

**TASK SPECIFICATIONS**  
**to award a Specific Contract**  
**under DG MOVE's Framework Contract MOVE/A3/350-2010 regarding**  
**Impact Assessment and Evaluations (ex-ante, intermediate and ex-post)**  
**for the assignment:**

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**

**DG MOVE Unit: C.4**

**Desk officer in charge:**

Rudolf Koronhály  
tel: 0032 2 29 858 79  
e-mail: rudolf.koronhaly@ec.europa.eu

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

Improving road safety with the objective of reducing fatalities, injuries and material damage is a prime objective of the EU transport policy. The installation and use of speed limitation devices for commercial vehicles constitutes an important measure which promotes sustainable mobility by improving road safety and environmental performance of road transport.

According to Directive 92/6/EEC on the installation and use of speed limitation devices for certain categories of motor vehicles in the Community<sup>1</sup>, speed limitation devices had to be installed in M3 and N3 category vehicles by 1 January 1995. In Recital 2 of Directive 2002/85/EC<sup>2</sup> amending Directive 92/6/EEC, the legislator declared that the use of speed limitation devices for category M3<sup>3</sup> and N3 vehicles (heaviest-motor vehicles) had a positive effect on the improvement of road safety and also contributed to environmental protection. Accordingly, Directive 2002/85/EC made the application of speed limitation devices to category M2, M3<sup>4</sup>, N2 vehicles obligatory from 1 January 2006 and required the Commission to *"assess the road safety and road traffic implications of adjusting the speed limitation devices used by M2 category vehicles and by N2 category vehicles with a maximum mass of 7.5 tonnes or less, to the speeds laid down by the Directive"*.

There is no EU law that specifies rules for the installation and use of speed limitation devices for light commercial vehicles of category M1 and N1<sup>5</sup>. Nevertheless, certain types of Intelligent Speed Assistance/Adaptation systems (ISA systems) are already used in the light

---

<sup>1</sup> OJ L 57, 2.3.1992, p.27

<sup>2</sup> OJ L 327, 4.12.2002, p.8

<sup>3</sup> Vehicles of M3 category with more than 10 tonnes of maximum permissible mass

<sup>4</sup> Vehicles of M3 category with more than 5 tonnes but not exceeding 10 tonnes of maximum permissible mass

<sup>5</sup> Vehicles of category N1 are those vehicles designed and constructed for the carriage of goods and having a maximum mass not exceeding 3,5 tonnes while vehicles of category M1 are those designed and constructed for the carriage of passengers and comprising no more than eight seats in addition to the driver's seat.

commercial vehicles. ISA systems appear to have potential to replace or complement existing speed limitation devices.

This document provides the terms of reference (ToR) of ex-post evaluation study concerning the application of speed limitation devices to commercial vehicles including the assessment of specific additional/alternative measures related to vehicle speed management. The ex-post evaluation study will be carried out by external consultants, specialists in the field of transport economics and impact assessment.

The purpose of this ToR is to describe the aim and scope of the ex-post evaluation study and give instructions and guidance to the companies willing to submit the offers. The ToR will also serve as the contactor's mandate during the implementation of the evaluation study, after selection of the successful tenderer. They will become part of the contract that will be concluded following the award of the tender.

## **2. RATIONALE AND AIMS OF THE STUDY**

### **2.1. Road safety**

Following the EU CARE Database, the share of the involvement of heavy commercial vehicles in accidents with fatal consequences on total number of road fatalities was approx. 17% in 2010. Nevertheless, the data on accidents in which heavy commercial vehicles were involved according to the vehicle category (e.g. for the vehicles of category M2 and N2) are missing for the most of Member States. The statistics about how many of these accidents were caused by speeding are scarce.

However, there are strong indications that the application of speed limitation devices with uniform maximum speed to all heavy goods vehicles exceeding 3.5 tons of maximum permissible mass had positive effects on road safety. Actually, statistics demonstrate that the involvement in fatal road accidents of heavy vans and trucks declined by approx. 50% in the last decade while this is not the case for vans not exceeding 3.5 tonnes (category N1 vehicles without speed limitation devices) where the involvement in fatal road accidents declined by approx. 30% (European Road Safety Observatory/Project DACOTA).

