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**1. INTRODUCTION**

In the interest of road safety, environmental protection and fair competition, European legislation provides for a set of measures to ensure that commercial vehicles on European roads are in appropriate technical condition. These include:

* rules on admission to the occupation, which require transport operators to have sufficient financial capacity to ensure the proper maintenance of vehicles (Regulation (EC) No 1072/2009[[1]](#footnote-1));
* periodic roadworthiness tests of vehicles, to be carried out in Member States for vehicles registered on their territory, with a minimum frequency laid down at European level (Directive 2009/40/EC[[2]](#footnote-2));
* technical roadside inspections — the subject of this report — ensuring that commercial vehicles are only used if they are maintained such as to ensure a high level of technical roadworthiness (Directive 2000/30/EC[[3]](#footnote-3)).

Under Directive 2000/30/EC (further referred to as "the Directive"), commercial vehicles, their trailers and semi-trailers circulating on the territories of the Member States are subject to technical roadside inspections of their roadworthiness, in order to improve road safety and protect the environment.

Article 6 of the Directive sets out, that every two years Member States should provide the Commission with data collected for the previous two years relating to:

* the number of commercial vehicles checked, grouped into seven vehicle categories and further grouped by the country of registration;
* the items checked as per the Directive; and
* the deficiencies discovered.

The Directive lists nine different points (see section 4 below) that can be subject to a technical roadside inspection. If any of the items checked do not comply with the relevant road safety requirements, the use of the vehicle may be prohibited. Every deficiency of the inspected vehicle must be mentioned in the inspection report to be given to the vehicle’s driver. The Directive requires the Commission to submit a report to the Council and the European Parliament on the application of the Directive, based on the data received from the Member States, together with a summary of the results obtained.

In 2014 the European Parliament and the Council revised the rules and procedures for the technical roadside inspection of commercial vehicles. On 3 April 2014 Directive 2014/47/EU[[4]](#footnote-4) was adopted, and must be applied by the Member States from 20th May 2018. The new Directive introduces *inter alia* the requirement that the total number of initial roadside inspections in the EU will have to correspond to at least 5% of the total number of these vehicles registered in the Member States. The first reporting obligation when this target will have to be taken into account will be due by 31 March 2021 for the years 2019-2020.

**2. DIRECTIVE 2000/30/EC**

According to Directive 2009/40/EC[[5]](#footnote-5) on roadworthiness tests for motor vehicles and their trailers vehicles used for commercial purposes have to be tested annually. However as the annual test is considered not to be sufficient to guarantee that these vehicles stay in a roadworthy condition throughout the year, it is necessary to apply targeted additional roadside inspections as an enforcement measure.

The Directive as amended[[6]](#footnote-6)- which is applicable until 19 May 2018 - sets out a number of conditions for the technical roadside inspections of commercial vehicles circulating in the EU.

Directive 2010/47/EU amended the vehicle categories and the list of items in Annex I of the Directive as from 01 January 2012.

Before the amendment vehicles on the roadside inspection report (Annex I) were defined by classes e.g. road train which meant any motor vehicle for the carriage of goods with a maximum mass exceeding 3,5 t (categories N2 and N3) coupled to a trailer (categories O3 and O4). At the same time vehicles of the category N2 had to be indicated under "light goods vehicle", category N3 vehicles under "lorry" while categories O3 and O4 vehicles under "trailer" and "semi-trailer".

The amendment of Directive 2010/47/EU however introduced a different way of grouping of the vehicles by using their category designation according to the type-approval legislation. As a result a vehicle which might have been indicated in different classes can now be only indicated in one vehicle category. Furthermore the towing vehicle and the trailer have to be indicated separately. Taking into account that the towing vehicle and the trailer can be registered in different Member States such division provides more accurate information and is also important for the obligation to notify the Member State of registration in case serious deficiencies were found on one of the vehicles.

A technical roadside inspection means an unannounced examination of a commercial vehicle circulating within the territory of a Member State. The inspection is carried out mainly on the public highway by the authorities or another body, acting under their supervision.

All technical roadside inspections must be carried out without discrimination on grounds of the driver’s nationality or the country in which the commercial vehicle is registered or entered into service. They must also be undertaken such as to minimise the costs and delay for drivers and operators.

