



Economic and Social Council

Distr.: General
25 June 2015

Original: English

Economic Commission for Europe

Inland Transport Committee

Working Party on Road Traffic Safety

Group of Experts on Road Signs and Signals

Fourth-session

Geneva, 4-5 June 2015

Report of the Group of Experts on Road Signs and Signals on its fourth session

Contents

	<i>Paragraphs</i>	<i>Page</i>
I. Attendance.....	1-2	2
II. Revision to Report of the Group of Experts on Road Signs and Signals On its third session	3	2
III. Adoption of the Agenda (agenda item 1)	4	2
IV. Programme of Work (agenda item 2).....	5-7	2
A. Assessing internal consistency of the 1968 Convention on Road Signs and Signals and the 1971 European Agreement supplementing it	5	2
B. Taking Stock of National Legislation	6-7	3
V. Other Business (agenda item 3).....	8	3
VI. Date and Place of Next Meeting (agenda item 4).....	9	3
VI. Adoption of the Report (agenda item 5).....	10	3
Annex A sign-by-sign assessment by the Group of Experts		4

I. Attendance

1. The Group of Experts on Road Signs and Signals (GE.2) held its fourth session in Geneva from 4-5 June 2015, chaired by Mr. Karel Hofman (Belgium). Representatives of the following UNECE member States participated: Belgium, Croatia, Denmark, Finland, France, Italy, Latvia, Luxembourg, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Serbia, Sweden and Switzerland.

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

II. Revisions to Report of the Group of Experts on Road Signs and Signals on its third session

3. The Group of Experts made the following minor corrections to the report of its third session (ECE/TRANS/WP.1/GE.2/6):

- "A, 24" in paragraph 6 of the Report was replaced by "A, 28b";
- All of the references in the Annex to "the experts" and "the expert group" was replaced by "the group";
- In the Annex, the words "Secretariat to delete the sign from Finland" in relation to sign A, 2c, was deleted as Finland has a reservation on this sign; and
- In the Annex, the title of sign A, 23 was rectified to "Two-way traffic".

III. Adoption of the Agenda (agenda item 2)

4. The Group of Experts adopted the session's agenda (ECE/TRANS/WP.1/GE.2/7) with the following changes:

- Insertion of new agenda item 1 "Revisions to the Report of the Group of Experts on Road Signs and Signals on its third session"; and
- Delete the words "and the 1971 European Agreement supplementing it" from the title of agenda item 3A.

IV. Programme of Work (agenda item 3)

A. Assessing internal consistency of the 1968 Convention on Road Signs and Signals

5. The delegate from Spain gave a presentation about the results of research on this subject, which included the terms used to refer to different essential parts of road signs, the analysis of various Variable Message Signs (VMS) and the key elements concerning road signs found in the Convention. He concluded that the Convention was rich enough to allow for different design strategies and that understanding complex road signs depended on the reading approach followed by drivers (i.e. verbal or iconic). The delegate recommended that families of signs allowing for the complete case (e.g. set of towards, between, after) under the same design paradigm should be prioritized and further, that new subclasses of

signs – exemplifying the families – should be added to the Convention with corresponding nomenclature codes.

B. Taking Stock of National Legislation

6. The Group of Experts continued its discussion on the information collected in the Road Signs Management System (RSMS) from the A, 28 signs to the C, 9 sign. While the outcome of these deliberations is attached to this report (see Annex), the Group agreed to re-visit these tentative conclusions after the discussion for each sign category has been completed. The countries which have contributed to the RSMS are (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)

7. To expedite the completion of this task, the Group of Experts agreed to divide the remaining signs to be analysed between the attending delegates in pairs (ie approximately 10 signs per pair) for discussion at the fifth session. The pairs are as follows:

- Nigeria and Switzerland – sign D, 1 to sign, D, 6;
- Spain and Sweden– sign D, 7 to sign E, 1c (all E, 1 signs are included);
- Republic of Moldova and Russian Federation – sign E, 2a to E, 7d (all E, 7 signs are included)
- Luxembourg and Portugal – sign E, 8a to sign E, 11b (all E, 11 signs are included);
- Latvia and Lithuania– sign E, 12a to sign E, 16;
- France and Kuwait – sign E, 17a to sign F, 6;
- Denmark and Finland – sign F, 7 to sign F, 18; and
- Kuwait only – all of the G signs on a best efforts basis (that is, from G, 1a to G, 24c).

V. Other Business (agenda item 3)

8. A-mazing Designs reported that a team of road safety researchers to evaluate road signs comprehension and comprehension time from across six continents had recently been formed. Ms. Pronin, who has been invited to participate in this project, asked the Group of Experts to suggest Convention sign symbols to be evaluated and alternatives to those symbols to be proposed (as part of the project). If suggestions are provided to Ms. Pronin by close of business on Friday, 5 June 2015, she will seek to have them included in the project.

