLES WITHOUT SIDE-CAR”

90. The Group noted some visual differences in the car symbol, but believed that the essential characteristics of the symbol have been retained.

91. The secretariat to look into section D paragraph 2 of the Convention (page 43) and point 20 of the European Agreement, and advise at the fifth session.

C, 3b “NO ENTRY FOR MOTOR CYCLES”

92. The Group noted that there were many differences in the motor cycle symbol, including the presence or absence of a motor cycle driver, but believed that the essential characteristics of the symbol have been retained. The Group emphasized that it should be clear that the symbol is referring to a motorcycle.
Convention sign: Examples from countries:

C, 3c “NO ENTRY FOR CYCLES”
93. The Group noted that there were differences in the bicycle symbol, but believed that the essential characteristics of the symbol have been retained. The Group emphasized that it should be clear that the symbol is referring to a bicycle.

Convention sign: Examples from countries:

C, 3d “NO ENTRY FOR MOPEDS”
94. The Group noted that there were differences in the moped symbol, but believed that the essential characteristics of the symbol have been retained. The Group emphasized that it should be clear that the symbol is referring to a moped.

Convention sign: Examples from countries:

C, 3e “NO ENTRY FOR GOODS VEHICLES”
95. The Group noted that there were differences in the goods vehicles symbol, but believed that the essential characteristics of the symbol have been retained.

Convention sign: Examples from countries:

C, 3f “NO ENTRY FOR ANY POWER DRIVEN VEHICLE DRAWING A TRAILER OTHER THAN A SEMI-TRAILER OR A SINGLE AXLE TRAILER”
96. The Group noted that some countries used a different symbol (entire goods vehicle with single axle trailer), this is considered as a change of the essential characteristics of the symbol. Some countries also use a symbol with two axles which the Group believes better reflects the meaning of this provision. The Group recommends altering the symbol of the convention to make it clearer that the prohibition is aimed at other than single axle trailers by adding a second axle on the trailer.
Convention sign: Examples from countries:

C, 3g “NO ENTRY FOR ANY POWER DRIVEN VEHICLE DRAWING A TRAILER”

97. No comment.

Convention sign: Examples from countries:

C, 3h “NO ENTRY FOR VEHICLES CARRYING DANGEROUS GOODS FOR WHICH SPECIAL SIGN PLATING IS PRESCRIBED”

98. The Group noted that countries are using different colours (yellow, orange and red) for the symbols of the vehicles carrying dangerous goods. The Group recommended that the colour used should be orange (as per the symbol in the Convention). The Group was advised that only UNECE member States that have acceded to the 1968 Convention on Road Signs and Signals are able to accede to the 1971 European Agreement Supplementing the 1968 Convention. The Group tentatively (subject to the examination of Consolidated Resolution on Road Signs and Signals as per drafting note below) agreed to recommend that the 1968 Convention should be amended to include signs C, 3m and C, 3n of the 1971 European Agreement.

The secretariat will inform the Group at the fifth session about the dangerous goods signs which have recently been included in the Consolidated Resolution on Road Signs and Signals (RE.2).

Convention sign: Examples from countries:

C, 3i “NO ENTRY FOR PEDESTRIANS”

99. The Group noted that one country used a slightly different symbol (person standing). The Group believes that the symbol of a pedestrian has to reflect movement. The Group recommended that the symbol of a person as it exists in E, 12 c should be used for this sign.
C, 3j “NO ENTRY FOR ANIMAL-DRAWN VEHICLES”

100. The Group noted that some countries used a different symbol of the animal-drawn vehicles (entire animal and half of the vehicle being drawn), and considered this as a change of the essential characteristics of the symbol. The Group believed that the entire symbol as it appears in the Convention should be used.

C, 3k “NO ENTRY FOR HANDCARTS”

101. The Group noted that there were differences in the symbols, but believed that the essential characteristics of the symbol have been retained. The Group recommended that the symbol of a person as it exists in E, 12c and pushing a handcart should be used for this sign.

C, 3l “NO ENTRY FOR POWER DRIVEN AGRICULTURAL VEHICLES”

102. The Group noted that there were differences in the symbols, but believed that the essential characteristics of the symbol have been retained.