A targeted approach should be adopted in selecting commercial vehicles for technical roadside inspection, placing particular importance on identifying vehicles that seem most likely to be poorly maintained.

Roadside inspections are usually carried out in a stepwise approach. First a visual assessment of the vehicle’s maintenance condition is carried out when stationary accompanied by the check of the documentation on the vehicle's recent roadside inspection and roadworthiness test. A detailed inspection for irregularities based on the list of items of the Directive may be also conducted on the spot or at a testing centre in the vicinity. In the case of a detailed inspection the outcome of the roadside inspection must be documented in a technical roadside inspection report that follows the model set out by the Directive. This information provides the basis for the information Member States are required to communicate to the Commission.

If a commercial vehicle with dangerous deficiencies presents a serious risk to road safety, its use may be prohibited until these deficiencies have been rectified. Foreign vehicles with serious deficiencies must be notified to the Member State of registration to allow for appropriate follow-up.

**3. DATA COMMUNICATED BY THE MEMBER STATES**

This is the fifth report on how Directive 2000/30/EC is applied in the Member States and it covers the period 2013-2014. The data collected by Member States relating to this period was supposed to be provided to the Commission by 31 March 2015 at the latest.

In order to facilitate the reporting obligation of the Member States the Commission sent out an information letter at the beginning of March 2015 accompanied by a template table. This template was developed together by the Commission and Member State experts to facilitate the collection and the reporting of the very complex data set; however, its use is not obligatory. Every Member State which fulfilled its obligation made use of the template and submitted the data in an electronic version which made the further analysis significantly easier.

The data, however, were not always communicated in a timely manner. 18 Member States (Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Greece, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, the Netherlands, Poland, Romania, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the United Kingdom) provided data on the number of vehicles checked, grouped by category and country of registration, as well as data on items checked and defects noted. Following discussions between the Commission and the remaining 10 Member States, 8 provided the required data. In the course of the dialogues with France and Germany however it has been identified that these Member States are not able to provide the required data in line with the requirements of the Directive.

France communicated only cumulated data concerning the two categories of heavy goods vehicles (N2 and N3) and for the two categories of buses (M2 and M3) instead of separating them. Furthermore France did not provide any information on trailers (categories O3 and O4). Consequently only the total numbers were used for this report, and for the comparison of the details the data provided by France were disregarded.

Germany at the same time used the vehicle classes which were in force before the amendments of Directive 2010/47/EU were introduced and could not provide the data according to the vehicle categories as required by the amendments. As a result the details for the vehicle categories cannot be identified therefore only the total numbers are used for this report.

Member States provided the data with varying levels of completeness. Austria, the Czech Republic, Romania, the Netherlands, Greece, Luxemburg, Poland and Croatia submitted data also on vehicles registered outside the EU classified by the country of registration while Belgium and Italy provided a data summary for non-EU countries.

**4. CONTENT OF THE INSPECTION**

The points likely to be checked and to be included in the data sent by Member States are, at a minimum, those referred to in point 10 of the specimen report set out in Annex I to Directive 2000/30/EC. These are:

* identification;
* braking equipment;
* steering;
* visibility;
* lighting equipment and electric system;
* axles, wheels, tyres, suspension;
* chassis and chassis attachments;
* other equipment, including tachograph and speed limitation devices;
* nuisance including emissions and spillage of fuel and/or oil.

**5. STATISTICAL DATA**

**5.1. Overall number of vehicles checked and their origin**

According to Article 3 of Directive 2000/30/EC the inspections must be carried out without any discrimination either on grounds of the driver’s nationality or the country of registration.

Compared to the previous period **2.561.820 fewer checks** have been carried out in 2013-2014 which is a **decrease of 31,5%.**

An outstanding change can be observed in the data reported by Finland which does not include checks of vehicles outside the EU and as a result the total number of checks was halved compared to the previous period and the proportion of the vehicles registered in Finland increased by 30%.

Though Poland also reported data for non-EU countries, the total number of checks was half that of the previous period. At the same time, the rate of checked Polish vehicles decreased from 92,1% to 47,3% which means that Poland put more emphasis on checking foreign vehicles especially registered in a non-EU country considering that the number of these checks is five times higher than that in 2011-2012.