In recent years, increasing participation of light commercial vehicles in road traffic has raised concerns related to road safety. To address this issue, White Paper on Transport<sup>6</sup> foresees, inter alia, an initiative to *"examine approaches to limit the maximum speed of light commercial road vehicles in order to decrease energy consumption, to enhance road safety and to ensure a level playing field"*. The initiative also reflects the European Commission's Policy Orientations on Road Safety for 2011-2020<sup>7</sup> where similar action aimed at improving the enforcement of road safety rules is envisaged within strategic Objective No. 2.

The EU CARE Database shows that the share of the involvement of light commercial vehicles of category N1 in accidents with fatal consequences on total number of road fatalities was approx. 9% in 2010. The share of the involvement of light commercial vehicles of category M1 is available only with few Member States. The role of speed in the accidents in which

---

<sup>6</sup> White Paper on transport *"Roadmap to a Single European Transport Area – Towards a Competitive and Resource-Efficient Transport System"*, COM (2011)144

[http://ec.europa.eu/transport/strategies/2011\\_white\\_paper\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/transport/strategies/2011_white_paper_en.htm)

<sup>7</sup> Communication from the Commission *"Towards a European road safety area: policy orientations on road safety 2011-2020"*, COM(2010) 389

[http://ec.europa.eu/transport/road\\_safety/pdf/road\\_safety\\_citizen/road\\_safety\\_citizen\\_100924\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/transport/road_safety/pdf/road_safety_citizen/road_safety_citizen_100924_en.pdf)

light commercial vehicles are involved is not quantified. According to CE Delft report<sup>8</sup> "Speed limiters for vans in Europe – environmental and safety impacts" (2010), relative reduction of fatalities and injuries allocated to vans, when using speed limiters, on the basis of intrinsic risks is estimated as follows:

<b>Motorways</b>	Fatalities (%)	Severe injuries (%)	Slight injuries (%)
Speed limiter 110 km/h	31	24	20
Speed limiter 100 km/h	46	37	26

<b>Rural roads</b>	Fatalities (%)	Severe injuries (%)	Slight injuries (%)
Speed limiter 110 km/h	0-2.3	0-1.8	0-1.5
Speed limiter 100 km/h	2.0-3.6	1.6-2.9	1.1-2.0

Nevertheless, the report does not contain an analysis concerning optimum mass and vehicle speed limits, including the application of various types of ISA systems, for all categories of light commercial vehicles. The report does not cover urban roads and the impact of light commercial vehicles of M1 category on road safety.

It has to be noted that M1 category vehicles are normally not considered as light commercial vehicles, but only as passenger cars (although all passenger cars can be used for commercial purposes). Therefore, the analysis concerning optimum mass of these vehicles or other relevant parameters in relation to the application of speed limitation devices would be important (e.g. a distinction between regular passenger cars and passenger vans with 9 seating positions, clearly meant to be used as mini-buses, would be a relevant option).

## **2.2. Fuel consumption and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions**

Heavy commercial vehicles represent about 25% of EU road transport CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and some 6% of the total EU emissions (TREMOVE). Since it is likely that the traffic of heavy commercial vehicles could continue to rise in future, it is necessary to assess measures which may contribute to lowering CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from these vehicles. Speed is an important variable influencing vehicles' fuel consumption and it appears that speed limits have positive impact on CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. It would however be difficult to further decrease the speed limits as laid down in Directive 92/6/EEC (as amended by Directive 2002/85/EC, hereinafter 'Speed Limitation Directive'), since the introduction of speed limits on roads falls within the exclusive competence of Member States and current limits, being generally recognized as sufficient in terms of road safety, only reflect the situation concerning maximum speed limits applied on the EU main road network. The introduction of more stringent speed limits could cause secondary effects (also known as "knock-on effects") that may not only increase fuel consumption and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions but be also detrimental to road safety.