C, 4a “NO ENTRY FOR POWER DRIVEN VEHICLES”

103. The Group believed that a horizontal bar was not in conformity with Section C.I paragraph 2. The Group recommended that a small group (comprising of Portugal and Switzerland) be established to consider the question as to whether an oblique diagonal bar is mandatory for all C signs except for the C, 3 signs where countries are given a choice (see Note on page 39).
C, 4b “NO ENTRY FOR POWER DRIVEN VEHICLES OR ANIMAL-DRAWN VEHICLES”

104. The Group agreed to defer discussion on this sign until the fifth session (after receiving feedback from the small group on C, 4a).

C, 5 “NO ENTRY FOR VEHICLES HAVING AN OVERALL WIDTH EXCEEDING … METRES”

105. The Group believed that the sign in the Convention is appropriate.

C, 6 “NO ENTRY FOR VEHICLES HAVING AN OVERALL HEIGHT EXCEEDING … METRES”

106. The Group believed that the sign in the Convention is appropriate.

C, 7 “NO ENTRY FOR VEHICLES EXCEEDING … TONNES LADEN MASS”

107. The Group noted that one country used a sign with the image of a goods vehicle, and believe that this was a change of the essential characteristics of the symbol. The Group also noted that there was a difference in the casing of the symbol “T” (ie some countries use lower casing “t”) as well as its positioning within the sign, and also that some countries used commas and period marks. The Group believed that the symbol in the Convention
should be modified from upper to lower casing ("t") and that the positioning of the symbol "t" should appear where it currently appears in the Convention.

108. The Group also believed, that where a comma or period mark is used, that the second digit should be two-thirds the size of the first digit, and that the lower casing "t" should appear immediately after the second digit and at the same level, and be proportionately visible. If a fraction is required, the Group believed that it should be to the nearest tenth (ie 3.5t, 7.8t). If it is an integer (i.e. 7.00t), it should appear without any zeros or period marks (ie 7t).

Kuwait to rectify its sign.

Convention sign: Examples from countries:

C, 8 “NO ENTRY FOR VEHICLES HAVING A MASS EXCEEDING … TONNES ON ONE AXLE”

109. The Group noted that there was a difference in the casing of the symbol “T” (ie some countries use lower casing “t”), its positioning within the sign, and also that some countries used commas and period marks. The Group also noted differences in the arrowheads and axles. The Group believed that the symbol in the Convention should be modified from upper to lower casing (“t”) and that the positioning of the symbol “t” should appear where it currently appears in the Convention. The Group also believed that the arrow should be deleted, replaced by one arrowhead and that the number used for the first digit in the Convention symbol should be larger.

110. Finally, the Group believed, that where a comma or period mark is used, that the second digit should be two-thirds the size of the first digit, and that the lower casing “t” should appear immediately after the second digit and at the same level, and be proportionately visible. If a fraction is required, the Group believed that it should be to the nearest tenth (ie 3.5t, 7.8t). If it is an integer (i.e. 7.00t), it should appear without any zeros or period marks (ie 7t).

Convention sign: Examples from countries:
C, 9 “NO ENTRY FOR VEHICLES OR COMBINATIONS OF VEHICLES EXCEEDING ... METRES IN LENGTH”

111. The Group noted that there was a difference in the casing of the symbol “m” (i.e. some countries use upper casing “M” where the Cyrillic alphabet is used) and that one country did not use the symbol of a truck. The Group believed that the symbol “m” should be placed immediately after the number, and not below the number, that the arrows be replaced by arrowheads, and that the number used in the Convention symbol should be larger.

Convention sign: Examples from countries:

C, 10 “DRIVING OF VEHICLES LESS THAN METRES APART PROHIBITED”

112. Some countries (e.g. Finland, Sweden) placed the symbol “m” under the number and they use an arrow.

113. Croatia uses a symbol for goods vehicle in addition to the symbol of a passenger vehicle. The Group believes this is not in conformity with the Convention. The application of this sign can be limited to the type of vehicle by the use of the relevant additional panel.

114. The Group believed that the symbol “m” should be placed after the number (not below the number).

Convention sign: Examples from countries:

C, 11a “NO LEFT TURN”

115. The Group considers that most countries use the sign in conformity with the Convention. Some countries (e.g. Finland) use the oblique bar that crosses from the upper right to the bottom left. The Group considers it not to be in conformity with the Convention.

