Evaluation of ITS Directive 2010/40/EU

Achilleas Tsamis, Marius Biedka, Edina Löhr, Ian Skinner

Stakeholder Workshop
23 04 2018

Disclaimer

- This presentation presents draft conclusions/recommendations. Any views expressed are preliminary views and may not in any circumstances be regarded as stating an official position of Ricardo Energy & Environment or the Commission.

Interactive session

- Following this presentation an interactive session was held during the workshop where each participant was given the opportunity to allocate up to four votes on recommendations they supported (indicated as +1) and a maximum of two votes on recommendations they did not support or felt was unclear (indicated as -1).

- The results of the voting are shown in this presentation

Agenda

- Recommendations given under the following themes:

  - **General recommendations**

  - Strengthening the effectiveness

  - Improve reporting and knowledge base

  - Increase coherence

  - Governance structures

General recommendations

- The general objectives of the Directive are still relevant today and the same applies to the Delegated acts.

- Withdrawal from the Directive would be expected to slow down ITS deployment in the future and increase the risk of divergence and fragmentation.

Recommendation 1 – Maintain the Directive and the Delegated Acts as they are still relevant. **+15**, **-2**

Agenda

- General recommendations

- Strengthening the effectiveness

- Improve reporting and knowledge base

- Increase coherence

- Governance structures

Recommendations

Strengthening the effectiveness of the policy framework

Conclusion - Significant increase in development of ITS infrastructure, but limited deployment of ITS services

- Due to a lack of strong business case and limited financial resources at national level.

- Greater focus on support measures for deployment of services needed.

> **Recommendation 2 –** Future support from CEF beyond pilot stage to help demonstrate a business case for broader deployment of cross-border ITS. **+19**, **-1**

Conclusion – 10 years since Action Plan was released, so time to review to include developments in technology and emerging needs.

- Analysis shows that mechanisms are working, but too early to see impacts.

> **Recommendation 3** – Update Action Plan and create a more comprehensive ITS deployment strategy to complement the Directive. **+3**

> **Recommendation 4** – Include specific targets for deployment at EU and possibly national level, with timelines. **+3**, **-5**

Recommendations

Strengthening the effectiveness of the policy framework

Conclusion – The objectives of the Directive and Action plan provide a framework for subsequent action.

Recommendation 5 – Add as an explicit objective of the Directive to cover C-ITS
- Include reference to ensuring security, and aim of cooperative, connected and automated mobility **+7**, **-1**

Recommendation 6 – Add an objective that makes explicit reference to all modes of transport and roads, particularly in urban areas.
- No specific objective refers to all modes currently
- Could underline that ITS should support the delivery of integrated, sustainable, low carbon mobility **+3**, **-2**

Recommendations

Strengthening the effectiveness of the policy framework

Conclusion – Priority Areas and Actions have led to high levels of deployment in those areas.

- Success is driven by explicit identification of importance, so expanding the scope of priority actions could be valuable.

Recommendation 7 – Revise scope of existing priority areas/actions, to add support in areas where least progress is made/most support is required to address emerging trends. **+6**, **-2**

Conclusion – ITS technology is evolving, and it is important the Directive supports appropriate ITS and addresses relevant issues.

Recommendation 8 – Consider defining additional priority areas/actions to ensure Directive remains up-to-date, effective and future proof.
- Potential candidates from autonomous vehicles, urban ITS and data protection and security. **+4**, **-5**

Recommendations

Strengthening the effectiveness of the policy framework

Conclusion – Action at international level through UN ECE and ICO helps reach greater harmonisation and interoperability at global scale.

- EU already has leading role in both organisations.

Recommendation 9 – Maintain and strengthen role of EU in international bodies, with the objective of ensuring compatibility of solutions internationally. **+4**, **-3**

Agenda

- General recommendations

- Strengthening the effectiveness

- Improve reporting and knowledge base

- Increase coherence

- Governance structures

Recommendations

Improve reporting and knowledge base

Conclusion – Analysis of national reports shows Member States struggled to provide KPIs in a consistent and comprehensive way.