Recital 31 of Regulation 510/2011/EU setting emission performance standards for new light commercial vehicles as part of the Union's integrated approach to reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from

<sup>8</sup> The Commission is not the contract authority (tenderee) of this most recent report concerning possible use of speed limitation devices for light commercial vehicles

light-duty vehicles<sup>9</sup> suggests to investigate the feasibility of extending the scope of the Directive to light commercial vehicles because the speed of road vehicles has a strong influence on their fuel consumption and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. In addition, the absence of speed limitation devices on light commercial vehicles could lead to oversized power-trains and associated inefficiencies in slower operating conditions.

Following the CE Delft report, the overall CO<sub>2</sub> emissions of vans (category N1 vehicles) increased of 26% between 1995 and 2010. The emissions of vans represent around 7.5% of the total CO<sub>2</sub> emissions of road transport and the share of van emissions on passenger car emissions was 12% (TREMOVE) in 2010.

The estimated average reduction potential over all types of roads is:

- 4-5% CO<sub>2</sub> reduction for speed limiters set up at 110 km/h,
- 6-7% CO<sub>2</sub> reduction for speed limiters set up at 100 km/h.

This would correspond with 3-5 mil tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub> reduction in the EU in 2010 that might be even higher since the report does not cover the emissions from light commercial vehicles of M1 category.

### **2.3. Level playing field**

The light commercial vehicles sold in Europe have been gradually equipped with more powerful engines, allowing them to travel at higher speed with higher loads. These vehicles are increasing in number<sup>10</sup> and it appears that companies use them to circumvent not only the EU social rules in road transport but also the EU law on speed limitation devices<sup>11</sup>. This might have an impact on (equal) level playing field with heavy commercial vehicles, especially with those having maximum permissible mass between 3.5 and 7.5 tonnes. A consequence could be that *"illegal modification of speed limiters (in heavy commercial vehicles) to allow higher speeds continues to be a problem"*<sup>12</sup>.

### **2.4. Additional/alternative measures**

In the White Paper on Transport, the European Commission recognised that promoting in-vehicle systems that *"provide real-time information on prevailing speed limits"* will also contribute to improving compliance with the rules in force concerning speed limits. Furthermore, the White Paper refers to the need to harmonise and deploy road safety technologies.

Intelligent Speed Adaptation/Assistance (ISA) is an Intelligent Transport System (ITS) which warns the driver about speeding discourages the driver from speeding or prevents the driver from exceeding the speed limit. Information regarding the speed limit for a given location is usually identified from an on-board digital map in the vehicle. Other systems use speed sign reading and recognition either using already built into the vehicle or aftermarket navigators. There are two major types of systems – informative and supportive. An informative system gives the driver feedback in the form of a visual or an audio signal. A supportive system works in the form of increasing the upward pressure on the pedal or cancelling a driver's throttle demand if it demands more throttle than is required to drive at the speed limit.

---

<sup>9</sup> OJ L 145, 31.5.2011, p.1

<sup>10</sup> New light commercial vehicle registrations increased between 2009 and 2011 by approx. 17% (Statistical pocketbooks of the European Commission, 2011 and 2012)

<sup>11</sup> Speed limitation devices are usually integrated with tachographs

<sup>12</sup> ETSC "PRAISE": Preventing Road Accidents and Injuries for the Safety of Employees, 2011

A Swedish large-scale study<sup>13</sup> of the effect of informative and supportive ISA systems, involving nearly 4500 vehicles, shows that if everyone had informative ISA system fitted, injury accidents could be reduced by 20% in urban areas. Supportive systems have even greater potential to reduce fatal and serious accidents. Estimates by Carsten<sup>14</sup> show that a mandatory supportive ISA system could lead to a reduction of 36% in road traffic (injury) accidents and 59% collisions resulting in death. There would also be benefits in terms of lower fuel consumption (up to 8%) and more effective road traffic enforcement.

