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## Progress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sign</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>Black sign indicating where many accidents have happened</td>
<td>Republic of Moldova</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>Narrow Bridge</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>Camagowy Viaduct</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td>Blind Spot / Carpark</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6</td>
<td>Y-Junction (Skier's Coffee)</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7</td>
<td>Intersection with Major Road</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A8</td>
<td>Ferry</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C0</td>
<td>No entry for vehicles as shown</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>No entry for bicycles, mopeds and invalid tippers</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>No entry for pedestrians, cycles and mopeds</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>Prohibition of passing vehicles due to police</td>
<td>Switzerland, Latvia, Republic of Moldova</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>Passing without stopping</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Details:

- **Signs**: A2, A3, A4, A5, A6, A7, A8, A9, C0, C1, C2, C3, C4
- **Countries**: Republic of Moldova, Nigeria, South Africa, Netherlands, Finland, Switzerland, Latvia, Republic of Moldova, Greece
- **Notes**: Various notes regarding the usage and interpretations of the signs.
I. Introduction

1. The Secretariat has reviewed the road "non-Convention" signs that were added to the Road Signs Management System (RSM) by Contracting Parties to the 1968 Convention on Road Signs and Signals as of the 1971 European Agreement Supplementing the Convention.

2. Using the review, the Secretariat made a number of observations which may be relevant to the Group of Experts on Signs and Signals in their work on reviewing the inconsistencies and inadequacies in the 1968 Convention on Road Signs and Signals, and the 1971 European Agreement Supplementing the Convention, and when these legal instruments and national legislation in the Contracting Parties.

3. The observations below, are grouped as general or sign subject specific observations. The Group of Experts is invited to consider these observations.

II. General observations:

A. Observation 1

4. The 1968 Convention is not consistent in its system of describing signs. Article 5 identifies the classes and subclasses of the Convention's signs. Articles 9 to 21 provide more detailed definitions of these signs subclasses (note: the very subclasses are defined as not consistent). Article 21 separately defines road works signs.

5. Annex 1 does not provide descriptions of all signs which are identified and defined in the text of the Convention (i.e. road identification signs, and includes identification signs as well as road works signs). Similarly, Annex 1, Section 6, point 1 (general characteristics and symbols) refers to temporary condition signs, including road works signs, which must be signs other than those referred to in Annex 2.

6. Furthermore, the signs, symbols and panels (referred to in Annex 1) do not always have corresponding colour reproductions (images) provided in Annex 1.

7. For example, images of A.1.a and A.1.b (Annex 1) do not illustrate all cases of increasing of the contingency as referred to in Annex 1 under Section A, part 4. The same applies to D.2 sign. However, it would seem useful to illustrate with A.1.a, A.1.b, A.2.a and A.2.b and D.2.a and D.2.b. 2 letter codes all possible cases for respectively increasing of emergency or passing an area. Illustrations are provided below.

8. For some signs, such as the temporary condition signs (Annex 1, section 6, point 1 general characteristics and symbols, part 4). Annex 1 does not provide any example.

9. The lack of consistency is probably the cause of confusion as to whether a particular sign is or is not a Convention's sign. It is to be noted that RSM6 includes a Convention Sign, only those signs that are reproduced in Annex 1, i.e. all signs that are defined in the Convention.

10. A possible solution for consideration: introduces a consistent way in which the Convention defines, describes and reproduces its signs. To this end, identify all Convention classes and subclasses of signs in Article 5. Define all these classes and subclasses in a...
Progress in numbers

- More than 160 Convention’s signs reviewed
- Each signed reviewed based on input to RSMS by 32 CP (EG evaluated some 4,000 national signs)
- Preliminary assessment of a secretariat’s paper reviewing over 1,400 non-Convention signs used in CPs
- Formulation of over 100 recommendations
Type of recommendations

• Changes to symbols to improve legibility
• Modernization of symbols to improve understanding
• Changes to design (white rim between two dark colors) also to improve legibility
• Amendments to Convention’s Articles to address internal inconsistencies and/or to improve understanding
• Amendments to sign definitions/name coding to clarify signs as necessary
Type of recommendations

• Introduction of new symbols
• Removal of signs
• Changes to CPs’ signs
A way forward

• The Group of Experts requested an extension of its mandate (required at least until end of 2017)
• eCoRSS
• Establishment of a trust fund