



Response to the European Commission Questionnaire on revision of Community legislation on the recording equipment in road transport (tachographs)

1. Introduction: This document sets out the response of the Road Safety Authority to the European Commission questionnaire on the revision of Community legislation on recording equipment in road transport. The Authority invited a number of organisations to provide their views on the specific questions raised by the Commission questionnaire. These organisations were advised that they could send their views directly to the Commission if that was their preference. Views received from consultees are attached at Appendix I – some organisations responded that they had no comments to offer.
2. RSA Response to the European Commission questionnaire

Question 1

Is it important that equipment of different manufacturers functions in exactly the same way? Or should legislation focus on essential requirements and give manufacturers more freedom to develop solutions and improve the equipment?

Yes – from an enforcement, operator and driver perspective – the equipment should function in exactly the same way irrespective of manufacturer and model.

Enforcement personnel, operators and drivers, deal with different kinds of tachographs on a daily basis. Different functionality and menu options on tachographs can cause confusion, delay and it may be hindering compliance and causing frustration amongst drivers and operators. Design, function menus and user instructions should be similar across all of the range of analogue and digital tachographs. From an operator and enforcement perspective, standardised tachograph systems would reduce costs for operators in relation to the training of drivers, enhance operational experience and contribute towards improvement of compliance.

We would encourage the different tachograph manufacturers to put in place standardised and user-friendly tachograph systems. Manufacturers should put in place common interfaces that provide enforcers, drivers and transport undertakings with the same basic information.

Question 2

Should the legislation on the tachograph already foresee the integration of the digital tachograph into an open in-vehicle platform? If so, what other regulatory applications should be integrated in this platform (e.g. e-toll, recorder for accident investigation, e-call, speed control) and why? Would it be interesting for fleet management or other applications related to safety or security of transport, or to law enforcement, to have a real-time "tracking and tracing" function?

From an enforcement and road safety point of view, an integrated system involving the incorporation of GPS, telematics and track and trace information could provide some benefits. On the other hand, such systems may result in extra and increased costs for operators and an assessment would need to be undertaken to establish the costs and benefits of such integrated systems. If integrated systems are developed, it is vital that there is compatibility/interoperability and that system design incorporates sufficient resilience in order that a component breakdown does not impair the total system and, the opportunity for interference is minimised.

Drivers and operators already have a range of different on-board systems in vehicles in relation to vehicle and operational performance – not all of these functions are used or understood by operators and drivers. While integrating the on-board systems may be logical, using the systems in the proper manner requires training and this will inevitably give rise to extra costs for industry.

Insofar as real-time "tracking and tracing" is concerned, an ability to track operators who are deemed high risk either through GPS or other tracking systems would on the face of it provide enforcement personnel with useful information. It is perhaps the case that some tracking and tracing function would be available from a greater deployment of ANPR systems. Tracking and tracing options would enable better targeting of high risk and non-compliant operators by enforcement personnel.

Question 3

Should remote download of the digital tachograph be encouraged? Is a regulatory approach deemed appropriate in order to facilitate widespread introduction?

Remote downloading functions can already be performed by operators and this should be encouraged. A regulatory approach is needed to facilitate widespread use of remote downloading. It is vital that there are secure systems to facilitate the downloading but also that operators have the requisite management arrangements in place to ensure that downloaded data is kept secure and available for inspection by enforcement personnel.

Delays in downloading data from digital tachographs causes frustration and delays for operators particularly if problems arise. Downloading of VU could take up to 2 hours per vehicle on occasions depending on usage (and tachograph type).

The possibility of VU downloads being done remotely while the vehicle is in motion should be explored provided a secure system is in place.

Question 4

What is your practical experience? Are there any obstacles for speedy download of data?

Newer models of digital tachograph have reduced download times but delays still occur. Further product development which improve download speeds will improve operator and driver perception and facilitate quicker enforcement of the digital tachograph.

Question 5

How could the equipment be changed in order to make controls more efficient? Should the mobile control of moving vehicles be envisaged in order to reduce administrative burden for industry and enforcement bodies?