The above mentioned indicates that ISA systems could constitute important alternative/additional measure to speed limitation devices. Apart of reducing the implications of illegal modification, ISA systems offset existing imperfections of current speed limitation devices such as no influence neither on reducing speeding on roads with speed limits below the speed limiter setting<sup>15</sup>, nor on reducing speeding on downgrades steep enough to cause free-rolling. Nevertheless, there is no assessment available to the European Commission to what extend current ISA systems could replace or complement speed limitation devices already installed in heavy commercial vehicles. The same applies to light commercial vehicles as regards *possible* installation of these devices.

## 2.5. Purpose of the study

The general purpose of the ex-post evaluation study is to provide the European Commission with independent and unbiased evaluation of road safety, environmental (fuel consumption and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions) and economic (level playing field) effects of the application of the Speed Limitation Directive to heavy commercial vehicles, particularly of category M2 and N2 with maximum mass exceeding 3.5 tonnes but not exceeding 7.5 tonnes. It will also consider whether and how the Directive should be amended to improve its effects and efficiency.

The study includes at least the evaluation of:

- possible application of speed limitation devices to light commercial vehicles;
- possible further decreasing the speed limits as laid down in the Directive;
- the use of various types of ISA systems in all commercial vehicles;

Apart from the questions related to the Directive, the study will also address in more general terms how efficient and effective are such speed limiting measures in comparison to other measures aiming to improve the road safety and/or to reduce emissions. The geographical scope of the study will cover 27 Member States.

---

<sup>13</sup> Biding, T. and Lind, G. (2002), Intelligent Speed Adaptation (ISA), Results of large-scale trials in Borlänge, Lidköping, Lund and Umeå during the period 1999-2000, Swedish National Road Administration, Publication 2002

<sup>14</sup> Carsten O., Fowkes M., Lai F., Chorlton K., Jamson S., Tate F., & Simpkin B. (2008), ISA-UK intelligent speed adaptation Final Report

<sup>15</sup> Van or truck drivers are often tempted to reach the maximum speed set by the limiters that, inter alia, makes overtaking between two vehicles too long with dangerous "wind push" of smaller vehicle towards bigger vehicle.

### **3. DESCRIPTION OF THE TASKS**

Evaluations performed in or commissioned by the European Commission shall comply with the evaluation standards in force<sup>16</sup>.

#### **3.1. Evaluation questions**

##### *Relevance*

- To what extent has the Speed Limitation Directive contributed to the improvement of road safety and environmental protection in the context of other factors/initiatives having effects on road safety, fuel consumption and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions?

##### *Effectiveness*

- What are the main results and impacts related to road safety, fuel consumption and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and level playing field of the measures set out in the Directive taking into account all categories of heavy commercial vehicles, with special focus on the use of heavy commercial vehicles of category M2 and N2 with maximum mass exceeding 3.5 tonnes but not exceeding 7.5 tonnes?
- Are there any other significant results and impacts of the measures set out in the Directive than those mentioned above?
- Which factors have hindered the improvement of road safety, environmental protection and level playing field?
- To what extent could further decreasing the speed limits as laid down in the Directive and the use of various types of ISA systems improve the impacts achieved by the implementation of the Directive?
- Would the application of speed limitation devices with specific speed limits to light commercial vehicles be necessary in view of road safety, fuel consumption and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and the application of ISA systems?

##### *Sustainability*

- What are the main problems with implementation of the Directive in Member States? Is there any evidence on existence of fraud? If relevant, what is the extent and dynamics of fraudulent practices?
- Given the technological developments, would exploitation of speed limitation devices be still appropriate in 5 years?

##### *Efficiency*

- Is there a scope for administrative burden and compliance/enforcement cost reduction while implementing the Directive?
- Is there a scope for limiting burdens for SMEs and micro-enterprises without significantly hindering the achievement of safety and emission reduction objectives of

---

<sup>16</sup> C.f. Annex to Communication SEC(2007)213 to the Commission - February 2007  
[http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/secretariat\\_general/evaluation/docs/standards\\_c\\_2002\\_5267\\_final\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/secretariat_general/evaluation/docs/standards_c_2002_5267_final_en.pdf).

the Directive? Could SMEs and micro-enterprises be excluded from the scope of the Directive?

