

## Annex 1 Tables illustrating the scope of the contractual tasks and the indicators applied

**Table 1.1 Scope of the contractual tasks**

Task	Scope	Type of evaluation
1Quantitative assessment of the effectiveness of the CBE Directive on the reduction in the number of fatalities and accidents on EU roads in 2013/2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assessing whether the entry into force of the provisions transposing the CBE Directive has had an effect on the reduction in the number of fatalities and accidents on EU roads.</li> <li>Assessing the status of implementation of the CBE Directive in the 28 Member States of the EU in order to understand to what extent it is possible to assess the impacts of the CBE Directive.</li> <li>Assessing the impact of the provisions of the CBE Directive on awareness.</li> <li>Assessing the complementarity of the provisions of the CBE Directive on vehicle registration data exchange (Article 4) and on the awareness of EU road users on applicable road traffic rules.</li> </ul>	Ex-post
2Assessment of whether EUCARIS guarantees an effective, expeditious, secure and confidential exchange of specific vehicle registration data, including a quantitative analysis on how many road safety-related traffic offences detected automatically are followed by searches via EUCARIS in 2013/2015.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assessing the extent to which the CBE Directive, in general, and EUCARIS/CBE application, in particular, are effective, i.e. the extent to which the EUCARIS/CBE application has facilitated the exchange of specific Vehicle Registration Data ("VRD") between EU MSs.</li> <li>Assessing the satisfaction of users with the EUCARIS/CBE application and the helpdesk service supporting the operation of the application, including the potential problems preventing EU MSs from using the EUCARIS/CBE application effectively, whether it comes to outgoing searches and exchange of VRD or reporting functionalities.</li> <li>Conducting a concise and exhaustive ICT assessment of the cross-border exchange of VRD via the European Vehicle and Driving Licence Information System (EUCARIS), focusing on the security and data protection measures put in place in the application.</li> </ul>	Ex-post
3Assessment of the need to develop comparable methods, practices and minimum standards for automatic checking equipment and elaboration of a proposal for road safety guidelines outlining the best practice of the automated enforcement of road traffic rules, at least for the following offences: speeding, drink-driving, non-use of safety belts and failure to stop at a red traffic light	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assessing the extent to which the current situation where Member States use different methods, practices and standards for automatic checking equipment creates obstacles to the cross-border enforcement of sanctions in the EU.</li> <li>Assessing whether there is a need to develop comparable methods, practices and minimum standards for automatic checking equipment.</li> <li>Identifying the best practices in the automated enforcement of road traffic rules for the following offences: speeding, drink-driving, non-use of safety belts and failure to stop at a red traffic light.</li> <li>Elaborating a proposal for road safety guidelines identifying the best practices of the automated enforcement of road traffic rules for the above offences.</li> </ul>	Ex-post  Ex-ante

## Evaluation study on the application of the CBE Directive

Task	Scope	Type of evaluation
4Assessment of the follow-up of the exchange of information in order to strengthen the enforcement of sanctions, especially in the case where a financial penalty is refused to be paid. Elaboration of proposal of common criteria for the procedures concerning mutual recognition of financial penalties. Assessment of whether the mutual recognition of financial penalties for the offences covered by the CBE Directive requires the harmonisation of relevant road traffic rules. Assessment of whether other road safety related traffic offences should be added to the scope of the CBE Directive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assessing whether the scope of the CBE Directive is appropriate taking into consideration (A) the offences that it covers, and (B) the fact that it is limited to the cross-border exchange of information on road safety related traffic offences. Notably: assessing whether there are road traffic offences not covered by the CBE Directive that affect road safety and that are likely to be committed by non-resident drivers; assessing whether the mechanism put in place by the CBE Directive sufficiently ensures cross-border enforcement of sanctions taking into consideration the fact that other EU legislation is in place and covers the issues of mutual recognition of financial penalties; assessing what would be the most appropriate way to strengthen the enforcement of sanctions for road traffic offences in the EU and whether bilateral and multilateral arrangements between MSs and joint police actions organized by TISPOL have a potential to replace the CBE Directive "regime"; assessing whether in order to improve road safety and to strengthen the cross-border enforcement of sanctions for road traffic offences it would be appropriate to adopt new EU legislation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Setting up common criteria for the procedures concerning mutual recognition of financial penalties;</li> <li>Harmonising relevant road traffic rules;</li> <li>Extending the scope of the CBE Directive to cover new road traffic offences.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
5Quantitative assessment of administrative costs, including for the cross-border exchange of data and for the follow-up procedures.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assessing the administrative costs related to the implementation of the CBE Directive.</li> <li>Assessing the costs of the follow-up of the exchange of information under the CBE Directive and of follow up-procedures.</li> <li>Comparing costs of EUCARIS CBE Directive application with those of other systems in view of understanding whether there are more cost effective system for the exchange of data than the one imposed selected by the CBE Directive.</li> </ul>	Ex-post Ex-ante
7Assessment of the legal consistency of the CBE Directive.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assessing the legal consistency of the CBE Directive and in particular whether its scope is appropriate taking into consideration the objectives pursued with the adoption of the CBE Directive (notably improving road safety and increasing the awareness of EU citizens on applicable traffic rules as well as improving the cross-border enforcement of sanctions for specific road traffic offences).</li> </ul>	Ex-post