Belgium and Luxembourg reported higher proportions of foreign vehicles having been subject to roadside inspection as was already the case in the two previous periods (2011-2012 and 2009-2010).[[7]](#footnote-7) Other Member States with significant transit traffic reported a more balanced distribution of checks on domestic and foreign vehicles. Due to their geographical position Cyprus and Ireland reported only locally registered vehicles, and a very high rate of domestic vehicles can also be observed in Malta, Estonia and Romania.

**Table 2: Origin of vehicles checked**

| **Reporting Member State (MS)** | **Registered in the MS** | **Registered in another MS** | **Registered outside the EU** | **Total** | **Vehicles of the MS (%)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Belgium** | 6,203 | 11,287 | 583 | **18,073** | **34.3 %** |
| **Bulgaria** | 254,651 | 65,752 | 922 | **321,325** | **79.3 %** |
| **Czech Republic** | 81,711 | 51,945 | 3,325 | **136,981** | **59.7 %** |
| **Denmark** | 1,748 | 333 |  | **2,081** | **84.0 %** |
| **Germany** | 989,524 | 541,168 | 70,036 | **1,600,728** | **61,8%** |
| **Estonia** | 1,669 | 20 |  | **1,689** | **98.8 %** |
| **Ireland** | 12,939 |  |  | **12,939** | **100.0 %** |
| **Greece** | 14,922 | 1,424 | 470 | **16,816** | **88.7 %** |
| **Spain** | 652,259 | 70,991 |  | **723,250** | **90.2 %** |
| **France\*** | 460,918 | 572,841 | 19,933 | **1,053,692** | **43,7%** |
| **Italy** | 10,153 | 4,576 | 414 | **15,143** | **67.0 %** |
| **Cyprus** | 1,174 |  |  | **1,174** | **100.0 %** |
| **Latvia** | 4,196 | 1,711 | 194 | **6,101** | **68.8 %** |
| **Lithuania** | 64,531 | 15,329 |  | **79,860** | **80.8 %** |
| **Luxembourg** | 125 | 584 | 17 | **726** | **17.2 %** |
| **Hungary** | 164,307 | 52,197 |  | **216,504** | **75.9 %** |
| **Malta** | 3,968 | 44 |  | **4,012** | **98.9 %** |
| **Netherlands** | 4,373 | 4,256 | 231 | **8,860** | **49.4 %** |
| **Austria** | 23,416 | 23,932 | 1,536 | **48,884** | **47.9 %** |
| **Poland** | 420,147 | 74,007 | 393,957 | **888,111** | **47.3 %** |
| **Portugal** | 602 | 29 |  | **631** | **95.4 %** |
| **Romania** | 7,404 | 516 | 215 | **8,135** | **91.0 %** |
| **Slovenia** | 3,948 | 1,165 |  | **5,113** | **77.2 %** |
| **Slovakia** | 11,135 | 5,076 |  | **16,211** | **68.7 %** |
| **Finland** | 9,250 | 1,902 |  | **11,152** | **82.9 %** |
| **Sweden** | 46,059 | 7,468 |  | **53,527** | **86.0 %** |
| **United Kingdom** | 174,678 | 118,160 |  | **292,838** | **59.7 %** |
| **Total** | **3,455,127** | **1,629,421** | **499,616** | **5,584,164** | **61.9 %** |

\* France has not reported data on trailer categories O3, O4

**5.2. Prohibited vehicles**

Vehicles with dangerous deficiencies that present a serious risk to its occupants or other road users may be prohibited from further use until those deficiencies have been rectified. According to the information sent by Member States, the proportion of vehicles prohibited in relation to all vehicles checked varies considerably from one Member State to another, from a high of **90.1 % in Estonia** to just **0.2 % in the Czech Republic and even 0% in Portugal.**

The rates of the prohibitions applied to vehicles registered domestically as opposed to those registered in other Member States indicate that domestic vehicles are likely to be more poorly maintained while vehicles sent abroad are kept in better condition. Significant differences can be found in **Estonia with 90.1% of prohibitions of domestic vehicles** and **45% of prohibitions of vehicles from other Member States**. The same rates in **Sweden** are **82.3% to 39.6%,** in **Malta 48.7% to 13.6%** while in **Italy 44.6% to 26.1%.**