Recommendation 10 – Better guidance on calculating KPIs following a comprehensive discussion on feasibility of data collection required and improvements to methodology. **+2**

i.   Deployment KPIs – Focus on reporting some key ITS services common across Member States and improved methodology for calculation of nation-wide deployment percentages. **+2**, **-1**

ii. Benefit KPIs – More detailed description of methodology for assessing benefits, complemented with best practices and knowledge sharing activities across Member States. **+ 7**

iii. Financial KPIs – EU level guidance on collecting financial KPIs, potentially using a template which precisely explains the description required. **0**

Recommendations

Improve reporting and knowledge base

Conclusion – Use of reporting structure voluntary, so some Member States use their own format.

- Makes comparison difficult, and hard to identify gaps.

Recommendation 11 – Report structure to be mandatory, to improve comparability and help assess completeness and quality of data. **+4, -5**

Recommendation 12 – Network effect of ITS means significant benefits only develop when deployed in large numbers, so benefit KPIs only need to be reported after deployment has picked up. **-6**

Conclusion – National reports do not clearly explain national ITS strategy, relevant priorities and progress made.

Recommendation 13 – Include a section on national strategy to inform EU-level strategy. **+5**

Recommendations

Improve reporting and knowledge base

Conclusion – Reporting on the Directive and Delegated Acts are not aligned, with different frequencies and deadlines.

- This increases administrative burden, and streamlining would minimise costs.

> **Recommendation 14** – Streamlining the reporting process for Directive and Delegated Acts.
> - One option would be to align report timings for all priority actions, so Member States could report in one annual report with the same structure. **+11**

Conclusion – Limited visibility of activities performed by national authorities, despite national reports.

- Reports are often long and not user friendly, so useful information is lost.

> **Recommendation 15** – Develop a dedicated website to present progress made by priority area, possibly through ITS Observatory or TRIMIS. **+14**

> **Recommendation 16** – Once reporting on KPIs is streamlined, a scoreboard on deployment statistics can be developed. **+2**

Recommendations

Improve reporting and knowledge base

Conclusion – Limited information on cost for development of ITS, that could be brought together in systemic and comprehensive manner.

- Relevant information in support studies for Delegated Acts, and through EU funded projects.

Recommendation 17 – Development of portal similar to the U.S. DOT ITS Knowledge Resources portal, where datasets on costs and benefits are consolidated.
- Cost-benefit analysis for such a portal would be needed, and possibility of integration with existing information portals. **-7**

Agenda

- General recommendations

- Strengthening the effectiveness

- Improve reporting and knowledge base

- Governance structures

- Increase coherence

Recommendations

Governance structures

Conclusion – ITS Committee has fulfilled function as mechanism for cooperation and coordination among Member States.

- However, not as clear for ITS Advisory Group, which some consider as a tool to inform industry of planned activities, rather than providing guidance.

- Friends of ITS informal meetings intended to encourage cooperation, but not clear if this has been effective.

Recommendation 18 – Revamp ITS Advisory Group with more clear definition of intended role, and possible increased role in definition of objectives and priorities. **+8**

Agenda

- General recommendations

- Strengthening the effectiveness

- Improve reporting and knowledge base

- Governance structures

- Increase coherence

Recommendations

Increase coherence

Conclusion – No specific issues, with strategic EU policy documents evolving in their references to ITS and C-ITS.

Recommendation 19 – Review of General Vehicle Safety Regulation to identify if there is an argument for mandatory inclusion of C-ITS applications in new vehicles. **+13, -2**

Recommendation 20 – Consider amending roadworthiness testing Directive to ensure assessment of ITS applications during periodic test. **+6, -1**

Recommendation 21 – Review implications of GDPR and e-privacy Regulation for C-ITS. **+21, -1**

Recommendation 22 – Use of other instruments to increase demand for ITS, such as public procurement.
• Include relevant ITS criteria in procurement processes for road transport. **+2, -7**

Recommendation 23 – Use common definitions across Directive and Delegated Acts to improve clarity and consistency. **+26**

Questions/Comments?

Next steps

Today's workshop

- Written feedback to the analysis/findings to be provided by 4th of May

Remainder of project

- Study team is available for further discussion if stakeholders are interested
  - Interviews to be conducted by 4th of May
  - Further questions to: ITS.evaluation@ricardo.com

Achilleas Tsamis, Marius Biedka, Edina Löhr, Ian Skinner (TEPR)
Ricardo Energy & Environment Ltd
30 Eastbourne Terrace
London W2 6LA
United Kingdom

ITS.evaluation@ricardo.com