**Table 2.1 Overview of the methodology applied**

Task	Evaluation question	Indicator proposed	Indicator applied
1	3	<p>1. Decrease/increase of fatalities and accidents in % (number of fatalities and accidents in 2011/2012 number of fatalities and accidents in 2013, 2014 and 2015)</p> <p>2. Estimates on the decrease/increase of fatalities and accidents caused by offences committed by non-residents in % (number of fatalities and accidents in 2011/2012, number of fatalities and accidents in 2013, 2014 and 2015)</p>	<p>1. Perception by road traffic users that the enforcement of sanctions for offences covered by the CBE Directive is effective and consequent improved compliance with road traffic rules as demonstrated: by 1) decrease of the share of offences committed by non-resident of the overall offences in some Member States further to the implementation of the CBE Directive; 2) improvement of cross-border enforcement, i.e. increases of offences committed by non-residents and follow-up.</p> <p>2. Decrease of the share of fatalities/accidents involving non-resident of all fatalities/accidents in some Member States having implemented the CBE Directive since 2014.</p>
	4	3. Improvement of police cooperation in combating offences other than those related to road safety	No change
	5	4. Increase/decrease of the complexity of the system	No change
	6	4. Increase/decrease of the complexity of the system	5. Lack of improvement of the credibility of cross-border enforcement
	16	6. Improvement of the consistency of the EU legal framework on road safety	No change
	2	<p>7. Improvement of the awareness of citizens on road traffic rules, sanctions for offences and their consequences</p> <p>8. Decrease/ increase of visits to the Commission Going Abroad webpage in 2013 – 2015 (%) and/or similar webpages/websites of MS/NGOs</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>8. Decrease/increase of visits to the Commission Going Abroad webpage during the year (%) and/or similar webpages/websites of MS/NGOs/opinion of stakeholders</p>
	10	9. Improvement of the level of awareness of citizens concerning road traffic rules in force in EU Member States	No change
	17	6. Improvement of consistency of EU legal framework on road safety	No change.

## Evaluation study on the application of the CBE Directive

Task	Evaluation question	Indicator proposed	Indicator applied
2	7	<p>8. % of automatically detected offences since 2013 out of the total number of offences (per year and per type of offence) covered by the CBE Directive</p> <p>9. % of automatically detected offences committed by foreign vehicles since 2013 out of the total number of offences (per year and per type of offence) covered by the CBE Directive</p> <p>10. % of followed/investigated offences which are automatically detected since 2013 (outgoing searches) out of the total number of offences (per year and per type of offence) covered by the CBE Directive</p> <p>11. % of failed outgoing searches</p> <p>12. Degree of satisfaction in the use of EUCARIS among stakeholders</p> <p>13. Degree of compliance with the security provisions of Article 4(4)</p> <p>14. Degree of compliance with the data protection provisions of Article 7</p> <p>15. % of MSs having implemented the EUCARIS/CBE application</p>	<p>10. Number of automated searches (using EUCARIS/CBE application) related to road safety related traffic offences committed by non-resident offenders out of the total number of road safety related traffic offences (per year and per type of offence) committed by non-resident offenders since 2013 (Indicator N°10)</p> <p>11. Number of failed automated searches (using EUCARIS/CBE application) related to road safety related traffic offences committed by non-resident offenders out of the total number of automated searches (using EUCARIS/CBE application) related to road safety related traffic offences committed by non-resident offenders</p> <p>12. Degree of satisfaction in the use of EUCARIS/CBE application</p> <p>13. Degree of compliance of EUCARIS/CBE application with the security provisions of Article 4(4) of the CBE Directive</p> <p>14. Degree of compliance of EUCARIS/CBE application with the data protection provisions of Article 7 of the CBE Directive</p> <p>15. Percentage of Member States having implemented the EUCARIS/CBE application.</p>
3	8	<p>16. Number of refusals of access to Member States' VRD on the grounds that the checking equipment used is found not appropriate</p> <p>17. Number of recording devices/equipment for the detection of offences covered by the CBE Directive divided by number of registered vehicles in 2013 – 2015 per MS</p>	<p>16.Existing national case law requiring that the automatic equipment used complies with specific principles that go beyond the requirements of national legislation</p> <p>17.Number of recording devices/equipment for the detection of offences covered by the CBE Directive divided by /KM of roads, suitability of the devices used and transparency of the legal framework</p>
	11	<p>18. Number of refusals of enforcement of sanctions on the grounds that the checking equipment used is found not appropriate and infringes the fundamental rights of the individuals</p>	<p>16. Existing national case law requiring that the automatic equipment used complies with specific principles that go beyond the requirements of national legislation</p>