**Austria** reported relatively high but at the same time a balanced prohibitions rate of both **domestic 55.9% and foreign vehicles 58.7%.** The figures seem to indicate that Austria target poorly maintained vehicles more successfully which increases operational effectiveness and decreases administrative burden. Some Member States like **Estonia (90.1% to 45%), Finland (56% to 34.9%) or Italy (44.6% to 26.1%)** are more successful in targeting domestic vehicles while the prohibition rate of vehicles registered in other Member States show that poorly maintained vehicles become less likely to be subject to a roadside inspection. Notably low prohibition rates of both domestic and foreign vehicles as in the **Czech Republic 0.5% to 0.2%, Bulgaria 1.7% to 2.3%, Latvia 0.7% to 1.1%, Lithuania 1% to 2% or the Netherlands 1.2% to 1.3%** indicate that the targeting method of commercial vehicles is rather undeveloped.

Compared to the prohibition rates of the previous period, the results suggest impressive development of the targeting method in some Member States. The overall **prohibition rate** for the EU of **Sweden** for the period **2011-2012 was 17.8%** while for the **current period it is 76.4%.** **Italy** reported also significant improvement with only **12.9%** for the previous and **38.9%** for the current period while the figures of **Slovakia are 22.6% and 38%**. Nevertheless the figures indicate a substantial **relapse in Romania** where the prohibition rate **decreased from 39.9% to 4.3%,** in **Luxemburg from 58.9% to 4.4%.** In **Ireland** the decrease is **37.4%** with a prohibition rate of **43.4% for the previous and 6% for the current period,** taking also into account that Ireland reported exclusively checks of domestic vehicles for both periods. The reasons for the decrease of the prohibition rates are unknown to the Commission.

The ratio of prohibitions in Estonia (90,1%) Sweden (82,3%) and in Cyprus (146,4%) indicates possible differences not only in the testing methods and the assessment of the deficiencies but also in the compilation method of the report in the Member States. In the case of Cyprus where more bans than inspected vehicles were reported, presumably if several deficiencies leading to a ban were found on a vehicle, these deficiencies were reported as separate bans. It should also be noted that although according to the Directive the "number of commercial vehicles checked" is to be communicated, the same vehicle can be inspected by the same Member State more than once during the covered period, which results in the report containing in fact the "number of the inspections carried out".

