



Brussels, 08 SEP. 2008  
D(2008) 7127

## 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 30 July 2008 – RESUBMISSION)**

**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 transport modes already have similar initiatives, the current proposal focuses on Road Transport Systems and its interfaces with other modes.

#### **(B) Positive aspects**

As compared to the previous version, the structure of the report has been improved. The impact assessment has been amended to partly reflect the recommendations contained in the Board's first opinion.

#### **(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 report could be further strengthened by corroborating with evidence that the drivers are hindering the uptake of each application area requiring EU action. There is a need to clarify throughout the report the link between the priorities, application areas and instruments presented. The report should provide additional information on the implementing costs, and better explain how the scenarios run with TRANSTOOLS have been used in the analysis of the policy options.

**(1) The problem definition should be strengthened further by corroborating with**

evidence that the problem drivers are hindering the uptake of each application area. While the problem drivers hindering ITS take-up have been improved and are now presented in a structured way, the report should better specify which application areas are affected by which driver and provide concrete additional evidence on how the take-up in each application area is hindered (this information is partly provided in subsequent sections).

**(2) The report needs to be made more consistent on the identification of priorities, application areas and instruments.** The links between the "priorities" pointed to by stakeholders in the interviews (section 1.2.4), the "priority application domains" and "proposed dedicated measures" resulting from the workshops (section 1.2.4) and the "priority action areas" presented in section 4.2 need to be made clearer. Also the link between those priorities and the policies and application areas presented in section 2.1.2 has to be better explained.

**(3) The analysis of the policy options needs to be further improved.** As already requested in the first opinion, the report should include at least an indicative assessment of the costs and benefits related to the type of measures that could be decided through the proposed Committee or through the Standardisation bodies, or indicate why this cannot be done at this stage. In particular, the report should avoid the risk of overestimating the positive impacts due to a lack of information on the implementing costs. Finally, the report should explain to what extent the TRANSTOOLS model scenarios (mentioned in section 5.1.2) correspond to the policy options and what level of ITS take up are assumed in the various scenarios, or consider whether other assessment tools that could better analyse the direct impacts of the actions should be used.

#### **(D) Procedure and presentation**

It appears that all necessary procedural elements have been complied with. The structure of the IA report has been improved. The executive summary should reflect the main impacts of the policy options.

The Board observes that in line with the recommendations in its previous Opinion, there has been an additional meeting with the Inter-service Group on 23 July 2008. The report should mention which services participated in the meeting.

## **2) IAB scrutiny process**

|                             |                     |
|-----------------------------|---------------------|
| Reference number            | 2008/TREN/035       |
| Author DG                   | DG-TREN             |
| External expertise used     | No                  |
| Date of Board Meeting       | Written procedure   |
| Date of adoption of Opinion | <b>08 SEP. 2008</b> |