

Distr.: General  
21 January 2022

Original: English

---

**Economic Commission for Europe**

Inland Transport Committee

**Global Forum for Road Traffic Safety**

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

**Informal session**

Geneva, 4 February 2022

**Questionnaire responses**

**Submitted by the Chair and secretariat**

This document provides a summary of the questionnaire responses which was undertaken to collect information on governments' priorities in the area of road signs not currently included in the 1968 Convention on Road Signs and Signals (para. 7, ECE/TRANS/WP.1/GE.2/40).

**Question 11:**

Please rank the priority areas (points 1-10) from the highest priority to the lowest priority

Responses by governments:

	GOVT RANKING
<b>Lithuania</b>	1, 4, 3, 2, 5, 9, 6, 7, 8, 10.
<b>Greece</b>	8, 3, 2, 6,5,9,4,10,1,7
<b>Russia</b>	5, 3, 1, 4, 10, 2, 8, 7, 9, 6.
<b>Latvia</b>	1; 4; 2; 5; 10; 8; 7; 3; 6; 9;
<b>Sweden</b>	2,3,4,1,6,5,7,10,9,8
<b>Denmark</b>	6, 1, 4, 10, 8, 9, 5, 7, 3, og 2.
<b>Switzerland</b>	2, 5, 4, 7, 6, 3, 1, 8, 9, 10
<b>Belgium</b>	5, 1, 2, 3, 8, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10
<b>Finland</b>	2, 3, 7, 10, 4, 8, 5, 9, 1, 6
<b>Luxembourg</b>	2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 10 - 7 - 8 - 1 - 9
<b>Portugal</b>	9, 10, 1, 4, 7, 8, 2, 3, 5, 6
<b>Estonia</b>	4, 2, 9, 3, 6, 5, 7, 10, 8, 1.
<b>France (version 3)</b>	2, 5, 3, 10, 1, 6, 4, 7, 8, 9
<b>Nigeria</b>	10, 3, 9, 2, 8, 7, 1, 5, 4, 6
<b>Italy</b>	2, 4, 5, 3, 6, 9, 1, 7, 8, 10
<b>Germany</b>	4, 5, 9, 7, 8, 3, 1, 6, 2, 10

Weights: 10 points for the first priority, and 1 point for the 10<sup>th</sup> priority:

SIGN AREA	Lithuania	Greece	RF	Latvia	Sweden	Denmark	CH	Belgium	Finland	Lux	Portugal	Estonia	France	Nigeria	Italy	Germany	Total
1=LEZ	10	2	8	10	7	9	4	9	2	3	8	1	6	4	4	4	91
2=Cycles	7	8	5	8	10	1	10	8	10	10	4	9	10	7	10	2	119
3=Pedestrians	8	9	9	3	9	2	5	7	9	9	3	7	8	9	7	5	109
4=Evs	9	4	7	9	8	8	8	5	6	8	7	10	4	2	9	10	114
5=Micro-mobility	6	6	10	7	5	4	9	10	4	7	2	5	9	3	8	9	104
6=AVs	4	7	1	2	6	10	6	4	1	0	1	6	5	1	6	3	63
7=Parking	3	1	3	4	4	3	7	3	8	5	6	4	3	5	3	7	69
8=VMS	2	10	4	5	1	6	3	6	5	4	5	2	2	6	2	6	69
9=School	5	5	2	1	2	5	2	2	3	2	10	8	1	8	5	8	69
10=Speed control	1	3	6	6	3	7	1	1	7	6	9	3	7	10	1	1	72

---

**Overall, the priority sign areas:**

**RANKING****SORTED****Points**

<b>2=Cycles</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>Highest</b>
<b>4=EVs</b>	<b>114</b>	
<b>3=Pedestrians</b>	<b>109</b>	
<b>5=Micro-</b>		
<b>mobility</b>	<b>104</b>	
<b>1=LEZ</b>	<b>91</b>	
<b>10=Speed</b>		
<b>control</b>	<b>72</b>	
<b>9=School</b>	<b>69</b>	
<b>8=VMS</b>	<b>69</b>	
<b>7=Parking</b>	<b>69</b>	
<b>6=AVs</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>Lowest</b>

**Question 2:**

**Cycles/cyclists**

- a. Commercial cycles or such (e.g., tricycles, rikshas)
- b. Cycles in shared roads
- c. Cycle crossings together with pedestrian crossings (A and E sign categories)
- d. Cycles passing on the red light