- Would it be possible to achieve the same level of road safety and environmental protection more efficiently by other means (e.g. infrastructure improvements, advanced solutions in vehicle construction, better enforcement of traffic rules)?
- Could ISA systems be efficient enough to replace or complement existing speed limitation devices? Would these technologies be mature enough for widespread implementation?

### *Utility*

- In the light of the targets set by the White Paper on Transport, can the impacts achieved by the implementation of the Directive be considered as sufficient in medium and long term?

### *EU added value*

- Why should the introduction of speed limitation devices to commercial vehicles be regulated at EU level, and not left up to each Member State to decide?

In order to answer these questions, the contractor will *at least* carry out the following:

- Define the role of speed for each heavy commercial vehicle category involved in fatal accidents and provide the evolution of the share of the involvement of each heavy commercial vehicle category in accidents with fatal consequences due to speeding on total number of road fatalities and, if possible, severe injuries before and after 2005 in the EU 27;
- Quantify the impacts related to road safety, fuel consumption and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and level playing field of the measures set out in the Speed Limitation Directive, especially as regards the use of heavy commercial vehicles of M2 category and N2 category vehicles with maximum mass exceeding 3.5 tonnes but not exceeding 7.5 tonnes.
- Quantify the impacts related to further decreasing the speed limits as laid down in the Directive and the use of various types of ISA systems for heavy commercial vehicles;
- Analyse what reference value<sup>17</sup> of maximum total permissible mass of vehicle could be considered as the optimum for the application of speed limitation devices to light goods vehicles (N1 category) and what would be the optimum parameter for light passenger vehicles (M1 category), if plausible. Analyse what could be optimum speed limit for each light commercial vehicle category;
- Taking into account the results of the analysis mentioned above, define the role of speed for each specified light commercial vehicle category involved in fatal accidents and provide the evolution of the share of the involvement of each specified light commercial vehicle category in accidents with fatal consequences due to speeding on total number of road fatalities and, if possible, severe injuries after 2005 in the EU 27;

---

<sup>17</sup> The reference mass of 2 610 kg for LCVs is used in Regulation 510/2011/EU and Regulation 715/2007/EC (OJ L 171, 29.6.2007, p.1)

- Assess possible application of speed limitation devices to light commercial vehicles in view of road safety, fuel consumption and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and the application of ISA systems, taking into account the most recent data, specified light commercial vehicle categories and speed limits. Assessment will cover motorways, rural roads and urban roads;

### **3.2. Other tasks under the assignment**

The contractor will organise stakeholders meeting after delivering intermediate report of the study as described in the subsequent chapter. The organisation will include:

- identification and invitation of stakeholders;
- drafting relevant questions for the stakeholders;
- presenting the study including available results/findings in the meeting;
- drafting minutes of the meeting;
- drafting conclusions which will be used for the final report of the study;

The European Commission will provide the meeting room in Brussels.

## **4. EXISTING DOCUMENTATION AND INFORMATION, MONITORING SYSTEM**

List of available background material and administrative and technical files is provided in Annex I of the ToR. All other data shall be gathered by the contractor.

## **5. REPORTING AND DELIVERABLES**

The contractor must ensure that all reports under the contract are clear, concise and operational. Each report (excluding the final version of the final report) will have an introductory page providing an overview and orientation of the report. It should describe what parts of the document have been carried over from previous reports or been recycled from other documents, and which represent progress of the work under the contract. It should also specify the status of any findings/conclusions/recommendations (e.g. whether these are tentative or final) and note any problems encountered during the process.

