

Delft, June 13th 2013

Minutes stakeholder conference on speed limiters

Conference: Stakeholder conference for the project “Ex-post evaluation of Directive 92/6/EEC on the installation and use of speed limitation devices for certain categories of motor vehicles in the Community, as amended by Directive 2002/85/EC”

Date of the conference: June 10th 2013 13:30h-17:00h

Location: Albert Borschette Conference Centre, 36 rue Froissart, in 1040 Brussels, meeting room AB 1A

Minutes prepared by : CE Delft.

List of attendants:

Mr Rob Aarse - Transport en Logistiek Nederland (TLN)	Mr Gianfranco Burzio- European Automobile Manufacturers' Association - ACEA
Mr Oliver Carsten - ETSC and PACTS	Ms Silke Conrad - Daimler
Ms Charlotte Creiser - EURALIA	Mr Jos Dings - Transport & Environment
Mr Hans Thomas Ebner - Verband der Automobilindustrie e. V. (VDA)	Mr Jonathan El-Nigomi- Nordic Logistics Association
Mr Maxime Flament - ITS Europe and ERTICO	Mr Olivier Fontaine - OICA
Mr Bernd Gottselig - Ford of Europe	Mrs Tanja Haberzettl - DEKRA e.V.
Mr Nicholas Hodac - Ford of Europe	Mr Frederic Keymeulen - UETS (European Road Haulers Association)
Mr Rainer Krautscheid -BAST + BMVBS	Ms Katherine Lancaster - UK Department for Transport
Mr Agustín Martín Lasanta- CETM	Mr Vincent Legagneur - Toyota Motor Europe NV/SA
Ms Isabelle Maître - French Road Transport Association	Mr Jeannot Mersch - FEVR
Mr Fernando Navarro Sordo - CETM	Mr Jan Nemeč - International Road Transport Union (IRU)
Mr Dirk Saile- Bundesverband Güterverkehr Logistik und Entsorgung (BGL) e.V	Mr William Todts - Transport & Environment
Ms Ellen Townsend - European Transport Safety Council (ETSC)	Mr Stephane Verwilghen - ASECAP
Mr Karim Yahia - ACEA	Mr Stephane Dreher - NOKIA/HERE
Mr Rudolf Koronhály (DG MOVE)	Mr Roberto Ferravante (DG MOVE)
Mr Casto Lopez Benitez (DG MOVE)	
Ms Odile Arbeit de Chalendar (DG MOVE)	Mr Peter Broertjes (DG ENTR)
Ms Eef Delhaye (TML)	Mr Angelo Martino (TRT)
Mr Huib van Essen (CE Delft)	Mr Maarten 't Hoen (CE Delft)

At the stakeholder conference, the project team presented the draft results on the surveys among EU Member States and various stakeholders. Also the draft results of the ex-post evaluation of the current Directive are presented. Next, the methodology for the ex-ante evaluations of various scenarios for amending the Directive (either for Heavy Commercial Vehicles or by extending the scope to Light Commercial Vehicles) that will also be carried out in the project was presented.

The goal of the stakeholder conference was to provide the stakeholders the opportunity to give feedback to the intermediate results and proposed methodology and to share their views and knowledge on this important subject.

The slides of the presentations are available on:

http://ec.europa.eu/transport/road_safety/events-archive/2013_06_10_speed_limitation_en.htm

13:30 Opening

DG MOVE welcomes the participants of the stakeholder conference and explains the agenda.

13:35 Tour-de-table

All participants briefly introduce themselves.

13:45 Background and objective of the study by DG MOVE

DG MOVE shortly presents the context and objective of the study and the way the results will be used. The explanation is based on the Terms of Reference.

No questions are raised.

14:00 Project overview and approach

The project leader (Huib van Essen, CE Delft) presents the scope and the overall approach of the project.

The questions discussed are:

1. Do you see any missing issues in the overall analysis?
2. Would you have any additional elements or suggestions to complement the methodology?