**Table 3: Proportion of prohibited vehicles in relation to all EU vehicles checked**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Reporting  Member  State** | **Vehicles registered in the reporting Member State** | | | **Vehicles registered in the EU (including reporting Member State)** | | |
| **Number  of vehicles  checked** | **Number of  prohibitions** | **Ratio of  prohibitions (%)** | **Number  of vehicles  checked** | **Number of  prohibitions** | **Ratio of  prohibitions (%)** |
| Belgium | 6,203 | 452 | 7.3 % | 17,490 | 972 | 5.6 % |
| Bulgaria | 254,651 | 4,319 | 1.7 % | 320,403 | 5,804 | 1.8 % |
| Czech Republic | 81,711 | 402 | 0.5 % | 133,656 | 507 | 0.4 % |
| Denmark | 1,748 | 432 | 24.7 % | 2,081 | 532 | 25.6 % |
| Germany | 989,524 | 13,628 | 1.4 % | 1,530,962 | 32,125 | 2.1 % |
| Estonia | 1,669 | 1,504 | 90.1 % | 1,689 | 1,513 | 89.6 % |
| Ireland | 12,939 | 779 | 6.0 % | 12,939 | 779 | 6.0 % |
| Greece | 14,922 | 202 | 1.4 % | 16,346 | 228 | 1.4 % |
| Spain | 652,259 | 79,872 | 12.2 % | 723,250 | 83,280 | 11.5 % |
| France**\*** | 460,918 | 77,327 | 16.7 % | 1,033,759 | 165,465 | 16.0 % |
| Italy | 10,153 | 4,533 | 44.6 % | 14,729 | 5,728 | 38.9 % |
| Cyprus | 1,174 | 1,719 | 146.4 % | 1,174 | 1,719 | 146.4 % |
| Latvia | 4,196 | 28 | 0.7 % | 5,907 | 47 | 0.8 % |
| Lithuania | 64,531 | 625 | 1.0 % | 79,860 | 933 | 1.2 % |
| Luxembourg | 125 | 8 | 6.4 % | 709 | 31 | 4.4 % |
| Hungary | 164,307 | 2,955 | 1.8 % | 216,504 | 5,651 | 2.6 % |
| Malta | 3,968 | 1,931 | 48.7 % | 4,012 | 1,937 | 48.3 % |
| Netherlands | 4,373 | 51 | 1.2 % | 8,629 | 107 | 1.2 % |
| Austria | 23,416 | 13,078 | 55.9 % | 47,348 | 27,123 | 57.3 % |
| Poland | 420,147 | 28,697 | 6.8 % | 494,154 | 29,740 | 6.0 % |
| Portugal | 602 | 11 | 1.8 % | 631 | 11 | 1.7 % |
| Romania | 7,404 | 326 | 4.4 % | 7,920 | 342 | 4.3 % |
| Slovenia | 3,948 | 386 | 9.8 % | 5,113 | 477 | 9.3 % |
| Slovakia | 11,135 | 4,738 | 42.6 % | 16,211 | 6,154 | 38.0 % |
| Finland | 9,250 | 5,177 | 56.0 % | 11,152 | 5,840 | 52.4 % |
| Sweden | 46,059 | 37,917 | 82.3 % | 53,527 | 40,871 | 76.4 % |
| United Kingdom | 174,678 | 37,310 | 21.4 % | 292,838 | 80,283 | 27.4 % |
| **Total** | **3,455,127** | **319,420** | **9.2 %** | **5,084,818** | **499,837** | **9.8 %** |

**\*** France has not reported data on trailer categories O3, O4

**Table 4: Proportion of prohibited domestic vehicles in relation to other EU vehicles checked**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Reporting  Member  State** | **Vehicles registered in the reporting Member State** | | | **Vehicles registered in the EU (excluding the reporting Member State)** | | |
| **Number  of vehicles  checked** | **Number of  prohibitions** | **Ratio of  prohibitions (%)** | **Number  of vehicles  checked** | **Number of  prohibitions** | **Ratio of  prohibitions (%)** |
| Belgium | 6,203 | 452 | 7.3 % | 11,287 | 520 | 4.6% |
| Bulgaria | 254,651 | 4,319 | 1.7 % | 65,752 | 1,485 | 2.3% |
| Czech Republic | 81,711 | 402 | 0.5 % | 51,945 | 105 | 0.2% |
| Denmark | 1,748 | 432 | 24.7 % | 333 | 100 | 30.0% |
| Germany | 989,524 | 13,628 | 1.4 % | 541,438 | 18,497 | 3.4% |
| Estonia | 1,669 | 1,504 | 90.1 % | 20 | 9 | 45.0% |
| Ireland | 12,939 | 779 | 6.0 % | 0 | 0 | N.A. |
| Greece | 14,922 | 202 | 1.4 % | 1,424 | 26 | 1.8% |
| Spain | 652,259 | 79,872 | 12.2 % | 70,991 | 3,408 | 4.8% |
| France\* | 460,918 | 77,327 | 16.7 % | 572,841 | 88,138 | 15.4% |
| Italy | 10,153 | 4,533 | 44.6 % | 4,576 | 1,195 | 26.1% |
| Cyprus | 1,174 | 1,719 | 146.4 % | 0 | 0 | N.A. |
| Latvia | 4,196 | 28 | 0.7 % | 1,711 | 19 | 1.1% |
| Lithuania | 64,531 | 625 | 1.0 % | 15,329 | 308 | 2.0% |
| Luxembourg | 125 | 8 | 6.4 % | 584 | 23 | 3.9% |
| Hungary | 164,307 | 2,955 | 1.8 % | 52,197 | 2,696 | 5.2% |
| Malta | 3,968 | 1,931 | 48.7 % | 44 | 6 | 13.6% |
| Netherlands | 4,373 | 51 | 1.2 % | 4,256 | 56 | 1.3% |
| Austria | 23,416 | 13,078 | 55.9 % | 23,932 | 14,045 | 58.7% |
| Poland | 420,147 | 28,697 | 6.8 % | 74,007 | 1,043 | 1.4% |
| Portugal | 602 | 11 | 1.8 % | 29 | 0 | 0.0% |
| Romania | 7,404 | 326 | 4.4 % | 516 | 16 | 3.1% |
| Slovenia | 3,948 | 386 | 9.8 % | 1,165 | 91 | 7.8% |
| Slovakia | 11,135 | 4,738 | 42.6 % | 5,076 | 1,416 | 27.9% |
| Finland | 9,250 | 5,177 | 56.0 % | 1,902 | 663 | 34.9% |
| Sweden | 46,059 | 37,917 | 82.3 % | 7,468 | 2,954 | 39.6% |
| United Kingdom | 174,678 | 37,310 | 21.4 % | 118,160 | 42,973 | 36.4% |
| **Total** | **3,455,127** | **319,420** | **9.2 %** | **2,743,970** | **286,642** | **10.4%** |