## Evaluation study on the application of the CBE Directive

Task	Evaluation question	Indicator proposed	Indicator applied
4	1	<p>19. Number/estimate of sanctions for offences not covered by the CBE Directive committed by non-resident drivers/divided by the number of sanctions for the same offences not enforced</p> <p>20. Number/estimate of offences not covered by the CBE Directive and committed by non-resident drivers divided by the number of the same offences committed by residents</p>	<p>18. Public authorities' perception of the adequacy of the scope of the CBE Directive</p> <p>19. Utility of the extension of the scope to the CBE Directive to other offences taking into consideration the way they are detected</p> <p>20. Share represented by the offences covered by the CBE Directive of overall offences committed by non-residents</p>
	9-11	<p>21. Number of successfully investigated traffic offences (number of offences where a sanction has been successfully enforced) as defined in Article 2 of the CBE Directive, committed by vehicles registered in another MS (cross-border offences) where searches under the CBE Directive regime have been used in 2013-2015 per MS/in the EU (or share of those in a given geographical area)</p> <p>22. Number of all judicial decisions issued in cases where a foreign offender refused to pay a sanction for a traffic offence in 2013-2015 per MS/in the EU</p> <p>23. Number of judicial decisions mutually recognized in cases where a foreign offender refused to pay a sanction for a traffic offence in 2013-2015 per MS/in the EU</p> <p>24. Number of judicial decisions issued for all (not only traffic) cross-border offences in 2013-2015 per MS/in the EU</p>	<p>21. Public authorities' perception of the efficiency of the existing follow-up procedures and of the rate of execution of financial penalties when an offender refuses to pay under the current legal framework</p> <p>22. Expected reduced deterrent impact of the CBE Directive when the public will be aware that problems with execution of financial penalties in other Member States have not been solved.</p>
	14-15	<p>25. Improved rapidity/success rate of enforcement as substantiated by examples of success stories</p>	<p>23. Rapidity/success rate of enforcement as substantiated by examples of success stories</p> <p>24. Geographical coverage and legal transparency of a non - EU framework</p>

## Evaluation study on the application of the CBE Directive

Task	Evaluation question	Indicator proposed	Indicator applied
5	12-13	<p>26.Total IT costs (expressed as Total Cost of Ownership) for administering, using and maintaining EUCARIS in the last 3 years in the context of the CBE Directive</p> <p>27.Comparison of EUCARIS total IT costs with similar applications maintained by the European Commission</p> <p>28.Increase of the administrative costs related to vehicle registration data exchange (in % or absolute figures) comparing the situation before 2013, where no data were exchanged for the purpose of the CBE Directive (but practically the same data were exchanged under the PRUM Decisions), with the situation in 2015 (A)</p> <p>29. Increase (in % or absolute figures) of the revenues generated by the enforcement of sanctions for traffic offences covered by the CBE Directive (B) plus reduction (in % or absolute figures) of the costs generated by the increased level of safety on EU road or on MSS' roads (C)</p> <p>30. Ratio between the A and B+C.</p>	<p>25. Total IT costs (expressed as Total Cost of Ownership) for administering, using and maintaining EUCARIS in the last 3 years in the context of the CBE Directive [A]</p> <p>26. Comparison of EUCARIS total IT costs with similar applications maintained by the European Commission</p> <p>27. Costs related to vehicle registration data exchange (in % or absolute figures) compared to the administrative costs related to the implementation of other (similar) applications [B]</p> <p>28. Amount of revenues generated by the enforcement of sanctions for road safety related traffic offences (covered by the CBE Directive) committed by non-resident offenders [C]</p>
7	1-11	29. Consistency/inconsistency of the legal framework	No change