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| **Executive Summary Sheet** |
| Impact assessment on a Proposal for a Directive amending Directive 2003/59/EC on the initial qualification and periodic training of drivers of certain road vehicles for the carriage of goods or passengers and Directive 2006/126/EC on driving licences |
| **A. Need for action** |
| **What’s the problem?** |
| Main problems:1. difficulties with mutual recognition of training
2. training content not fully relevant to drivers’ needs
3. difficulties and legal uncertainties in the interpretation of exemptions
4. inconsistencies in minimum age requirements between Directive on the initial qualification and periodic training of drivers (Directive) and Directive on driving licences (DLD)
 |
| **What is this initiative expected to achieve?** |
| General objective: contributing to road safety and free movement of professional driversSpecific objectives (SO):1) streamline administrative practices for mutual recognition in Member States2) training content to encompass ICT, road safety and fuel efficiency3) improvement of legal clarity and consistency with other EU legislation |
| **What is the value added of action at EU level?** |
| Efficient solutions for transnational problemsImproved training systemsLevel playing field for road transport operators in terms of road safety standards  |

|  |
| --- |
| **B. Solutions** |
| **What legislative and non-legislative policy options have been considered? Is there a preferred choice or not? Why?** |
| Legislative policy options SO1:a) obligatory recognition of CPCs (certificates of professional competence) between Member Statesb) requirement to issue Driving Qualification Cards (DQC) if code 95 cannot be indicated in the driving licencec) extending the information system for driving licences (RESPER) to cover CPC trainingAlternative measures concerning non-EU drivers: 1) recognising driver attestations even if code 95 is not indicated or 2) marking code 95 on the driver attestationConcerning SO2  and SO3: improving training relevance, clearly stating the possibility to use e-learning and blended trainingclarifying the scope of exemptionsaligning minimal age requirements with DLDPreferred choice: SO1 (b) plus alternative measure (1). |
| **Who supports which option?**  |
| Stakeholders supported all policy options, in principle.The International Road Transport Union (IRU) supported improving the current training system and adapting it to current needsMember States were concerned that issuing DQCs could be burdensome |
| **C. Impacts of the preferred option** |
| **What are the benefits of the preferred option (if any, otherwise main ones)?**  |
| Resolving mutual recognition issues and costs savings of €2.30 million for businesses and €6.7 million for drivers (2018-2030)Improved training system efficiencyImproved clarity and consistency of the Directive with other relevant EU legal acts |

|  |
| --- |
| **What are the costs of the preferred option (if any, otherwise main ones)?**  |
| Estimated costs (2018-2030): regulatory costs: €6.3 million transitional costs (over four years) for changes to training content: up to €14.1 million |
| **How will businesses, SMEs and micro-enterprises be affected?** |
| Transport SMEs expected to benefit from increased labour supply and reduced costsPossible costs from reviewing the training content not expected to exceed 5 % |
| **Will there be significant impacts** **on national budgets and administrations?** |
| None except regulatory costs |
| **Will there be other significant impacts?**  |
| No |
| **D. Follow up** |
| **When will the policy be reviewed?**  |
| The Commission will monitor effects of the new policy cooperating with Member States and relevant stakeholders |