\* France has not reported data on trailer categories O3, O4

**5.3. Types of deficiencies and data by Member State**

Annex I shows the rate of deficiencies found on vehicles during the inspections carried out by the same Member State.

The most frequent deficiencies detected during inspections concern the roadworthiness condition of:

- lighting equipment and electric system(20,9%);

- axles, wheels, tyres, suspension(20,6 %);

- braking equipment (18,8%); and

- other equipment including tachograph and speed limitation device (17,4%).

Within the different items to be tested, considerable differences in deficiency rates were reported. The reason for this may be the different testing methods applied by Member States and the emphasis put on the inspection of specific items during the inspection. When it becomes applicable, Directive 2014/47/EU will introduce greater harmonisation in testing methods, assessment of deficiencies and use of test equipment for more detailed technical roadside inspections.

Comparing the figures with those of the previous period, a remarkable decrease is showed concerning the deficiencies found in the **lighting equipment and electric system** (from 47% to 20,9%). However, on closer examination of the figures, some striking results can be noted. In 47,3% of the inspections in Sweden and in 45,4% in Portugal deficiencies were found on the lighting equipment and electric system. The previous period shows nearly the same rates in these Member States (Sweden 49%, Portugal 50,7%).

Defective **braking equipment** appears to be found most often by the authorities in Denmark (46,7%), in the United Kingdom (34,3%) and in Poland (31,8%). At the same time Greece found 1,6% of the vehicles defective in this respect, while Estonia and Luxemburg found 2,9% and Spain found none (0%).

For deficiencies relating to **emissions and leakages** — which, in addition to being a road safety hazard, can also have an impact on the environment — after a decrease over the previous period of 3,1% (from 4,1 % to 1,0 %) an increase of 3,2% (4,2%) is shown. Vehicles with this defect were found most often in Lithuania (14,6%) and in Cyprus (10,6%). It needs to be mentioned that Cyprus only inspected domestic vehicles during this period.

Annex I shows further results of the inspections and the deficiencies found by the Member State of inspection.

Data submitted by Member States on the number of inspections made on vehicles registered in non-EU countries are still not sufficient to draw significant conclusions on their roadworthiness.

Annex IV of this report provides an overview of the number of vehicles checked in Member States by country of registration and the ratio of prohibitions issued.

**5.4. Prohibited vehicles per vehicle category and per Member State of registration**

Annex II shows how often the vehicles coming from a given Member State were found with defects which led to a prohibition. As regards the vehicles per category, heavy trucks (category N3) were prohibited most often, in 13,6% of the inspections in total. Trailers belonging to the category O3 were found to have a defect in the smallest proportion (6,8%). It needs to be highlighted that vehicles belonging to the not further specified 'other' category were found in 22,2% of the cases with such severe defects that a prohibition had to be applied. Vehicles checked under this category are usually agricultural vehicles, light trailers (O1, O2) or light vans (N1). Directive 2014/47/EU will make the inspection of high-speed tractors (T5) obligatory in cases where they are used mainly on public roads for commercial haulage purposes.