Standardisation of functions, designs, quicker download times, remote downloading options, tracking and tracing would provide benefits for enforcement personnel and operators.

From an enforcement perspective, it is difficult to envisage how mobile control of moving vehicles would be implemented in the absence of a specific proposal and what exactly would be controlled and how this would reduce the administrative burden for industry and enforcement bodies.

Question 6

Is the current security level proportional? Can and should there be other sources of motion? Could the authenticated time/speed/positioning data provided by the future European "GPS" system, Galileo, be used as a second and independent source of motion to ensure security of data?

The extent of digital tachograph manipulation involving various devices and magnets, must not be underestimated. Greater efforts need to be made to prevent manipulation of the system. Enforcers need to be provided with the training, technical capacity and technical resources to detect manipulation devices – manufacturers should be encouraged to assist the enforcement authorities in this regard.

As regards authenticated time/speed/positioning data from a GPS, the Road Safety Authority believes that such information may be useful from an enforcement perspective but an assessment would be necessary as regards the evidential value of such information in the context of court processes.

Question 7

In case a vehicle is only occasionally used in the scope of Regulation (EC) No 561/2006, for example when exceeding from time to time the radius set in some exceptions, should it be possible to use different means of recording activities?

No we do not believe that this is desirable – an operator and driver should use the standard recording equipment and this facilitates enforcement. If alternate recording systems are used, this would give rise to confusion for operators and drivers, make enforcement more difficult, potentially result in abuses, reduce road safety and possibly lead to a reduction of working conditions for drivers.

Question 8

Which option do you prefer? In case you prefer option 2: What are the most important issues for compatibility between a new generation of tachographs and the current digital tachograph, and what other parts of the equipment, apart from driver cards, should be compatible in your view?

The Road Safety Authority believes that the evolution of tachograph technology should be encouraged and particularly in relation to some of the topics referred to earlier regarding standardisation, design, functions. The RSA has already invested significant resources in training and the procurement of download tools including liaison with legal advisors on the preparation of court cases involving digital tachograph evidence. Option 1 (no new generation of tachograph) and Option 3 (new generation without any requirement for compatibility) are not realistic. Option 2 involving newer generation tachograph is to be encouraged; it is essential that all relevant systems be fully compatible/interoperable including downloading systems, tachograph cards and as far as possible calibration arrangements.

Question 9

Should the legislation specify how new equipment has to be introduced in the field? Should a retrofit be possible, mandatory or take place in case of replacement of defective equipment? What are the essential steps for the introduction of new equipment? Should type approval for tachographs fall under the general type approval scheme for vehicles?

As far as the Road Safety Authority is concerned, there is merit in specifying in legislation how changes are to be implemented in the field – it would greatly facilitate enforcers, drivers and operators if there was legal clarity in relation to types of equipment to replace defective systems and the retrofitting of vehicles.

Vehicles should not have to be retrofitted with the latest specification. In circumstances where there is a failure of the system, there would be merit in having the latest generation system installed subject to full compatibility and interoperability. If such interoperability and compatibility is not possible, then the defective system should be replaced with the same component.

Enforcement organisations need to have sufficient time to accommodate training of enforcement personnel in relation to new systems. In addition, manufacturers need to take a more pro-active role in the training of distributors of their recording systems. Too often, distributors and suppliers are only interested in a sale rather than providing customers with

information on how to use the various tools. Recognised trainers should also be given advance training on any new system. Training on the various tachograph including download systems should involve a combination of computer based learning and practical demonstrations.

As regards whether or not type approval of tachographs should fall within the general type approval of vehicles, this particular issue is not directly relevant from an enforcement perspective. We support the concept that whatever option is taken in this regard that tachograph systems need to be type approved and that the equipments and associated components conform with minimum regulatory technical and safety standards.

Question 10

Should it be possible to carry out field tests before type approval is requested, while maintaining the same security standards? How should field test be limited (geographically, number of equipments, duration of the field test, etc.)?