116. Some countries (e.g. Chile) use an “arrow” symbol without any curvature.
C, 11 b “NO RIGHT TURN”

117. The Group considers that most countries use the sign in conformity with the Convention. Some countries (e.g. Austria, Switzerland) use the oblique bar that crosses from the upper left to the bottom right. The Group considers it not to be in conformity with the Convention.

118. Some countries (e.g. Chile) use an “arrow” symbol without any curvature.

C, 12 “NO U-TURNS”

119. The Group considers that most countries use the sign in conformity with the Convention. Some countries (e.g. the Netherlands) do not use the oblique bar on the sign. The Group considers it not to be in conformity with the Convention.

120. Some countries (e.g. Ukraine) use a white outline around the red oblique bar.

B. General observation for D category

121. The Group noted that many countries use a white rim to enhance the sign’s conspicuity.

D, 1a (directions left, right, straight, etc.)

122. There are minor differences in shape of arrow heads, arrow tails, proportions of arrows within the sign and in the presence/absence of the white rim. However, the Group considers all signs to conform to the Convention. The Group recommends Contracting Parties to pay closer attention to the design details, in particular, to the shape of the arrow head (by making it wider to improve the legibility). Arrows used in the same category of signs should be of the same width. The tail of the arrow should not touch the edge of the sign.

123. In addition, for the sign arrow turning left/right, there are differences in the arrow’s curvatures. The Group considers this conforming to the Convention, however, it recommends Contracting Parties to ensure the arrow’s curvature is placed towards the centre of the sign.
124. The Group recommends that each sign should have its own name code and requested Nigeria and Switzerland to make a proposal to that end (including D, 2; and assessing a possibility of including in the Convention the variation of D, 2 which allows left or right direction).

Convention sign: Examples from countries:

D, 2

125. There are minor differences in shape of arrow heads, arrow tails, proportions of arrows within the sign and in the presence/absence of the white rim. However, the Group considers all signs to conform to the Convention. The Group recommends Contracting Parties to pay closer attention to the design details, in particular, to the shape of the arrow head (by making it wider to improve the legibility). The tail of the arrow should not touch the edge of the sign.

Convention sign: Examples from countries:

D, 3

126. There are minor differences in shape of arrow heads, arrow tails, proportions of arrows within the sign and in the presence/absence of the white rim. However, the Group considers all signs to conform to the Convention.

127. The Group recommended that the symbol in the Convention be modified by enlarging the arrow heads.
D, 4

128. There are minor differences in symbol and in the presence/absence of the white rim. However, the Group considers all signs to conform to the Convention. The Group recommends simplifying the symbol to enhance its legibility.

129. The Group notes that Vietnam should rectify its input.

D, 5

130. There are differences in symbol (two persons versus one person) and in the presence/absence of the white rim. The Group considers that having a one person symbol is not in conformity with the Convention.

131. The Group recommends to simplify the symbol to enhance its legibility. The Group agreed to review the pedestrian symbol used across all sign categories. To this end, Kuwait will report on its findings at the next session.

D, 6

132. There are minor differences in symbol and in the presence/absence of the white rim. However, the Group considers all signs to conform to the Convention.

D, 7

133. The number should be centred and there should be reasonable amount of distance between the digits (applicable to the Convention’s sign).
Convention sign: Examples from countries:

![Examples](image1)

**D, 8**

134. The number should be centred and there should be reasonable amount of distance between the digits (applicable to the Convention’s sign).

135. The Group decided that too much space between the digits (i.e., Czech Republic) is not in conformity with the Convention. The red oblique bar should be in front of the number and not behind.

Convention sign: Examples from countries:

![Examples](image2)

**D, 9**

136. The Group noted differences in the illustration of the symbol but conforming with the Convention. The Group recommended Czech Republic, Montenegro and Serbia to use wider black lines illustrating the chains on the tyre.

Convention sign: Examples from countries:

![Examples](image3)

**D, 10 a, b, c**

137. The Group noted that some countries are using different colours (yellow, orange and red) for the symbols of the vehicles carrying dangerous goods. The Group recommended that the colour used should be orange (as per the symbol in the Convention) with a black internal rim. The symbol should show the rear part of the truck and be placed in the upper part of the sign.