<b>QUESTION 2 - RESPONSES IN PER CENT</b>			
	<b>YES</b>	<b>MAYBE</b>	<b>NO</b>
<b>A</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>B</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>C</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>D</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>62</b>
<b>Note: "Maybe" signifies "not sure", need more information/clarification</b>			

**Question 4:**

**Electric or other alternative fuel vehicles**

- a. Filling stations/charging points
- b. Restrictions and/or preferential treatment
  - “a” – 81 per cent supportive
  - “b” - 100 per cent supportive

**Question 3:**

**Pedestrians**

- a. Same as in 2 c above
- b. Pedestrian zones
- c. Non mandatory use of D 11 type signs by cyclists
- d. Road users with special needs such as pedestrians with disabilities

<b>QUESTION 3 - RESPONSES IN PER CENT</b>			
	<b>YES</b>	<b>MAYBE</b>	<b>NO</b>
<b>A</b>	<b>81</b>		<b>19</b>
<b>B</b>	<b>81</b>		<b>19</b>
<b>C</b>	<b>38</b>		<b>62</b>
<b>D</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>38</b>

**Question 5:**

**Micro-mobility**

Restrictions and/or preferential treatment

- Virtually all respondents supportive
- Two respondents point at the need to define “micro-mobility” first

**Question 1:**

**Low emissions zone**

- a. A zonal sign of the E9 and E10 type
  - Almost 100 per cent supportive
  - One country already has it
  - Additional panels equally important
  - One country proposed a C-sign instead

**Question 6:**

**Automated vehicles**

- a. Platooning
- b. Restrictions and/or preferential treatment

QUESTION 6 - RESPONSES IN PER CENT			
	YES	MAYBE	NO
<b>A</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>B</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>27</b>

**Question 7:**

**Parking**

Restrictions such as conditions, time or preferential treatment

- All respondents are supportive
- Notes (from one respondent):
- Carpooling only
- The variation of signage between CPs is too wide. Restrictions for time limitations (date, weekday, hours), vehicle types (including charging of electric vehicles), payment/price of parking, validity area/zone of all these etc.
- Preferential treatment: H,7 already exists but probably other needs too (elderly people, family parking, P+R).
- Should allow for the indication on some signs that parking is paid (parking meter symbol) or that it is time-limited, regulated by disc (disc symbol). It is also possible to indicate the dates of the month when parking is prohibited.

**Question 8:**

**Variable message signs (VMS)**

- a. Incorporate VMS provisions from RE.2
  - Virtually all respondents are supportive
  - One reservation (from one respondent): The Vienna Convention already allows for the use of VMS in Article 8(1bis), and leaves considerable flexibility in the use of VMS. We do not believe that it would be useful to further regulate their use. Moreover, it would be necessary to avoid defining precisely the decorations of variable message signs because with the development of LED technology, the possibilities of displaying on VMS, in particular the possibilities of displaying colours, are more important than before. Resolution RE.2 contains proposals for PMV. Some of these proposals do not exist in fixed signage. We would like PMV to only use panel decors that exist in fixed signage.

**Question 9:**

**School safety**

Special restrictions and regulations in school areas

QUESTION 9 - RESPONSES IN PER CENT			
	YES	MAYBE	NO
A	56	6	38

**Question 10:**

**Speed controls**

- a. Location of a speed control device eg., photo radar
- b. Average speed measurement

QUESTION 10 - RESPONSES IN PER CENT			
	YES	MAYBE	NO
A	93		9
B	79		21

**Question 12:**

**Please specify specific priority areas and/or road signs applicable to low and middle income countries**

- We don't have enough information so we can(not) respond to it now
- I am not an expert of the needs of the LMICs. We need direct input from these countries
- No comments