Field tests should be possible and rigorous – manufacturers should have regard to the experience in other comparable applications particularly as regards possible vulnerability to manipulation and this should be part of the type approval process. The type approval process should not be confined to the ability of the system to meet the prescribed regulatory standards but also look at the possibilities for manipulation and how this can be overcome. Alternatively, other on-board systems should be easily accessible to enable enforcement personnel to facilitate the detection of manipulation devices and interference with the digital systems.

Question 11

Which option do you prefer and if you prefer option 2 or 3, for which parts: seals, downloading equipment, control equipment, calibration tools, etc.?

From an enforcement perspective, Option 3 (Community legislation) is preferred. A legal framework for downloading and analyzing equipment e.g. seals, calibration tool, avoids legal challenges.

The RSA is strongly of the view that downloading systems including interrogation software needs to be type approved – or at least accredited by an organisation which has the ability to confirm that the (i) downloading procedure and (ii) software analysis of the data does not interfere with the “raw” data generated by the digital tachograph. In circumstances where there are no printouts, legal advice has been received that it would not be possible to proceed with a prosecution against an operator on the basis of “raw” digital tachograph data. To overcome this problem, legal advice has recommended that the download system would need to be certified and accredited on the same basis as “intoxilyzers” used by police forces to establish the level of alcohol intake by drivers.

Question 12

Is the current way of updating the specifications on the tachograph satisfying? Who should be responsible for the updating of the technical requirements? What is your preferred option?

The RSA believes that the current arrangements involving the Commission and Member States through the comitology procedure is the optimum approach. This should not exclude the possibilities of using CENELEC or other technical bodies concerning certification and accreditation of systems particularly downloading and tachograph data analysis systems

Question 13

What kind of data should be entered manually by the driver? What kind of information should be recorded automatically by the recording equipment? Is it appropriate to record more precisely the location (via GPS or GNSS for example)?

Start and end locations could be input from a GPS system. Information on weekly rest would be useful as additional manual input on the digital tachograph. Manual inputs need to be made easier for the drivers.

Simplifying the pictograms for drivers and operators may be useful.

Question 14

Should the trustworthiness of workshops be improved? If so, how? How can conflicts of interest be avoided for workshops that are living from delivering services to individual clients but play at the same time an important role in the security of the recording equipment?

There is anecdotal evidence to suggest that there is complicity between workshops and transport undertakings in relation to the fitment of manipulation devices which are used for the purposes circumventing driving - and resting hour legislation, speed limits, etc.

It is essential that there is sharing of information between Member States on this particular issue and that best practice is shared between Member States in relation to the conduct of checks on workshops.

It is recommended that an operator should not be allowed to be the owner of or have any beneficial interest in workshop. This may be difficult to achieve.

Question 15

Should the Regulation explicitly foresee the use of electronic data exchange on cards that are issued between card issuing authorities?

Yes – there must be electronic exchange and this needs to be dealt with by way of legislation. The uniqueness of the personalised driver card must be safeguarded;

For enforcement purposes data on driver cards must be available at inspections and this should include validity, name of driver.

There is concern regarding drivers who possess more than one driving license and that they are able to hold more than one card.

Question 16

Should the Regulation explicitly foresee warnings for the driver in order to enhance compliance with the legislation on driving times and rest periods? Should it be up to manufacturers' choice to offer such warnings as an optional tool, including additional warnings for other aspects than the continuous driving time?

Yes – we believe that users of the digital tachograph should receive warnings on breaks, rest, interference and breakdown.

Question 17

Do you have any other comments or suggestions which you consider should be taken into account during the revision of the European legislation on recording equipment?

There needs to be more harmonised enforcement across the EU – it appears that there are different practices and interpretation of the rules across the EU.

Question 18

Would you like to propose other measures to make the recording equipment more user-friendly and to improve the reliability of controls?

Making the system more user friendly for drivers, operators and enforcement personnel must be the priority – through standardisation in format, design etc.

We would also recommend that downloading and interrogation software should be type approved/accredited across the EU.

The possibility of integrating the driver card with the driving licence might be considered – and this may assist in the removal of drivers who have been banned from driving from using their driver cards.