Discussion:

- BAsT/BMVBS notes that important Member States are missing in the survey (Netherlands, Sweden, Germany, Spain)
 - TRT answers that the consortium also performed an extensive literature search to fill the gap of non responding Member States. These Member States were repeatedly contacted.
- T&E suggests make a comparison with the USA regarding impacts on trucks' engine power.
- DG MOVE acknowledges that the speed limiter has a potential impact on the HGV engine power of and it is relevant for this study. Nevertheless, the data to evaluate this will be difficult to gather and a comparison with the USA is not foreseen for this study. (T&E could assess such impacts in their own study).
- CE Delft says that if evidence on this is available in literature, it can be included in the analysis of market impacts.

- ETCS notes that size and mass were not taken into account for the safety calculations, but that there will be a larger effect in terms of accidents' gravity for trucks because of their high mass. The suggestion is made to adjust the power model for this.
- VDA wonders why the 2012 study that they provided is not mentioned in the workshop paper. VDA also thinks that the workshop input paper is too short to judge the quality of the methodology.
- TRT replies that the study has been received and will be taken into account in the project report.
- CE Delft assures that the input paper was not too lengthy on purpose, to enable the participants to read it beforehand. The report will be more extensive.
- DG MOVE replies that the study should be seen as an iterative process.

14:20 Presentation of the draft results of the survey

The consortium (Angelo Martino, TRT) presents the results of the survey among Member States and stakeholders on the implementation of the Directive and options for amendments.

The question discussed are:

1. Do you agree/recognise the position of your country/organisation presented in the survey results?

Discussion:

- ETSC mentions that data on accidents (and where they happen) are available and will be sent to the consortium. TRT replies that the data were well received and that this information has been taken into account.
- Daimler notes that lack of data is a problem, and wonders how this was dealt with in the project.
- CE Delft replies that accident data will be used in the analysis and that there are ways to overcome the limitations in data availability.

14:45 Coffee break

After the coffee break T&E urges the Commission to take this project seriously. Not only safety is an issue, also CO₂, NO_x, noise. There is no level playing field for commercial vehicles. They think that there is a lack of enthusiasm and the Commission does not seem to care about these issues.

DG MOVE replies that they are sorry to have made the impression that they don't care. They would not be here if they didn't believe that there is room for manoeuvre. However, they have to justify if there is need for action. This study is only the first step. If there is a proposal to amend the Directive, "standard" impact assessment will be carried out. Also, all the effects are taken into account in this study, not only safety. If any stakeholder feels that this is not sufficient, they are encouraged in the stakeholder conference or later to give input to the project and feedback on the process.

15:05 Presentation of the draft results of the ex-post analysis

The consortium (Eef Delhay, TML) presents the draft findings of the ex-post evaluation of the current Directive, including impacts on speeds, safety and emissions and market impacts.

Questions presented as a starting point for the discussion are:

1. What additional information sources could be included in the ex-post evaluation?
2. Can you agree with the main conclusions drawn from the draft results of the ex-post evaluation?
3. Do you see other elements which could complement the conclusions of the ex-post evaluation?

Discussion:

- IRU states that the draft findings correspond to their findings. Their members also agree that speed limiters did not have a great impact on speeds. They can largely go along with these conclusions.
- BGL explains that they have good experience with limiting the speed to 80 km/h: Fuel consumption has dropped by 10%, wear and tear decreases and there is less stress for drivers.
- BAST/BMVBS mentions that the IMPROVER project includes data for fuel consumption and emissions. It was also suggested that emissions should only be calculated for Euro-6 / Euro-VI in his opinion.

16:00 Scenarios and methodology for ex-ante evaluations on HCVs and LCVs

The consortium (Huib van Essen, CE Delft) presents the list of scenarios that will be subject to the ex-ante evaluation. This includes four scenarios with respect to HCVs and four with respect to LCVs. For both HCVs and LCVs, there are two scenarios on speed limiters and two with ISA systems. Furthermore the methodologies for the evaluation of the impacts on speeds, safety and emissions and market impacts which will be applied in the next phase of the project are presented.

