



Brussels, 15-07-2008
D(2008) 5987

Opinion

Title **Impact Assessment on: Measures to accelerate the deployment of Intelligent Transport Systems (ITS) for Road and their Interconnections with Other Modes of Transport**

(draft version of 11 June 2008)

Lead DG **DG TREN**

1) Impact Assessment Board Opinion

(A) Context

The Commission has supported several R&D projects in the field of Intelligent Transport Systems (ITS) since 1988. An Action Plan was announced in the Mid-term review of the European Commission's 2001 White Paper on Transport Policy. As other modes already have similar initiatives, such as the Single European Sky ATM Research (SESAR) for air, the European Rail Traffic Management System (ERTMS) for rail and River Information Services (RIS) for inland waterway transport, the current proposal focuses on Road Transport Systems and its interfaces with other transport modes. It is foreseen to be launched almost simultaneously with the adoption of the Greening Transport Package which includes proposals for a revised Eurovignette Directive and a Strategy to Internalise the External Costs of Transport.

(B) Positive aspects

Substantial preparatory work has been carried out, including the use of external expertise.

(C) Main recommendations for improvements

The recommendations below are listed in order of descending importance. Some more technical comments will be transmitted directly to the author DG and are expected to be incorporated in the final version of the report.

General recommendation: The IA report should better explain the nature of the problems to be addressed, clearly separating those that require a policy response at the national level from those that can be better tackled at the EU level. For instance, this choice may be different for interoperability as compared to personal safety features. Subsequently, the presentation of the specific objectives and the content of the policy options need to be more closely and clearly linked to the reworked

problems and the link with other EU policies such as internalisation of external transport cost needs to be reinforced. The description and analysis of the policy options needs to be significantly improved, in particular as regards the choice of areas and criteria applied, as well as a comparison of the expected benefits and implementing costs including the synergies and trade-offs within the policy options. The exact nature of the ITS Committee proposed in Option B++ needs to be clarified, in particular if it is considered to give the Commission wide-ranging harmonisation or standardisation powers in this field. The limitations of using the assessment tool TRANSTOOLS should be clearly indicated.

During the meeting DG TREN agreed to revise the IA report on this basis. Given the nature of these recommendations and the need for substantial restructuring, the Board considers that additional work in the Inter-Service Steering Group would be beneficial before the Board examines and issues an opinion on a revised version of the report.

(1) The report should better explain the nature of the problems and their drivers, identifying those which require EU-intervention (e.g. market or regulatory failures that cannot be addressed by Member States individually, such as lack of coordination, cross-border issues). The report should also distinguish between interoperability and personal safety issues. With regard to the core problems of ITS deployment, the report should explain more systematically why the uptake of ITS is found to be "slow, unfocussed and fragmented", corroborated with evidence for specific examples while taking due account of autonomous market developments and existing measures. The objectives need to be made much more specific and linked to the reworked problem definition. The number of objectives should be limited and very general objectives relating to EU policies (e.g. improving the competitiveness of industry) should be avoided.

(2) The nature of the responsibilities and powers of the Committee foreseen in option B++ should be clarified. The report should also clarify the link between this Committee and the existing Toll Committee. The report needs to include at least an indicative assessment of the costs and benefits of the type of measures that could be decided through the proposed Committee or through the Standardisation bodies. The IA should recognise that the costs and benefits resulting from standardisation measures can be substantial, and state clearly that such measures will be subject to individual impact assessments as needed.

(3) The analysis of the policy options needs to be improved on a number of key points. The report should consider the use of assessment tools related to the problem definition that could better analyse the direct impacts of the actions at hand such as the take-up of ITS tools. The TRANSTOOLS model seems less appropriate considering that the proposed initiative aims to create platforms and facilitate further measures, and will not in itself have a direct impact on achieving for instance environmental and safety objectives. These wider societal impacts should be described in the IA report, including the impacts on specific vulnerable groups such as disabled people's access to transport, but the report should avoid overstating these at a stage when the specific follow-up measures are not yet known.

(4) The content of the policy options needs to be clarified and clearly linked to problem aspects and objectives. The report has to clearly state which selected areas are included in each option and which criteria have been used to identify these areas and

allocate them to different options, taking into consideration the different level of development of the specific areas/actions. For instance, the report should explain whether e-Call is also included in Option B and B+, and if not why not.

(D) Procedure and presentation

The IA report should state which kind of analysis will be carried out for concrete measures to be implemented in further steps. It should also explicitly state whether the Commission's minimum standards for stakeholder consultation have been met and provide more information on the representativeness of the stakeholders consulted.

2) IAB scrutiny process

Reference number	2008/TREN/035
Author DG	DG-TREN
External expertise used	No
Date of Board Meeting	9 July 2008
Date of adoption of Opinion	15-07-2008