There must be consistency in terms of enforcement practice across the EU in relation to checks of the tachograph at the roadside specifically as regards downloading and analysing of the driver's card and the Vehicle Unit.

APPENDIX I – RESPONSES RECEIVED BY RSA CONCERNING COMMISSION QUESTIONNAIRE



Dear Mr. Duggan,

Thank you for inviting us to submit our views on the issues and topics raised by the Commission with regard to the legislation on the recording equipment in road transport.

Please find below our answers to the questions asked in the consultation paper set out by the commission.

1. Yes, all recording equipment from all manufacturers should function in exactly the same way to rule out confusion. Design, function buttons and user instructions should no differ in any way.
2. It would be helpful for fleet management to integrate systems however it would not be essential. If the vehicle unit was to give more information related to safety and security of transport it would be ideal. I do not think that there would be need for it to be integrated into a real time "tracking and tracing" function and should only be optional.
3. Yes, remote downloading via either GPS or Data Sims on the mobile phone network would be the ideal way for administration to download both vehicle units and drivers cards. It would cut out any extra downloading tools, manufacturers yearly fees and would only require extra software and a permanent connection to each vehicle unit. Information would be stored easier.
4. Manual downloading is very time consuming and is not always possible due to numerous errors occurring either through the vehicle unit, download tool or software updates. This can often incur extra workshop costs.
5. Mobile control of moving vehicles by enforcement agencies would not be an ideal option and feel it would be an invasion of privacy. Enforcement bodies to have digital downloading equipment when stopping vehicles as is would be adequate and if there are any queries all information is stored on the administrative premises.
6. Security has never been a question for us and we do not have any reason to suspect that it may be an issue.
7. N/A
8. Option 2. Drivers cards are an important part of the design and no change is required on this aspect. The basic design of the VU to stay as is.

9. A filtering period of new equipment with a realistic time period and keeping in mind extra expenditure for all parties involved would be the main factors in deciding a time line.
10. Yes field tests before type approval would be best.
11. Option 2. Downloading equipment.
12. The current way of updating the specifications is satisfactory for the equipment available. Option 2.
13. Workshop trustworthiness has not been an issue. I don't think it needs to be improved.
14. The manual entries by drivers should be kept simple with the minimum amount to be entered. The VU needs to be more user friendly for drivers.
15. If the situation arose for electronic exchange on cards then it would be ideal.
16. All warnings on the Vehicle unit should be up to the manufacturer and company administration.
17. Remote downloading of the vehicle units and drivers cards to the administration premises would be the highest priority. Extra downloading tools are not practical. If the remote downloading was run through the mobile phone network or GPS to computer software it would cut out the vehicle having to be on premises for downloading.
18. A warning sound once the ignition of the vehicle is switched off would be ideal to remind the driver to change their working status if required, e.g.. rest status, other work. With regard to coach drivers compared to truck and goods vehicle drivers they would not have quite as much other work to do once they are not driving and often forget to change their work status to rest.

If you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact me.

Kind regards,

Caoimhe Cronin

Secretary,

Glynn's Coach Hire (Ennis) Ltd.

Irish Petroleum Industry Association

Response to European Commission Consultation Paper

Revision of the Community legislation on the recording equipment in road transport (tachographs)

The Irish Petroleum Industry Association represents all the major oil companies in Ireland and its members are involved in the distribution of fuels from the refinery and sea fed terminals to their customers around the country using a range of vehicles.

The following comments are made in the format of the Consultation Paper using the question reference numbers therein.

Question 1. Equipment should be standard from the perspective of driver operation and downloading. This is to minimise costs of training of drivers and downloading equipment.

Question 2. It is best that the legislation should focus on what is available now. Future revisions should incorporate developments in other areas such as vehicle tracking.

Question 3. Downloading is a key area and at present downloading can take up to 2 hours per vehicle every quarter. Remote downloading would be a significant advantage if it would facilitate the data being downloaded while the vehicle is in operation.

Question 4. As stated in our response to Question 3, downloading from the vehicle unit can take up to 2 hours and this is a problem for vehicle operators.

Question 5. We believe that the enforcement is adequate at present.

Question 6. This is not an issue for the IPIA.

