



Brussels, 17.5.2018  
SWD(2018) 191 final

**COMMISSION STAFF WORKING DOCUMENT**

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF THE IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

*Accompanying the document*

**Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council  
on type-approval requirements for motor vehicles and their trailers, and systems,  
components and separate technical units intended for such vehicles, as regards their  
general safety and the protection of vehicle occupants and vulnerable road users,  
amending Regulation (EU) 2018/... and repealing Regulations (EC) No 78/2009, (EC) No  
79/2009 and (EC) No 661/2009**

{COM(2018) 286 final} - {SEC(2018) 270 final} - {SWD(2018) 190 final}

## Executive Summary Sheet

Impact assessment on the *Revision of the General Safety Regulation (EC) No 661/2009 and Pedestrian Safety Regulation (EC) No 78/2009*

**NOTE: Please be aware that the total length of the executive summary sheet should not exceed two pages (at 1500 char/page)**

### A. Need for action

**Why? What is the problem being addressed?** Maximum 11 lines

Road safety is addressed in the EU through an integrated approach (e.g. enforcement, driver training, infrastructure and vehicle safety). Since 2001, road casualties have been significantly reduced. Recently, stagnation has been observed. Some Member States even report an increase for several consecutive years. It is expected that without new initiatives on road safety in general, the safety-effects of the current approach can no longer off-set the increasing traffic volumes. With still over 26 000 annual fatalities and nearly 250 000 seriously injured, new actions in this domain have to be considered. In terms of road users, there is a need to better protect those that are more vulnerable, i.e. pedestrians, cyclists and those of small stature and the elderly. Other matters of attention relate to e.g. SUV crash tests exemptions and anticipated electrification of the vehicle fleet and its safety risks. In general, these objectives may be achieved by improvements in several policy areas (e.g. infrastructure, training) and for this specific initiative by improving vehicle safety features, provided that the approach is consistent for all relevant vehicle categories.

**What is this initiative expected to achieve?** Maximum 8 lines

General objective: Either completely avoid accidents and thus lower their overall number or to lower the severity of un-avoided accidents, so that in each case there are less fatalities and severe injuries.

Specific objective 1: To do so in accidents between vehicles or between vehicles and other obstacles.

Specific objective 2: To do so in accidents between vehicles and pedestrians/cyclists.

**What is the value added of action at the EU level?** Maximum 7 lines

When actions to address road safety problems were to be taken individually by Member States at national level by imposing specific non-harmonised and additional vehicle safety performance requirements, there would be a particular risk of creating obstacles to the free movement of motor vehicles in the Union, negatively affecting citizens as well as economic operators. Furthermore, action at EU level allows for more effective integrated approach with other EU road safety policies in the context of the Third Mobility Package.

### B. Solutions

**What legislative and non-legislative policy options have been considered? Is there a preferred choice or not? Why?** Maximum 14 lines

Three legislative options, cumulative in nature, have been considered whereas a self-regulatory approach has been discarded at an early stage. Non-legislative policy options have not been considered. The options are:

- 1) Generalisation of mature and widely available safety features
- 2) Introducing widely available and less commonly available safety features as standard equipment
- 3) Introduction of a full set of safety features boosting innovation

All policy options consider various vehicle safety legislation items, each covering a specific safety issue, where option 1 addressed the least and option 3 the most safety areas and issues. Broadly speaking, the first option covers effective measures and technologies that are already widely available on a range of mainstream cars. The second option adds a specific focus on potential technologies that require vehicle manufacturers to go slightly beyond what is presently available on the market on non-entry level vehicles. The preferred choice for all categories is option 3. This option is expected to prevent the highest number of fatalities and severe injuries for vehicle occupants, pedestrians and cyclists, at an overall acceptable cost. It also ensures a consistent and non-discriminatory approach towards all vehicle categories.

**Who supports which option?** Maximum 7 lines

The vehicle manufacturing industry is clearly supportive of option 1 as it has the least implications for new vehicle models while still showing an acceptable safety benefits for especially light duty vehicles. They could also support option 2, save for a few measures for which they question the effectiveness. Option 3 is supported by the European Parliament, Member States, Safety Advocacy groups, supplier industry and appears to be

supported by the general public as well.

### **C. Impacts of the preferred option**

#### **What are the benefits of the preferred option (if any, otherwise main ones)?** Maximum 12 lines

Over the evaluation period (2021 – 2037) the preferred option 3 is expected to have the following effects over the scenario where no legislative action is taken in terms of strengthening vehicle safety requirements:

Fatalities prevented: 24 794 covering vehicle occupants (in frontal, side or rear impacts) reduction by 16.0% and pedestrians and cyclists (hit with front-side, side or rear-side of a vehicle) reduction by 14.4%.

Severe injuries prevented: 140 740

Present value benefit: € 72.8 billion

The impact of the preferred option on vehicle users, pedestrians, cyclists, equipment manufacturers and Member State is in all cases rated as strongly positive.

Comparison of the impacts shows significantly increased vehicle occupant safety as well as pedestrian and cyclist protection. The supplier industry benefits from increased safety system and component sales and encouraged innovative technologies and R&D activities. Consumers may benefit from reduced insurance premiums. Member States may see a reduction in need for emergency services and reduced traffic congestion.

#### **What are the costs of the preferred option (if any, otherwise main ones)?** Maximum 12 lines

Over the evaluation period (2021 – 2037) the preferred option 3 is expected to have the following effect:

Present value cost: € 57.4 billion

The impact of the preferred option on vehicle manufacturers is rated as strongly negative, due to the costs and efforts that are necessary on the manufacturers' side to upgrade vehicle safety performance.

The initial cost increase, lowering over time, for the vehicle manufacturer is estimated at € 516 per passenger car, € 521 per van and light commercial vehicle, € 970 per bus and € 1013 per truck. Historical data shows that it is not likely that this cost will be entirely passed on to the end consumer. However, vehicle users may face higher cost of repairs.

#### **How will businesses, SMEs and micro-enterprises be affected?** Maximum 8 lines

No major impacts are expected on SMEs, although some may benefit from increased demand if they are part of the supplier industry value chain. SMEs purchasing vehicles could face higher purchase prices, although this is not expected (see above). SMEs using light commercial vehicles for transportation of crew, tools, packages, etc. will benefit from an equal level of required vehicle safety performance.

#### **Will there be significant impacts on national budgets and administrations?** Maximum 4 lines

It is not expected that there will be significant impact on national budgets and administrations.

#### **Will there be other significant impacts?** Max 6 lines

No. Although the initiative is also expected to have some environmental impact, it is not expected that this is significant.

### **D. Follow up**

#### **When will the policy be reviewed?** Maximum 4 lines

In order to make the new Regulation future proof, it has been deemed more appropriate to address any review of these vehicle safety rules in a more dynamic fashion, namely linked to the overall technical progress and occurrences of new safety needs. In this context, the international regulatory developments through UNECE as well as the frequent need for the adaptation of those rules tend to prompt this reviewing process automatically.