138. The Group considers that countries using a different symbol of the vehicles carrying dangerous goods than an orange rear part of truck are not in conformity with the Convention.

139. Some countries placed the truck symbol and the direction sign in a reverse order (e.g. Albania), which the Group considers not to be in conformity with the Convention.

140. Some countries placed the wrong direction sign respectively to D, 10 a (e.g. Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Lithuania, Montenegro, Poland and Serbia), to D, 10 b (e.g. Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Italy, Poland and Sweden) and to D, 10 c (e.g. Hungary, Lithuania, Serbia and Sweden).

141. The Group notes that the symbols used in signs C, 3m and C, 3n of the European Agreement could be used within the D, 10 signs. The Group further requested the secretariat to consult with the WP.15 secretariat whether it is desirable and report back at
the next session. Should it be desirable and legitimate, the Group would propose a revision to the definition and examples of the signs of the D,10 signs in the Convention.

142. The Group noted that Greece uses the E category sign with the C, 3 n symbol instead of the proper D, 10 sign and arrows instead of the proper D,1 a signs, which is not in conformity with the Convention.

Convention sign: Examples from countries:
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D, 11 a and b

143. The Group recommends that the symbols of D, 4 and D,5 should be exactly replicated in the D, 11 sign (e.g. the direction of the bicycle symbol). The actual format of the symbols will be determined at the future session.

144. The Group noted a white horizontal line in the D, 11 b sign separating symbols (e.g. Poland). The Group notes that when there is a separation of the path or track for different road users (by physical means or road markings), the sign D, 11 a should place the symbols side by side and separate them by a vertical line through the centre of the sign. If there is no separation of the path or track (by physical means or road markings), the symbols should be placed one above the other without any lines.

145. The Group agreed that using a white horizontal line is not in conformity with the Convention.

146. Denmark and Kuwait are requested to replace their sign accordingly.
General observation for E category

147. The Group noted that many countries use a white rim to enhance the sign’s conspicuity.

148. The Group recommended to revise the definition of E sign category (Section E, SPECIAL REGULATIONS SIGNS, General Characteristics and symbols) to say:

“Special regulation signs are usually square or rectangular with a dark coloured ground and a light coloured symbol or inscription, or with a light coloured ground and a dark coloured symbol or inscription.”

149. Note by the secretariat: Applicable to all E signs or to only Special Regulation Signs E,1 a, E,1 b and E, 1,c.

E, 1 a

150. Azerbaijan, Hungary, Montenegro, Moldova, Russian Federation, Ukraine and Uzbekistan wrongly used examples for E, 1 b instead of E, 1 a.

151. Many countries use road markings (broken line) on this sign. The Group recommended the symbols on this sign not to include road markings ie., broken lines, as the arrows indicate the “lanes”.

152. The Group recommends that for the E, 1 a sign the sign D, 7 is used with a white rim.

E, 1 b

153. Albania, Croatia and Greece wrongly used examples for E, 1 a instead of E, 1 b.

154. Many countries use road markings (broken line) on this sign. The Group recommended the symbols on this sign not to include road markings ie., broken lines as the arrows indicate the “lanes”.

155. The Group recommends that for the E, 1 b sign the sign D, 7 is used with a white rim.
Convention sign:  Examples from countries:

E, 1 c

156. Azerbaijan used a wrong example for E, 1 c sign (truck entry prohibition sign instead of speed limit sign).

157. The Group recommends that the E, 1 c sign is improved by placing the sign C, 14 on the arrows and adding a white rim.

Convention sign:  Examples from countries:

E, 2 a

158. Article 26bis paragraph 2, Section E, sub-section II, point 2 and E, 2 a and E, 2 b reproductions in Annex 3 do not appear to be consistent and thus do not clearly define signs E, 2 a and E, 2 b.

159. Azerbaijan, Belgium, Croatia, Latvia, Luxembourg, Montenegro and Ukraine used examples for E, 2 a that do not correspond to the examples of the Convention.

160. Many countries use road markings (broken or continuous line) on this sign. The Group recommended the symbols on this sign not to include road markings as the arrows indicate the “lanes”.