Question 7. This is not an issue for the IPIA.

Question 8. Option 2, with no requirement for retrofitting.

Question 9. The legislation should not specify how new equipment is to be introduced, other than not to require retrofitting. New equipment should be given as long a lead time as possible to facilitate training. Tachograph approval should be part of general approval for vehicles.

Question 10. Field testing should be carried out in all sectors of the transport industry and the oil industry would wish to be included because of the special requirements for Ex rated tachographs.

Question 11. Option 1.

Question 12. Option 1 or 2.

Question 13. No. We have no issue with the trustworthiness of workshops.

Question 14. Any system that will reduce the amount of input by the driver is welcomed, including the use of GPS to indicate the location.

Question 15. This is not relevant to the IPIA.

Question 16. This should be standardised across manufacturers. The more warnings given to drivers, the more effective the system.

Question 17. No

Question 18. No

IPIA Transport Committee Contacts

Paul Leahy

Email paulleahy@emo.ie

Telephone + 353 5786 74716

Michael Joyce

Email mgjoyce@eircom.net

Telephone + 353 87 2552930

FREIGHT TRANSPORT ASSOCIATION

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this European Commission consultation paper on the revision of the community legislation on the recording equipment in Road Transport (Tachographs) and we are pleased to submit our response as follows.

Overview

The Freight Transport Association (FTA) on behalf of its membership in Ireland welcomes the opportunity to submit views to the Road Safety Authority (RSA).

Functioning of the recording equipment

Question 1 - Is it important that equipment of different manufacturers functions in exactly the same way? Or should legislation focus on essential requirements and give manufacturers more freedom to develop solutions and improve the equipment?

Answer:

For the benefit of the driver the precise order in which manual entries are made and the various different menus accessed should be standardised within the law and therefore by manufacturers as this is a common cause of major problems for drivers being able to use digital tachographs.

Input screens / options, should be standardised on all VU's. Drivers find these screens difficult enough without adding to their confusion brought about when they move from vehicle to vehicle which contain different VU's.

Integration of ITS applications

Question 2 - Should the legislation on the tachograph already foresee the integration of the digital tachograph into an open in-vehicle platform? If so, what other regulatory applications should be integrated in this platform (e.g. e-toll, recorder for accident investigation, e-call, speed control) and why? Would it be interesting for fleet management or other applications related to safety or security of transport, or to law enforcement, to have a real-time "tracking and tracing" function?

Answer:

We agree with the development of the unit to incorporate GPS, telematics and track and trace information. Some thought would need to be given to the way these were created as the breakdown of one component should not result in a replacement of the complete unit.

However, these choices must be left to the operator as to demand by law vehicle tracking, telematics and/or any other additional device will add unnecessary expense to a vehicle and thereby delay the overall take up of digital tachographs.

Legislation should ensure the display and screen can be seen and operated by the driver whilst sitting in their natural driving position. This concept would allow manufacturers to develop tachograph units to meet the base requirement but allow for a continual advancement without the need for a review of legislation.

Interrogation of the unit should not be allowed whilst the vehicle is in motion and without the driver being aware.

Remote download of recorded data and speed of downloading

Question 3 - Should remote download of the digital tachograph be encouraged? Is a regulatory approach deemed appropriate in order to facilitate widespread introduction?

Answer:

Something like the Automatic download of the Tachograph either on entry to a site or pulsed daily (or weekly) via the airwaves to a database. This would eliminate the long slow process of downloads.

The legislation could be amended to allow the option (**but not a regulatory approach**) of capability to allow remote downloading of both driver card and VU unit. This can be either by way of linking to a telematic system which the operator may choose to have fitted or by way of mobile telecommunications which can be linked directly into the VU itself.

A small operator most likely finds that the current manual download options are adequate whereas large fleet operators will greatly value a remote download facility.

Question 4 - What is your practical experience? Are there any obstacles for speedy download of data?

Answer:

Download speeds are laboriously slow for some, particularly if there is a lot of data to download from the VU. Also, card ejection can be very slow, particularly on double manning operation. Since the current generation tachograph was developed and type approved some time ago there are bound to be significant technical improvements to ensure data can be downloaded more quickly.

