



EUROPEAN COMMISSION  
IMPACT ASSESSMENT BOARD

Brussels,  
D(2011)

## Opinion

**Title**

**Impact Assessment on regulatory proposals on roadworthiness tests for motor vehicles and their trailers, and on the technical roadside inspection of the roadworthiness of commercial vehicles**

**(draft of 18 June 2011)**

**(A) Context**

The EU legislation concerning Periodic Technical Inspection (PTI) dates from 1977 and is based mainly on Directive 2009/40/EC, which mandates Member States to carry out periodic safety and emission inspections for certain types of motor vehicles. It sets minimum requirements for those inspections and their intervals and is complemented by legislation on roadside inspections to control the technical state of commercial vehicles in between periodic inspections. Directive 2009/40/EC allows Member States to apply higher standards for PTI (on testing frequency, inspected items, vehicle types covered etc.). Directive 2000/30/EC on roadside inspections only demands visual inspection of commercial vehicles, but it allows Member States to "carry out inspections not covered by this Directive or to check other aspects of road transport". Policy orientations on road safety adopted in 2010 announced the target to reduce road fatalities by 50% between 2010 and 2020. Harmonising and strengthening EU legislation on roadworthiness tests and on technical roadside inspections and considering ways to harmonise and to exchange vehicle data (type approval, registration, results of inspections, etc.) aim to contribute to the realisation of this target.

**(B) Overall assessment**

**Although the report gives a clear and comprehensive overview of the issues in relation to roadworthiness testing it should be improved on a number of points. Firstly, the report should better present the evidence for the link between higher roadworthiness requirements and improvement of road safety. Secondly, the report should strengthen the subsidiarity argument and explain why important aspects of the problem cannot be addressed at Member State level. Thirdly, it should improve the presentation of compliance costs for vehicle owners. Finally, the report should provide greater transparency on the assumptions underlying the presented quantitative estimates.**

### **(C) Main recommendations for improvement**

**(1) Provide more evidence on the link between higher roadworthiness requirements and improvement of road safety.** The report should clarify to what extent the higher standards as applied in a majority of Member States can be shown to have resulted in a lower incidence of roadworthiness-related accidents. On this basis, it would have to show whether the evidence supports the argument that current European legislation provides an adequate minimum standard. The report should better explain the link between the objectives of this initiative and the achievement of targets announced in the Communication "Towards a European road safety area (2011-2020)". The report should also better indicate the relative importance of the absence of a central database in comparison with the other identified problem drivers as a basis for the justification later on in the report for the need for an "optimal data exchange system".

**(2) Strengthen the subsidiarity argument.** The report needs to indicate more explicitly which aspects of roadworthiness testing are currently within Member States' competence, and where extension of EU competences is foreseen. On that basis, evidence should be provided to show that the underlying problem cannot be adequately addressed at Member State level. The report should strengthen the internal market argument by addressing the trends in cross border vehicle movements and re-registration. It should explicitly assess the proportionality of the options presented. The report should indicate which aspects that would be relevant for the effectiveness and efficiency of roadworthiness testing cannot be addressed at EU level but would require action by Member States. Finally, the reasons for preferring policy option 3b should be presented more explicitly.

**(3) Improve the presentation of compliance costs for vehicle owners and better assess certain impacts.** The report should better assess compliance costs associated with the different policy options for vehicle owners and operators. It should especially assess the consequences for SMEs who operate vehicles, and particularly for micro-enterprises. The report should explain to what extent the options will positively affect competition in the internal market. Other impacts on citizens, such as impacts on other road-users and vehicle noise related to mechanical defects should also be assessed.

**(4) Provide greater transparency on the assumptions underlying the presented quantitative estimates.** The report should explain the most important assumptions and limitations of the cost-benefit analysis in the main text. It should explore the ensuing uncertainties through sensitivity analysis of the presented quantitative estimates. The estimates for accident/fatality reduction, the monetised social benefits and the cost per unit in EUR for saved lives, avoided serious injuries and slight injuries should be described in greater detail. Finally, the report should explain the methodology used to calculate the average annual cost of testing per vehicle owner.

*Some more technical comments have been transmitted directly to the author DG and are expected to be incorporated in the final version of the impact assessment report.*

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

The report should more clearly present stakeholder views on the different options throughout the main text, particularly the views of those with reservations about this proposal or those who have expressed opposition. Options 3a - c should be summarized individually in the final section. The executive summary should be completed by providing succinct descriptions of the baseline (in the problem section), of the main characteristics of the options, and providing a brief overview of the relative importance of the main categories of costs and benefits in the aggregate figures in Table 2.

|                                 |  |
|---------------------------------|--|
| <b>(E) IAB scrutiny process</b> |  |
|---------------------------------|--|

|                  |               |
|------------------|---------------|
| Reference number | 2010/MOVE/014 |
|------------------|---------------|

|                         |    |
|-------------------------|----|
| External expertise used | No |
|-------------------------|----|

|                       |                   |
|-----------------------|-------------------|
| Date of Board Meeting | Written procedure |
|-----------------------|-------------------|