Questions presented as starting point for the discussion are:

1. Do you agree with the definition of the scenarios for the ex-ante evaluations on HCVs?
2. Do you agree with the definition of the scenarios for the ex-ante evaluations on LCVs?
3. Do you see other elements which could be taken into account to complement the conclusions of the ex-ante evaluation?
4. Can you agree with the application of different speed limits for vehicle categories N2 and N3 (e.g. 100 km/h for N2 and 90 km/h for N3 category)?
5. What should be the definition of light commercial vehicles of M1 category and light commercial vehicle of N1 category (e.g. M1 category with 8 and 9 seats including driver's seat, N1 category between 2.6 and 3.5 tonnes)?
6. What suggestions do you have with respect to the possible amendments of the Speed Limitation Directive?

Discussion:

- ETCS thinks that the scenarios are reasonable. Some details might be discussed (eg. Do you want ISA system on top of speed limiters?) They also suggest using the Euro NCAP terminology for ISA systems. The 5 years' time horizon regarding the maturity of certain ISA systems appears to be too pessimistic.
- BAST/BMVBS states that it will be difficult for the police to find out whether a vehicle is intended for private or commercial use. This is not a good criterion. It should be based on concrete definition of the vehicle (sub)type.
- TLN agrees that it should be based on vehicle (sub)type and thinks that the fixed speed limiter is old fashioned and that ISA systems are the future.
- DG MOVE agrees that the effect of ISA on local and urban roads is an advantage. It depends on legal definitions what is possible.

- CE Delft emphasizes that the ex-post results do not imply that the effects of speed limiters are small. It depends on the maximum speed in the reference situation and on the level of the maximum speed in the speed limiter.
- T&E explains that the additional definitions for sub-categories of LCVs are not consistent. The 2.6 and 3.5 t mass limits for N1 category vehicles refer to different definitions. T&E recommends a lower reference mass than 2.6 t for N1 subcategory vehicles.
- CETM states that road safety and accidents are related to speed limits, but also to harmonized speed limits. When speed differences become larger the accident risk is higher. CETM asks if the consortium has already thought about this effect.
- CE Delft confirms that this effect is also recognized in the project. However, the scientific basis to quantify this effect of variations in speed is smaller compared to the effect of absolute speed. Both relationships are in the evaluation
- VDA is puzzled by the presentation. They say it does not make sense to discuss in detail how to implement new measures, before it is discussed why and if they should be implemented.
- DG MOVE explains that this is an iterative process and that they have to start from somewhere. This discussion would be premature if it was the final step, but this is only the first step.
- T&E thinks that 90 km/h for vans should also be considered. All commercial vehicles except vans will be limited at 90 km/h.
- Daimler emphasised that the speed limitation device is not the device to reduce CO2 emissions, there are other more effective measures. The cost benefit ratio is low.
- CE Delft responds that not only emissions but all impacts are considered. Whether it should be part of CO2 reduction strategy or not, is not the issue. In this study only the impacts are assessed. Policy makers should decide whether to implement them, with what aim and under what strategy.

17:20 Next steps and closing remarks

- CE Delft explains that all the data that has been received will be analysed.
- CE Delft states that as independent consultants, the consortium is transparent on the methodology and data limitations. Data limitations do not mean that it is not possible to make a reasonable evaluation of the effects.
- DG MOVE emphasizes that this is not an impact assessment study, but an evaluation study.

Next steps in the coming weeks:

- The draft final report should be ready at the end of July, in September the final report will probably become available.
- There will not be other stakeholder workshops within this project.

17:30 End of the conference

MAIN CONCLUSIONS:

The conclusions that will be used for the finalisation of the study are summarised below, regarding the ex-post analysis and the ex-ante analysis.

Ex-post analysis

The conclusion for the ex-post analysis is that the approach/methodology is endorsed and no significant changes are required. The questionnaire has been well received and the results correspond to what was expected by the stakeholders. Some stakeholders wondered if the data that they sent is taken into account, and are assured by the consortium that all responses are included in the research. The results of the statistical analysis of safety statistics are inconclusive: there was a decrease in accidents but there is insufficient data to determine if this was due to the speed limiters. The draft results from the model simulation generally correspond to the experience and expectations of the stakeholders.

Ex-ante analysis

According to the stakeholder conference the approach/methodology for the ex-ante analysis is appropriate, based on what was presented at the conference. Based on the discussions, there is no reason to change the scenarios for HCVs and LCVs that were proposed. Some details should be considered, concerning the terminology and additional definitions of subcategories.