Improvement of controls

Question 5 - How could the equipment be changed in order to make controls more efficient? Should the mobile control of moving vehicles be envisaged in order to reduce administrative burden for industry and enforcement bodies?

Answer:

The new generation tachograph should contain features that enable roadside enforcement officers to speedily download and access digital data enabling them to determine compliance with regulations.

However, enforcement agencies should not be able to interrogate the data from a vehicle whilst it is still moving. There must still be a requirement for roadside checks to ensure roadworthiness, to include tachograph compliance and this will demonstrate to the industry that nobody escapes these random checks. It is better for this activity to remain visible to all road users.

Security level of the system

Question 6 - Is the current security level proportional? Can and should there be other sources of motion? Could the authenticated time/speed/positioning data provided by the future European "GPS" system, Galileo, be used as a second and independent source of motion to ensure security of data?

Answer:

The current level of security should be maintained at its currently proportionate levels by countering current or foreseeable threats.

A digital tachograph that used GPS to record time/speed/location would be a good idea to ensure accurate and secure data.

Scope of the regulation

Question 7 - In case a vehicle is only occasionally used in the scope of Regulation (EC) No 561/2006, for example when exceeding from time to time the radius set in some exceptions, should it be possible to use different means of recording activities?

Answer:

An alternative means of recording activities for a driver who only operates under the EU drivers Hour Regulations once a week or irregularly would be welcomed. Currently having to add a manual entry within the VU for a period going back more than a day is a real pain. I.e. if someone only drives under EU regulations on a Friday, he needs to go back and add manual entries for other work and rest from the start of the fixed week until the point of adding the card on a Friday before he can commence driving. Ideally it should be possible to record these periods of other work and rest within the software where it can be keyed in rather than scrolled through.

An operator who operates both in and out of scope of the regulations must as a minimum still be required to record the work that he undertakes whilst in scope and a failure to do so would be a retrograde step and it would allow the unscrupulous operator the ability to hide required recordings from the enforcement authorities.

Compatibility and interoperability

Question 8 - Which option do you prefer? In case you prefer option 2: What are the most important issues for compatibility between a new generation of tachographs and the current digital tachograph, and what other parts of the equipment, apart from driver cards, should be compatible in your view?

Answer:

Option 2 – backwards compatibility.

The driver's card should be kept as a standard throughout the next generation of digital tachographs with a recommendation to increase the size of storage capacity on the card.

They have to remain compatible as failure to do so would result in drivers needing more than one card and operators would therefore be required to download from more than one source and then correlate the data for analysis – as with mobile phones where a new sim card may have greater capability but is still compatible with other models of phone the driver card must be the same.

Introduction of equipment based on new specifications

Question 9 - Should the legislation specify how new equipment has to be introduced in the field? Should a retrofit be possible, mandatory or take place in case of replacement of defective equipment? What are the essential steps for the introduction of new equipment? Should type approval for tachographs fall under the general type approval scheme for vehicles?

Answer:

The digital tachograph dedicated type approval process should remain as it is and continue to be a stand alone approval.

Vehicles should not have to be upgraded to the latest specification in the event of a tachograph failure, but continue to be replaced with the same device. Operators should have the option to upgrade to the latest specification.

Question 10 - Should it be possible to carry out field tests before type approval is requested, while maintaining the same security standards? How should field test be limited (geographically, number of equipments, duration of the field test, etc.)?

Answer:

Yes field tests should be carried out within a wide range of existing applications in order to get accurate feedback from real time operations.

Equipment in relation with the tachograph where no type approval is foreseen

Question 11 - Which option do you prefer and if you prefer option 2 or 3, for which parts: seals , downloading equipment, control equipment, calibration tools, etc.?

Answer:

Option 2

Downloading equipment should continue to be a feature available to operators to maintain the security signature and it should be required to meet type approval as there is a wide variation and standard of equipment currently available.

Adaptation to technical progress

Question 12 - Is the current way of updating the specifications on the tachograph satisfying? Who should be responsible for the updating of the technical requirements? What is your preferred option?

