




---

**Economic Commission for Europe**
**Inland Transport Committee**
**Working Party on Transport Trends and Economics**
**Group of Experts on cycling infrastructure module**
**Second session**

Geneva, 28 and 29 November 2022

**Report of the Group of Experts on cycling infrastructure  
 module at its second session**
**Contents**

	<i>Paragraphs</i>	<i>Page</i>
I. Attendance.....	1–3	2
II. Adoption of the agenda (agenda item 1) .....	4	2
III. United Nations Economic Commission for Europe cycling network (agenda item 2)	5–15	2
IV. Cycling infrastructure definitions and standards (agenda item 3) .....	16–28	3
V. Other business (agenda item 4) .....	29–30	5
VI. Date and place of next meeting (agenda item 5) .....	31–32	5
VII. Summary of main decisions (agenda item 6) .....	33	5



## **I. Attendance**

1. The Group of Experts on Cycling Infrastructure Module (hereafter called GE.5) held its second session on 28 and 29 November 2022. The session was chaired by Mr. G. Steklacic (Slovenia) and held as a hybrid meeting with virtual participation through zoom platform and in-person participation.
2. Representatives of the following United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (ECE) member States participated: Armenia, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Russian Federation, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland and United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.
3. The following non-governmental organizations were represented: Bike in time (Romania); European Cyclists' Federation (ECF); The Energy Efficiency and Environment Protection Association (Enverçevko) and World Bicycle Industry Association (WBIA).

## **II. Adoption of the agenda (agenda item 1)**

*Documentation:* ECE/TRANS/WP.5/GE.5/2

4. GE.5 adopted the agenda for the second session as contained in ECE/TRANS/WP.5/GE.5/2.

## **III. United Nations Economic Commission for Europe cycling network (agenda item 2)**

*Documentation:* Informal documents Nos. 1 and 2

5. GE.5 reviewed data on national cycling infrastructure in the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (ECE) countries as they had been made available in ECE-led International Transport Infrastructure Observatory (ITIO) Geographic Information System (GIS) platform. It welcomed the availability of data from Israel on the platform.
6. It then renewed its request to Germany to provide its cycling network data for incorporation into ECE ITIO. The invitation was also extended to other countries which own data on their cycling networks to send their data to the secretariat before the end of February 2023. The secretariat was requested to work with the countries focal points to have more cycling network data included on the ITIO platform.
7. GE.5 took note with appreciation on the progress made by Spain in implementing its national cycling strategy and in particular on the advances reported in designating national cycling network as per national guidance. It welcomed the fact that Spain should be in position to approve its national cycling network in January 2023 and thus be able to submit network data to the secretariat before the end of February 2023.
8. GE.5 also considered the outcomes of a European project on data usage presented by the Netherlands. The project suggests that decisions on cycling should be information driven deduced from data collection and analysis. Thus, data should be guiding policy choices. At the same time, it was acknowledged that creating meaning from the cycling data might be challenging at times.
9. ECF briefed GE.5 about the new developments concerning EuroVelo network. It included information about the celebration on 21 November 2022 of the 25th anniversary of EuroVelo, the largest cycle route network in the world, as well as on GPX tracks available to download on EuroVelo.com since July 2022. New data from the EuroVelo Data Hub are also available with 64 per cent of the network being ready to cycle in 2021 and an increase in usage of 11 per cent of bike counts from January to October 2022 compared to 2019. For the future, the World Tourism Organisation and ECF are looking for sponsors to launch a new study on cycling tourism and EuroVelo in Europe.
10. GE.5 discussed then Informal document No.1 which contains a draft guidance for the designation of national cycling network. The draft guidance was developed by the secretariat

further to the request made by GE.5 at the first session. It was elaborated based on the Guidelines to Define National Cycle Route Network prepared in the framework of the Danube Cycle Plans Project and other available materials. GE.5 agreed to indicate in the guidance to take into account all pre-existing networks and not only networks at the municipal and regional level as backbone. GE.5 also agreed to elaborate further on the differences in objectives between either advanced and vulnerable or leisure and daily commuting cyclists, as they may impact the design of cycle route networks, for which reason at some sections two separate cycling routes might need to be planned.

11. GE.5 agreed with the proposed eight steps for designating the cycling network. It requested that Step 1 also suggests setting up cooperation between different stakeholder groups to be involved in the subsequent steps for designating the network. Step 3 should make a more clear reference to data collection and analysis. In Step 7, benefits from cycling should be mentioned so as to assist in building the case for ensuring financing for the network implementation. The elaboration would in particular be helpful for countries which have not taken a firm decision on promotion of cycling for personal mobility.

12. GE.5 requested that experts send to the secretariat any additional comments in writing before the end of 2022.

13. GE.5 also considered Informal document No.2, which reviews several international methodologies/standards on cycle route parameters as well as discusses several approaches to classification of users and routes. GE.5 agreed on four key parameters to be considered for determining a relevant type of infrastructure. These are: volume of motorized traffic (i.e., number of vehicles per day) (including share of heavy traffic), volume of cycle traffic (i.e., number of cyclists per day), speed limit/observed speed of motorized traffic and width of the infrastructure. These four parameters should be supported by parameters defining quality of the infrastructure and affecting comfort and safety of cyclists using the infrastructure. The secretariat and ECF were requested to reorganize the parameters accordingly.

14. With regard to user classification, GE.5 agreed on three groups of user categories. The first group would encompass everyday cyclists for which minimum acceptable infrastructure parameter values should be set. The second group would refer to attentive cyclists. The third group would encompass special cyclists (e.g., carrier cyclists or vulnerable cyclists). For the groups two and three enhanced values should be recommended. GE.5 would further consider how best to name each of the groups.