All reports will be drafted in English and transmitted in electronic Microsoft Word format according to the indicative timetable as specified in Chapter 6 below. The final report and the executive summary will be of publishable quality, provided also in the Adobe portable document format (pdf) format and in 5 hard copies. All relevant evidence of the analysis process (questionnaires, results of surveys, calculations, etc.) has to be annexed to the report to allow the argument to be followed in a transparent manner. Excel sheets including formulas for any calculations carried out by the consultants to support tables or graphs in the study, should also be provided. *As all evaluation reports shall be available to the public, no form of confidential data shall be contained in the final report (if relevant, such data shall be provided in a separate annex).*

The contractor is requested to present:

- a) An inception report specifying the detailed work programme and planning of the evaluation in order to complete the tasks as listed in Chapter 3. It will describe the proposed methodological, empirical approaches and working assumptions. The report



will also identify any additional need for information to be collected during the evaluation and present data collection methodology and tools along with the list of contacts to be surveyed or interviewed, interview guides and survey questionnaires. A detailed work plan including the allocation of experts per task per number of working-days will also be provided.

- b) An intermediate report, which is produced after the main desk and field research has been completed will summarise the results reached until that moment and raise any problems encountered with sufficient information to permit reorientation, if appropriate. More specifically, it has to cover at least the evaluation/assessment concerning the application of speed limitation devices to HGVs. The intermediate report will also demonstrate how the existing data has been analysed and outline the preliminary conclusions drawn. It will give clear indications and detailed planning of the work to be carried out during the rest of the study period. It has to include a proposal for the structure of the final report.
- c) Draft final report will follow the structure of the final report as agreed. It will describe the purpose of the evaluation, its context and objectives. It has to include the first findings, analysis, conclusions and recommendations. It will take account of the comments made earlier in the process. The draft final report will include a proposal for the structure of the executive summary.
- d) Final report will follow in principle the same format as the draft final report. It will cover all points of the work plan and shall include sound analysis of findings and factually based conclusions and recommendations. It must take into account Commission's comments and requests as regards the draft final report insofar as these do not interfere with the independence of the contractor in respect of the conclusions they have reached and the recommendations made. The final report will be accompanied by an executive summary in three languages (EN, DE and FR), which provides a short synthesis of the main conclusions of the evaluation, the key points of evidence underpinning them and the resulting recommendations.

## **6. ORGANISATION AND TIMETABLE**

### **6.1. Organisation**

The contract will be managed by Unit C4 of DG MOVE. The Commission will appoint a technical officer in charge, who will participate in the meetings with the contractor, facilitate access to information, monitor the work and validate the results of the services of the contractor. A steering group will be involved while assessing the quality of the evaluation work and reports submitted by the contractor. The contractor must ensure that activities progress properly, are reported upon regularly and for that purpose will designate a person responsible for permanent and regular contact with the Commission. The contractor is to provide the required reports and documents in accordance with the conditions agreed. The amount of work involved to carry out this contract is assessed at approx. 150 man-days.

### **6.2. Meetings**

It is expected that the contractor (the team leader and other relevant experts) participate in maximum 4 meetings in Commission premises in Brussels with the steering group (apart of the stakeholders meeting in Brussels). Minutes of the meetings will be drafted by the contractor within 5 working days, and will be agreed among the participants.

### 6.3. Timing

The indicative starting date of the evaluation study is January 2013, depending on the date of entering into force of the contract. The contract shall enter into force on the date on which it is signed by all contracting parties. The period of execution of the contract is 6 months. This period is calculated in calendar days.