**Question 13:**

**Please provide any other relevant comments (reproduced below as provided):**

- In the area "Parking" (7) I am supportive of introducing not new signs, but the possibility of combining of existing signs (E, 14) with additional panels, such a H, 7 or panels, indicating paid services, with the location of all information on one sign E, 14. 1.
- a Suggests that the group consider, if possible, similar regulation for the sign or types of signs and for the vehicles entering the zone. It can be questioned what benefit there will be with traffic between countries if the sign is the same, but the traffic rules that follow from the road sign are different between countries. 2a Do we need a common understanding or regulation of what a cycle is by definition? given that countries allow certain electric vehicles to be used as bicycles 2b Suggests that the group consider the difference between sharing the road between cyclists and cars when there is no cycle path and the examples of bicyclestreets or similar or rules and signs that make it possible to cycle in the both direction when the motorised traffic only can drive in one direction. 2c Suggests that the group also consider infrastructure requirements in order to signpost such a crossing. 2d Very hesitant to consider such possibilities without further investigation of how other traffic rules in these intersection situations may be affected. Do we really want to place the obligation and responsibility for cycling at a red light on children and a group roadusers that lacks education. What consequences will it have? Is there a risk that others will also drive at a red light and what will apply to different mopeds? 3a Suggests that the group also consider other possible requirements, (such as roadmarkings, certain infrastructure etc) in order to signpost such a crossing. 3b Suggests that the group also consider to suggest general common traffic rules for such a zone. It can be questioned what benefit there will be with traffic between countries if the sign is the same, but the traffic rules that follow from the road sign are different between countries. 3c Advice should be given on the circumstances under which the sign does not need to be set up. 4a Suggests that the group also consider directionsigns for such a place as well as signage and eventual chargingrules or rules for lineup at the place. 4b Suggest that the group takes into account that there in countries can be differences in conditions between public and private parking which may be important for how electric or other alternative fuel vehicles or charging points can be restricted and/or be preferentially treated and signposted. 6a Cant really see a reason or a need for specific signs or signposting connected to platooning. Suggests that the group also look into what different signs and other devices that are used temporarily eg during road works to give directions in traffic to road users. Can have serious impact on systems in automated vehicles if it differs between countries. 10a Suggests that the group also look into the possibility to have the same sign or symbol for different monitoring of traffic rules.
- Reference is made to the main purpose of a simplification of road signs and signals already provided for in the Convention. Road signs and signals must therefore have a traffic purpose when they are introduced as new road signs and signals in the Convention. There must be consistency between the Convention on Road Traffic (Traffic Act) and the Convention on Road Signs and Signals, so that there is no different understanding between road signs and the Traffic Act. The purpose of introducing proposals for new road signs and signals should always be described in detail. Denmark gives high priority to driving with zero-emission cars together with special environmental zones and limiting noise from vehicles. Electric charging stations are another high priority in Denmark, where road signs symbols for both reservation of parking and only parking for charging should be introduced jointly in the



---

convention for road signs and signals. In addition, the mode of transport is greatly promoted by more cycling in Denmark.

- Other important signs that are not included are e.g. toll/payroad signs. We could have need for a warning of longitudinal ruts. This survey could have had examples of the RMSS where CPs included their existing non-conventional signs just to give more possibilities to think about these needs.
- In LXB we notice an upcoming problem with the signal C,2 - municipalities using it to create some kind of private areas where only residents and their suppliers can enter in order to avoid traffic in residential areas
- We should additionally focus on temporary traffic management and automated weight control.
- It would be interesting to be able to work on: - road marking - illuminated road markings - pedestrian lights - signage for lanes reserved for certain categories of vehicles or users, in particular lanes reserved for carpooling, public transport and low emission vehicles - signage for free-flow freeways - signs for roads with "unmarked center lanes", where cyclists ride on the paved shoulder, and vehicles must back up to the shoulder to pass each other - limited traffic zone signage
- In Germany, roads are to be marked in a way to enable road users to draw conclusions regarding the behaviour expected of them based on the nature of the road markings (principle of recognizable and self-explaining roads). To help distinguishing between different categories of roads, double centreline markings, including broken double markings, are to be used on some supra-regional roads. The Vienna Convention on Road Traffic Signs of 1968 governs double broken lines in Chapter IV Article 26, paragraph 2 (c), which reads: "Double broken lines may be used to delineate a lane or lanes in which the direction of the traffic flow may be reversed in conformity with Article 23, paragraph 11, of this convention." The article referenced (Article 23, paragraph 11) concerns lanes with lane control signals that facilitate reversing the direction of traffic flow. Germany would like to inquire whether the provision in Chapter IV Article 26, Paragraph 2 (c) (double broken lines) can also be expanded to other cases, or rather, whether the restriction to Article 23, paragraph 11 can be waived entirely?

#### **Question 14:**

**16 respondents**

---