N/A

INSTALLATION AND INSPECTION

Question 13 - Should the trustworthiness of workshops be improved? If so, how? How can conflicts of interest be avoided for workshops that are living from delivering services to individual clients but play at the same time an important role in the security of the recording equipment?

Answer:

Tachograph calibration workshops should continue to be approved and therefore any individual working on a tachograph must therefore be approved and carry the suitable accreditation and be able to be identified at a later date.

Automatic and manual recording of information

Question 14 - What kind of data should be entered manually by the driver ? What kind of information should be recorded automatically by the recording equipment? Is it appropriate to record more precisely the location (via GPS or GNSS for example)?

Answer:

The more that can be automated the better. Some drivers take to the digital tachograph very easily, however others don't and this gives the potential to incur infringements and run the risk of error.

The tachograph unit should be more user friendly for the recording of weekly rest breaks.

Start and end locations could be obtained from a GPS system.

The electronic exchange of data should not pose a problem for legitimate drivers.

Uniqueness of the driver card

Question 15 - Should the Regulation explicitly foresee the use of electronic data exchange on cards that are issued between card issuing authorities?

Answer:

Card issuing authorities should be obliged to exchange data between themselves to combat the risk of drivers having more than one card. The exchange of digital work activity data between authorities can only succeed when all countries apply identical standards.

Warnings

Question 16 - Should the Regulation explicitly foresee warnings for the driver in order to enhance compliance with the legislation on driving times and rest periods? Should it be up to manufacturers' choice to offer such warnings as an optional tool, including additional warnings for other aspects than the continuous driving time?

Answer:

An audible warning when a driver has completed 4 hours of continuous driving would be beneficial, and at subsequent 15 minute intervals. Currently the on screen warning at 4 hours 15 mins can be easily missed.

A warning to advise a driver who is about to cut short the statutory break would be helpful. i.e., if the mode switch button was selected to change the mode from rest to POA or other work before

45 mins rest was taken, an on screen message making the driver aware of the shortfall and asking him if he definitely wanted to proceed would appear.

Warning should alert drivers of the 10 hour driving day, over 9 hours driving more than twice in a week, over 56 hours driving and over 90 hours in a 2 week period.

Warnings are useful but should be left as options for the manufacturer and optional to use by the vehicle operator. They should be capable of being activated or not by the vehicle operator and not the driver.

1. OTHER QUESTIONS

Question 17 - Do you have any other comments or suggestions which you consider should be taken into account during the revision of the European legislation on recording equipment?

Answer:

Time is right to start the integration of the Driving Licence Card, Driver's Tachograph Card and Drivers CPC card.

Question 18 - Would you like to propose other measures to make the recording equipment more user-friendly and to improve the reliability of controls?

Answer:

UTC feature removal for operators who never leave Ireland.

There is an issue around a driver losing up to 2 minutes of potential drive time if a delivery takes less than 2 minutes to complete. If the vehicle idle time was reduced to 1 minute prior to recording, this would work in favour of the driver rather than against him.

If a drivers card gets stuck in the VU, by the time a dealer can remove it, the driver is likely to have incurred an infringement for lack of daily rest. This stays on his records.

The equipment should have the facility in a future device to enter the claim for Article 12 exception from the regulations where the driver can enter this through the menu at the latest on arrival at a suitable stopping place. This should then automate a print out upon which the driver enters the reason for the delay and puts the enforcement authority on notice that either the driver or the operator will hold a print out explaining the Article 12 for investigation.

The method of manual recording must be standardised throughout all manufacturers and must allow for retrospective amendments to individual manual records.

It is also recommended that digital tachographs allow the facility for the driver to enter on his card the potential that a wrong mode has been selected and the times that that wrong mode was selected in order that this can be highlighted to any enforcement authority thereby preventing the need for a driver to provide a print out with that amendment, but at the same time allow the enforcement authority and/or operator to make a decision as to the validity of the driver's claim.

**Prepared by Tom Wilson – Head of Policy – Ireland
Freight Transport Association**