Convention sign:  Examples from countries:

E, 2 b

161. Article 26bis paragraph 2, Section E, sub-section II, point 2 and E, 2 a and E, 2 b reproductions in Annex 3 do not appear to be consistent and thus do not clearly define signs E, 2 a and E, 2 b.

162. Belgium, Croatia, Finland, Latvia, Montenegro, Poland and Ukraine used examples for E, 2 b that do not correspond to the examples of the Convention.

163. Many countries use road markings (broken or continuous line) on this sign. The Group recommended the symbols on this sign not to include road markings as the arrows indicate the “lanes”.

164. The Group noted a spelling mistake in Article 26 bis paragraph 2. Second sentence should read “The sign indicating such a lane ….”
Convention sign:  Examples from countries:

E, 3 a

165. There are minor differences in shape of arrow heads, arrow tails, proportions of arrows within the sign. The Group recommends Contracting Parties to pay closer attention to the design details, in particular, to the shape of the arrow head (by making it wider to improve the legibility). The tail of the arrow should not touch the edge of the sign.

166. Some countries (Sweden) use rectangular shape for this sign.

167. The Group recommended that the symbol in the Convention be modified by enlarging the arrow head.

Convention sign:  Examples from countries:

E, 3 b

168. There are minor differences in shape of arrow heads, arrow tails, proportions of arrows within the sign. The Group recommends Contracting Parties to pay closer attention to the design details, in particular, to the shape of the arrow head (by making it wider to improve the legibility). The tail of the arrow should not touch the edge of the sign.

169. The Group recommended that the symbol in the Convention be modified by enlarging the arrow head.

Convention sign:  Examples from countries:

E, 4

170. All the signs are in conformity with the Convention as they are examples. However, the Convention Section E, subsection II, point 4 is not very clear. The Group believes that the Convention sign, as reproduced in Annex 3 should not include the right and left broken line indicating the road markings. The use of road markings between the lanes e.g. indicated by broken lines should be optional.

171. The E, 4 sign should be placed immediately after E, 2 b sign.
172. All the signs are in conformity with the Convention. Nigeria was requested to move its sign to the section non-Convention signs.

173. The Group recommends Contracting Parties to pay closer attention to the design details. In particular, the symbol should not touch the edge of the sign (to improve the legibility).

174. The Group decided to include in the point on general characteristics and symbols (Section E, point I) an exception for E, 5 and E, 6 signs to have a blue or green ground.

175. Kuwait’s sign is crossed by an oblique bar running from the upper left edge to the lower right edge. The Group noted that the Convention does not specify the positioning of the oblique bar for the sign E, 5 b. However, for all the other end of regulation signs of the E section, the oblique bar crosses from the right upper edge to the lower left edge.

176. The Group recommended that the Convention defines the positioning of the oblique bar to cross the sign from the right upper edge to lower left edge.

177. The sign E, 5 b of the Netherlands includes a red oblique bar with a white outline.

178. The Group noted that in some cases (Latvia) the car symbol is not placed centrally on the sign. Some countries (Belgium, the Netherlands) use a white rim. All the signs are considered in conformity with the Convention.

179. The Group decided that the heading 6 (subsection II of E section) and the description of the E, 6 a sign should be evaluated. The European Agreement shall be revised accordingly, if necessary.
Convention sign: Examples from countries:

E, 6 b

180. The Group noted that in some cases (Latvia) the car symbol is not placed centrally on the sign. Some countries (Belgium, the Netherlands) use a white rim. All the signs are considered in conformity with the Convention.

Convention sign: Examples from countries:

E, 7 a; E, 7 b; E, 7 c; E, 7 d and E, 8 a; E, 8 b; E, 8, c; E, 8 d (general remark)

181. The Group discussed at length the relationship between E, 7 and E, 8 signs and the place identification signs (as defined in Article 18). Some countries (e.g. Finland, the Russian Federation, Sweden) informed the Group that they use a sign resembling the E, 7 a or E, 7 d signs (as reproduced in Annex 3) as “place identification signs”. The Group agreed that the use of a sign resembling the E, 7 a or E, 7 d as place identification signs contradicts Article 18. However, the Group believed that place identification signs could not be made to differ conspicuously from the E, 7 a or E, 7 d signs (as required by Article 18).

182. The Group further noted the differences in the signs.
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E, 9 a