

Making the railway system
work better for society.

9TH March 2018

Explanatory Note: Update of European Vehicle Register (EVR) Impact Assessment

1. Reasons for updating the impact assessment report

The Agency's proposal for EVR specifications accompanied by an impact assessment was presented at the 81st RISC meeting (30-31 January 2018) as item no. 13 (under 'Items for exchange of views'). Some Member States questioned the selected preferred option due to the very similar overall rating of the two best-performing options and the economic benefit from the option not retained. Following the discussion the Commission concluded that the impact assessment may be revisited and the sensitivity of the hypotheses tested.

2. Summary of changes to the impact assessment report

Overall, the changes to the impact assessment report compared to the version available for the RISC81 can be summarised as follows:

- › **No changes have been introduced regarding the qualitative scoring or the quantitative assessment**
- › Options are now consistently referred to as Option 0, Option 1, Option 2, Option 3 and Option 4, with **Option 1** being the centralised EVR and **Option 3** being the hybrid
- › Minor adjustment of text in **Section 4.1** where the impacts by stakeholder are described **without influencing the qualitative scoring**
- › Main changes are in **Section 5.4 (Preferred Option)** and **Section 5.5 (Further work required)**:
 - In Section 5.4, the initially preferred option has been removed following the intervention of Member States, as the assessment of options 1 and 3 does not allow identifying the single preferred option among these.
 - The qualitative and quantitative assessment are summarised for all options with particular emphasis on the performance concerning Option 1 and Option 3. In addition, the outcome of a sensitivity analysis re. Option 1 and Option 3 is outlined. Finally, the main pros and cons for Option 1 and Option 3 are summarised
 - In Section 5.5, it is mentioned that no further work on the impact assessment is foreseen. It is also highlighted that further monitoring re. return of experience may be appropriate in case Option 3 is selected
- › In **Section 6.1 (Monitoring indicators)** an additional sentence is included to emphasise that monitoring regarding the user experiences would be relevant for Option 1 but in particular in the case of Option 3 in order to ensure a smooth implementation.