The following outline work plan and indicative timetable are envisaged:

Deadline (from starting date)	Task
Signature (T0)	January 2013
Kick-off meeting (T0+10 working days)	The project is kicked off at the meeting between the contractor and the steering group. The kick-off meeting will ensure that the contractor has a clear understanding of the terms of the contract and the objectives of the project. The contractor will be provided with all relevant available documents and be informed of useful information sources for data collection.
Inception report (T0+5 weeks)	The contractor submits an inception report. Within 2 weeks the report will be discussed in a meeting with the steering group and should be approved by the Commission.
Intermediate report and <u>stakeholders meeting</u> (T0+12 weeks)	The contractor submits an interim report. Within 2 weeks the report will be discussed in a meeting with the steering group and should be approved by the Commission. Subsequently, the contractor will organise stakeholders meeting.
Draft final report (T0+20 weeks)	The contractor submits the draft final report.
Comments on the draft final report (4 weeks from the reception of the draft final report)	The Commission will provide the contractor with comments on the draft final report and suggests a meeting date for the discussion with the steering group.
Final report (2 weeks from the reception of the Commission comments)	The contractor submits the final report which reflects the Commission's comments. It also submits the executive summary in three languages (EN, DE and FR).
Approval of the Final Report –10 working days from the reception of the final report)	The Commission approves the final report. In the event of inadequate quality of the final report, Article I.11.2 (2.) of the Special Conditions of the Framework Contract applies.

The quality of the final report will be non-exclusively assessed and rated on the basis of the quality criteria as identified in Annex II.

#### **7. COMMISSIONING BODY AND USER (S) OF THE STUDY RESULTS**

The Commission retains all rights relating to the reports produced under this contract and to their reproduction and publication. The Commission services will be responsible for deciding the possible dissemination of the findings and conclusions of the assessment and its related materials produced under this work contract.

Annexes:

- Annex I: Indicative List of Relevant Material gathered by the Commission
- Annex II: Quality Assessment Criteria

**Indicative List of Relevant Material**

**Studies/Reports:**

1. CE Delft report "Speed limiters for vans in Europe – environmental and safety impacts", 2010
2. The European Parliament study on the Road Safety Performance of Commercial Light Goods Vehicles, 2009
3. IMPROVER Final Report "Impact assessment of measures concerning the improvement of road safety of light goods vehicles (LGV)", Subproject 2, 2006

**Fact sheets/brochures:**

1. ETSC "Contribution to CARS 21 WP1 on Road Safety", 2012
2. ETSC "PRAISE": Preventing Road Accidents and Injuries for the Safety of Employees, 2011
3. ETSC "Managing Speed - Towards Safe and Sustainable Road Transport", 2008
4. ETSC "Intelligent Speed Assistance - Myths and Reality", 2006
5. SWOV Fact sheet " Lorries and delivery vans", 2010
6. UK Transport Department statistical release "Free Flow Vehicle Speeds in Great Britain 2010"
7. COMMERCIAL TRUCK AND BUS SAFETY SYNTHESIS PROGRAM - SYNTHESIS 16 "Safety Impacts of Speed Limiter Device Installations on Commercial Trucks and Buses", USA 2008

## Quality Assessment Criteria

The quality of the final report will be non-exclusively assessed on the basis of the following quality criteria, and rated (grade: poor/satisfactory/good/very good/excellent) according to the following criteria:

1. **Relevance:** Does the evaluation respond to information needs, in particular as expressed in the terms of reference?
2. **Appropriate design:** Is the design of the evaluation adequate for obtaining the results needed to answer the evaluation questions?
3. **Reliable data:** Are data collected adequate for their intended use and have their reliability been ascertained?
4. **Sound analysis:** Are data systematically analysed to answer evaluation questions and cover other information needs in a valid manner?
5. **Credible findings:** Do findings follow logically from and are justified by, the data/information analysis and interpretations based on pre-established criteria and rational?
6. **Valid conclusions:** Are conclusions non-biased and fully based on findings?
7. **Helpful recommendations:** are there areas needing improvements identified in coherence with the conclusions? Are the suggested options realistic and impartial?
8. **Clarity:** Is the report well structured, balanced and written in an understandable manner?
9. **Overall assessment** of the final evaluation report: Is the overall quality of the report adequate, in particular:
  - Does the evaluation fulfil contractual conditions?
  - Are the findings and conclusions of the report reliable, and are there any specific limitations to their validity and completeness?
  - Is the information in the report potentially useful for designing intervention, setting priorities, allocating resources or improving interventions?