15. GE.5 requested the secretariat and ECF to prepare tables with parameters value propositions differentiated for the three user categories for each of the agreed types of infrastructure for consideration at the next session. This document in its first section should consolidate information on the parameters and user categories.

#### **IV. Cycling infrastructure definitions and standards (agenda item 3)**

*Documentation:* Informal documents Nos. 3 and 4

16. GE.5 continued to review the common definitions for various types of cycling infrastructure as contained in ECE/TRANS/WP.5/2021/6 starting from the definition of grade-separated cycle crossing and made the following recommendations:

- Advanced stop line/bike box/bike lock and indirect/hook/two-stage turn provision, are important pieces of infrastructure for cyclists and should be commonly defined. They should also be signposted and marked in a harmonized way. Advice on sign designs and markings should therefore be sought from the Group of Experts on Road Signs and Signals. The GE.5 secretariat was requested to communicate with the secretariat of the sister group of experts.
- Application of traffic-light exemption for cyclists requires more discussion and presentation of evidence from the countries which use this type of infrastructure that it does not compromise safety for any road user and in particular for cyclists.

Countries with experience on using this type of infrastructure were requested to share them at the next session.

- Wayfinding does not require a common definition.
- More consideration should be given to the definition of cycle highway. Countries should be requested to share their own definitions for this type of infrastructure. Countries were also requested to share their experience with using such type of infrastructure.

17. GE.5 discussed then Informal document No.3 which contains considerations and proposal on cycle definitions and on existing provisions for markings and traffic light signals relevant to cyclists.

18. GE.5 considered the proposed modification of the cycle definitions and the differentiation between cycle, speed cycle and carrier cycle. It discussed on speed and width as key parameters for possible classification of types of cycles. GE.5 agreed that more discussion is necessary and that an important input to this discussion would be collection of different definitions developed in countries. To this end, the secretariat was requested to collect and consolidate these definitions from countries. Also, industry should be requested to provide its further views in this regard.

19. Concerning the traffic light signals provisions as stipulated in the 1968 Convention on Road Signs and Signals, GE.5 agreed that the options provided in the provisions for restricting traffic light signals for cyclists do not cover the option of using the signals with symbols of cycle of red, amber and green colour on a black background. GE.5 also agreed that such an option appears to be the most suitable and legible one for restricting the traffic light signals to cyclists only. To this end, GE.5 agreed with making a proposal for modification to paragraph 13 of Article 23.

20. GE.5 also agreed that it would be desirable for Article 23, paragraph 13 to cover directional light signals for cyclists in an explicit way as well as detection of cyclist light signal. To this end, it agreed with making a proposal for additions to paragraph 13 (as paragraph 13a and 13b) on directional light signals for cyclists and detection of cyclist light signals.

21. GE.5 also agreed that it would be useful if the Convention did not exclude a possibility for a common cycle and pedestrian traffic light signal, to which end it agreed with making a proposal for modifications to Article 24.

22. GE.5 requested the secretariat to prepare an official document with the agreed proposals to be made for modifications to Articles 23 and 24 of the 1968 Convention on Road Signs and Signals.

23. Concerning markings and road signs for indicating lane preselection, GE.5 considered the proposals for modifications to the 1968 Convention on Road Signs and Signals and agreed to seek the opinion of the Group of Experts on Road Signs and Signals on the sign and markings proposed. It requested the secretariat to communicate with the secretariat of the sister group of experts.

24. GE.5 agreed then to consider proposals for specific modification to the 1968 Convention on Road Signs and Signals in case such may be desirable in view of the prepared common definitions for types of cycle infrastructure. To this end, GE.5 requested the secretariat and ECF to appraise if the accepted definitions would necessitate making proposals for additions or modifications to the provisions of the Convention in addition to those already prepared or considered. The secretariat was requested to present the outcomes of this appraisal at the next session.

25. GE.5 also discussed Informal document No.4 which contains proposals for modified and additional definitions for types of cycling infrastructure.

26. GE.5 welcomed the new proposals for common definitions of cycle track and cycle street with counterflow cycling. GE.5 modified them further by deleting direct symbol references to road signs.

27. GE.5 also reviewed and accepted proposed definitions for advisory cycle lane (with a slight modification), sharrows, 2-1 road and cycle parking. It decided that no specific definition is required for mixed-use zone and that discussion should continue on whether it is necessary to define cycle stands and cycle lockers.

28. GE.5 requested the secretariat to prepare for the next session an official document with all the common definitions for types of cycling infrastructure which have been agreed upon during the first two sessions.

## **V. Other business (agenda item 4)**

29. A representative of THE PEP secretariat informed GE.5 about upcoming activities under THE PEP.

30. The secretariat informed GE.5 on a pledge for funding from the Netherlands in support of GE.5 activities. Such funding could be potentially used to organize a workshop on the designation of national cycling networks for countries lacking experience in this area. GE.5 welcomed this idea and indicated that this could be done back-to-back or in conjunction with one of the forthcoming THE PEP meetings or another relevant event.

## **VI. Date and place of next meeting (agenda item 5)**

31. The secretariat informed GE.5 that its next meeting was scheduled to take place in Geneva on 23 and 24 March 2023.

32. The secretariat also informed that the next session would be organized as in-person meeting since holding of hybrid meetings as of 1 January 2023 would be charged against extrabudgetary funding earmarked for organisation of such meetings and such funding is currently not available for GE.5.

## **VII. Summary of main decisions (agenda item 6)**

33. The secretariat summarized the decisions taken by GE.5. The full report of the session, prepared by the secretariat in consultation with the Vice-Chair, would be shared electronically after the session for adoption.

---