VI. Date and Place of Next Meeting (agenda item 4)

9. The next meeting of the Group of Experts will take place on 12-13 November 2015 in Geneva.

VII. Adoption of the Report (agenda item 5)

10. The Group of Experts adopted the report of its fourth session.

Annex

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

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.

General recommendations:

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.

Aa Danger warning signs

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

Ab Danger warning signs

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

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

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.

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

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

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.

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

Secretariat to verify/delete N/A responses for the Czech Republic and Ukraine.

A, 1c Dangerous bend or bends

No comment.

Kuwait to rectify its input.

A, 1d Dangerous bend or bends

No comment.

Secretariat to delete the extra signs from Kuwait.

A, 2a Dangerous descent

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.

A, 2b Dangerous descent

No comment.

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.

A, 2d Dangerous descent

No comment.

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

No comment.

A, 3c Steep ascent

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

No comment.

A, 4a Carriageway narrows

Kuwait to replace its input and include an additional non-Convention sign.

No comment.

A, 4b Carriageway narrows

No comment.

A, 5 Swing bridge

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.

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.

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.

A, 7a Uneven road

No comment.

A, 7b Uneven road

Belgium to replace its input.

The group agreed that the definition of 7b requires elaboration.

A, 7c Uneven road

No comment.

A, 8 Dangerous shoulders

Secretariat to check the symbol of Uzbekistan

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

A, 9 Slippery road

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.

A, 10a Loose gravel

France to rectify numbering.

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.

A, 10b Loose gravel

No comment.

A, 11a Falling rocks

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.

A, 11b Falling rocks

No comment.

A, 12a Pedestrian crossing

Secretariat to move current Lithuanian sign to non Convention signs.

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

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).

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

A, 13 Children

The group suggested modernizing the children symbol.

A, 14 Cyclists entering or crossing

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

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.

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

A, 15a Domestic animal crossing

Sweden to replace the current "moose" sign.

No comment.

A, 15b Wild animal crossing

No comment.

A, 16 Road works

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

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

A, 17a Light signals

No comment.

A, 17b Light signals

No comment.

A, 17c Light signals

No comment.

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

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.

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

No comment.

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.

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.

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).

No comment.

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

Secretariat to remove the symbol from Albania.

No comment.

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

Secretariat to remove the symbol from Albania.

No comment.

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.

No comment.

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

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.

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

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

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.

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

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

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.

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

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).

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.

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.

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

A, 22 Roundabout

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

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

A, 23 Two-way traffic

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

A, 24 Traffic congestion

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

The group noted that many countries used slightly different symbols and in many 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.

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.

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

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.

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

A, 26b Other level crossings

No comment.

A, 27 Intersection with a tramway line

No comment.

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.

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

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.

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

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

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

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

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

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.

A31 Cross-wind

The group noted that one country uses 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.

A32 Other dangers

The group noted that one country does 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.

B1 "GIVE WAY" sign

The group noted that one country 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

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.

B, 2b "STOP" sign

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

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.

B4 “END OF PRIORITY” sign

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.

B5 Sign indicating priority for oncoming traffic

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.”

B6 Sign indicating priority over oncoming traffic

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.

C, 1a “NO ENTRY”

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”

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”

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”

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

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”

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.

C, 3c “NO ENTRY FOR CYCLES”

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.

C, 3d “NO ENTRY FOR MOPEDS”

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.

C, 3e “NO ENTRY FOR GOODS VEHICLES”

The group noted that there were differences in the goods vehicles symbol, but believed that the essential characteristics of the symbol have been retained.

C, 3f “NO ENTRY FOR ANY POWER DRIVEN VEHICLE DRAWING A TRAILER OTHER THAN A SEMI-TRAILER OR A SINGLE AXLE TRAILER”

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.

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

No comment.

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

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).

C, 3i “NO ENTRY FOR PEDESTRIANS”

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”

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”

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, 12 c and pushing a handcart should be used for this sign.

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

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”

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”

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”

The group believed that the sign in the Convention is appropriate. However, the group intends to discuss a proposal at the next session to be prepared by A-mazing Designs.

Kuwait to rectify its sign which was erroneously entered. A-mazing Designs to provide the proposed image.

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

The group believed that the sign in the Convention is appropriate. However, the group intends to discuss a proposal at the next session to be prepared by A-mazing Designs.

A-mazing Designs to provide the proposed image.

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

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.

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.

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

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.

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 (ie 7.00t), it should appear without any zeros or period marks (ie 7t).

C, 9 “NO ENTRY FOR VEHICLES OR COMBINATIONS OF VEHICLES EXCEEDING ... METRES IN LENGTH”

The group noted that there was a difference in the casing of the symbol “m” (ie 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.

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

C, 11a “NO LEFT TURN”

C, 11 b “NO RIGHT TURN”

C, 12 “
