



COMMISSION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES

Brussels, xxx
SEC(2008) 352

AVIS DU COMITÉ DES ÉVALUATIONS D'IMPACT

Proposition de

DIRECTIVE DU PARLEMENT EUROPEEN ET DU CONSEIL

**Pour faciliter les poursuites transfrontalières dans le domaine
de la sécurité routière**

{COM(2008) 151}
{SEC(2008) 350}
{SEC(2008) 351}



Brussels, 7 May 2007
D(2007) 4081

Opinion

Title **Impact Assessment on: Road safety enforcement**

(draft version of 16 April 2007)

Lead DG **DG TREN**

1) Impact Assessment Board Opinion

(A) Context

The 2001 White Paper on European transport policy proposed that the EU sets itself the target of halving the number of road deaths by 2010. This was repeated in the 2003 road safety action programme, and endorsed by Council and Parliament. The 2006 mid-term review of the action plan made it clear that if the current trend continues, the target of 50% would not be met and the reduction would only be 40%.

(B) Positive aspects

The IA report offers quantified assessment of some of the costs and benefits associated with each option, while indicating clearly the assumptions made and the associated uncertainty intervals.

(C) Main recommendations for improvements

The recommendations below are listed in order of descending importance. Some more technical comments have been transmitted directly to the author DG.

General recommendation: The IA report needs to more clearly distinguish between the two different issues the initiative is addressing (cross-border enforcement and enforcement standards), and to further specify and elaborate the policy options and concrete measures that are being considered.

(1) The IA report should clearly distinguish between the two different issues it is addressing: improved cross border enforcement and harmonised enforcement standards. The relative importance of each for preventing road deaths should be clearly outlined, as well as differences between the two issues in terms of problem definition, EU added value, proportionality and subsidiarity. Furthermore the IA report should clarify how and

to what extent the two issues are linked, for instance the costs and other (efficiency) concerns associated with two parallel enforcement systems (national and cross-border).

(2) The IA report should contain more information on the enforcement standards envisaged. The projected benefits in terms of road deaths avoided seem to suggest that the envisaged level of enforcement standards will be higher than the current EU average, but this should be made explicit. The IA report should also give a better feel of how the impacts will differ from one Member State to the other, without having to give a complete overview of all EU-27.

(3) The policy options should be further clarified. For options 1-4 (on improved cross-border enforcement) the IA report should clearly explain which elements within these options will require legislative action. Only one option (option 5) currently involves harmonised enforcement standards, but this option could identify and examine further sub-options depending on the implementing measures envisaged. Furthermore the IA report should make it clear whether this harmonisation option also fully includes option 4, and if so, the assessment of the impact of option 4 as an element of option 5 should be more clearly indicated.

(4) The IA report should further comment on the scope. The initiative is currently limited to the three offences that are found to be the main 'killers' on the road. The IA report should comment more on whether other traffic offences have been considered to be brought in the scope of this initiative, and on whether the scope could be expanded in the future, especially as this latter option has been suggested by some stakeholders.

(D) Procedure and presentation

It appears that all necessary procedural elements have been complied with, but the IA report should state clearly that DG TREN takes full ownership of the report including the elements that were prepared originally by the outside consultant.

2) IAB scrutiny process

Reference number	2006/TREN/002, CLWP 2007 (priority initiative)
Author DG	TREN-E-3
External expertise used	No
Date of Board Meeting	2 May 2007
Date of adoption of Opinion	7 May 2007