The total number of prohibitions per Member State show that Swedish (80,9%) and Finnish (53,2%) vehicles were most often found with serious defects, while Greek (2,2%) and Latvian (2,8%) only rarely. It needs to be taken into account however that from the 47.046 inspections carried out on Swedish vehicles 46.059 (97,9%) were carried out by Swedish authorities, while from the 10.573 inspections on Finnish vehicles 9.520 (90%) were carried out within Finland. On the other hand 29.360 Greek vehicles were inspected all over Europe and 50,8% (14.922) of it was carried out in Greece, while the same comparison for Latvia shows that Latvian vehicles were in 80% of the cases inspected by other Member States (20.955 inspected vehicle, 4.196 inspected by Latvia).

On the one hand, the figures of Annex II interpreted with Table 4 show which Member States' vehicles are used and therefore inspected more frequently in other Member States. On the other hand the particular high proportion of prohibited domestic vehicles might be caused by the different testing methods and the difference in the assessment of the defects. Concerning the latter Directive 2014/47/EU will introduce greater harmonisation not only in the testing methods but also in the assessment of deficiencies and the use of test equipment for more detailed technical inspections.

Further details per vehicle category per Member State of registration can be found in Annex II. Annex III shows the details per vehicle category per Member State of the inspection.

**6. TYPES OF PENALTIES**

The Directive does not set out a system of penalties for any infringements discovered. Penalties are to be set by Member States, without discrimination on the grounds of the driver’s nationality or of the country in which the vehicle was registered or entered into service.

If it becomes evident that a commercial vehicle presents a serious risk to its occupants or other road users, the authority or inspector carrying out the inspection is empowered under Directive 2000/30/EC to prohibit the use of a vehicle until the dangerous deficiencies discovered have been rectified.

Serious deficiencies found in a commercial vehicle belonging to a non‑resident, in particular those that lead to its use being prohibited, must be notified to the competent authorities of the Member State where it is registered.

The competent authorities of the Member State that found the serious deficiency may ask the competent authorities of the Member State where the vehicle is registered to take appropriate measures, such as subjecting the vehicle to a further roadworthiness inspection. However, no reporting is required on such cases.

**7. SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS**

The Member States' compliance with the reporting obligation has improved although the deadline was still not met in many cases despite the information letter sent out by the Commission at the beginning of March 2015. In some cases the report was only provided following discussions between the Commission and the relevant Member State authorities. In most cases, Member States made use of the standardised electronic format recommended by the Commission for submitting their report. In the case of France and Germany clarification attempts revealed that the reports could not be provided as the Member States were not fully compliant with the Directive.

Several conclusions can be drawn from this report on roadside inspections of commercial vehicles circulating within the EU.

A remarkable change compared to the previous period is that **2.561.820 fewer checks** were carried out in 2013-2014 which is a **decrease of 31,5%.** This might be the result of a more efficient targeting of possibly defective vehicles or a decrease in the resources in the Member States available for roadside inspections.

The proportion of domestic vehicles out of the total number of vehicles checked also varies substantially in the Member States. Further efforts should therefore be made to ensure a more balanced rate of inspections. In Belgium and in Luxembourg for example, domestic vehicles were inspected in fewer than 40% of cases whereas in other transit Member States the proportion is more balanced.

The proportion of vehicles prohibited in relation to all inspected vehicles shows sizeable variations, from 0,4 % in the Czech Republic and 0,8 % in Latvia to more than 89,6 % in Estonia and 76,4 % in Sweden. The figures reported suggest that the efficiency of technical roadside inspections can be increased by better targeting the checks that are carried out. The time lost by the transport operators and the administrative burden both for them and for the enforcement authorities could also be reduced with better targeting. As of 2018 the new roadside inspection Directive 2014/47/EU requires Member States to adjust their inspection systems, moving from carrying out purely random checking to a more targeted approach.

The most frequent deficiencies detected during inspections concern the roadworthy condition of lighting equipment, wheels, tyres and braking. However, significant variations in these deficiency rates can be seen across Member States. The European Commission encourages Member States to pay particular attention to the categories of deficiencies that continue to be most problematic and to adjust the inspection methods they use accordingly.
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