

Dear Sirs

I have several complaints about the administration and structure of the Survey.

First it is available only in English. From the perspective of promoting the voice of European citizens this fact is as bizarre as it is appalling. It totally disenfranchises those who don't speak English well. It is this kind of arrogance on the part of the European Commission that, in my view, led to the recent embarrassment of founder member states and the Irish voting against the constitution and the Lisbon treaty. It is absolutely outrageous that the Survey is possibly incomprehensible to the majority of EU citizens given that the outcome of any consultation may affect every vehicle owner in the EU. In my view it represents an infringement of their democratic rights to give their voice and does not promote transparency

The questionnaire itself is very leading and will produce biased results. Writing as someone who has Survey design experience it appears to be one designed to produce deliberately biased results or was developed by someone who is not competent in survey design. As such it wastes EU tax payers money. I give the following question as an example

To improve road safety and reduce emissions, how much could the PTI cost reasonably increase for you?

up to 5%
up to 10%
up to 20%
up to 30%

Where are the options to represent

don't know
No increase acceptable
Decrease (e.g. 5%)

The No Opinion option has been recognised on other questions

E.g.

Do you think that inspection results of all vehicles should be available to those carrying out tests and to government authorities in Europe? (for administration and testing centres)

Yes

to authorities only

no

no opinion

Given the use of English the questions show a clear lack of domain knowledge for the countries being targeted, e.g. UK and Ireland

What was the cost of the test to the vehicle owner per vehicle tested (excluding any consequent cost of e.g. repairs to the vehicle)? [(optional)]

Indicate the currency [drop down list]

Private cars

Goods vehicles (<3.500 kg)

Goods vehicles (>3.500 kg)

Passenger vehicles (< 8 pass.)

Passenger vehicles (> 8 pass.)

Trailers (< 3.500 kg)

Trailers (> 3.500 kg)

Agricultural tractors

Motorcycles

Caravans

Other (Please Describe)

No charge to vehicle owner

This information as to PTI should be readily available from each national department of transport, e.g. The DoT in the UK for its MOT regime. I appreciate some countries do not have such testing regimes but why as the citizens for this. Quicker and cheaper to ask the governments.

I've reattached the survey for the benefit of the London MEP's who represent me and whom I've copied on this email.

Personally I believe the person or team that came up with this survey should be sacked for their incompetence and wasting EU Taxpayers' money. I can recommend at least one survey organisation who I have been involved in commissioning for attitudinal surveys to either take over the contract or provide some basic training in survey design. I have no financial interest in that organisation but I do know that they are both competent and have the capability and resources to carry out this kind of survey on a global basis so Europe shouldn't be a problem.

As a motorcyclist I find the idea that a bike should be ranked alongside commercial vehicles as being considered for random roadside inspections as abhorrent as it is unfounded based on the evidence covering the contribution of vehicle faults to fatalities and serious injuries that the EC itself cites. What is the hidden agenda here?

Regards

Jon Strong BSc MBA