

Directive 2003/59/EC on the initial qualification and periodic training of drivers of certain road vehicles for the carriage of goods or passengers

Information about the respondent	
Your name -open reply-(optional)	PATRIZIA
Your surname -open reply-(optional)	DI MAURO
Your organisation -open reply-(optional)	UEAPME - TRANSPORT FORUM
Your email address -open reply-(compulsory)	p.dimauro@ueapme.com
Please provide some information about your organisation -single choice reply-(compulsory)	Other
Please specify "Other" -open reply-(compulsory)	Private SME Organization
Please specify your main country of operations or residence -single choice reply-(compulsory)	BE – Belgium
Are you answering as an individual or on behalf of an organisation or an institution? -single choice reply-(compulsory)	I am answering on behalf of an organisation or institutions (business organisation, NGO, public authority, etc.)
Please note that as part of the European Transparency Initiative, organisations are invited to use the register of interest representatives to provide the European Commission and the public at large with information about their objectives, funding and structures (http://europa.eu/transparency-register/index_en.htm). Please indicate if your organisation is registered in the Transparency Register of the European Commission. -single choice reply-(compulsory)	Yes
Please enter your registration number in the Transparency Register. -open reply-(compulsory)	55820581197-35
Received contributions may be published on the Commission's website, with the identity of the contributor. Do you agree with your contribution being published under your name? -single choice reply-(compulsory)	My contribution may be published under the name indicated.
The general relevance and effectiveness of the Directive	
The importance of education and training of drivers	
<i>The European Commission's action in the area of transport of goods and passengers by road is based on the strong belief that action in this area is an important</i>	Yes

element to increase safety on European roads and that the qualification and training of drivers have an important role to play. In 2009 alone, more than 4,200 people died in road traffic accidents involving so-called Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs), meaning vehicles of over 3.5 tons maximum permissible gross vehicle weight. In the overall number of accidents the share of trucks is modest. However, while less than 2.5 % of the total road accidents lead to fatalities, over 6 % of the accidents involving heavy good vehicles lead to fatalities. A study on the causes of accidents involving trucks has shown that around 85 % of the accidents are linked to human error of one of the road participants. Other causes of accidents such as weather and infrastructure conditions could as well be mitigated through specific training of drivers.

1. Do you think that qualification and education of drivers engaged in the transport of goods or passengers by road have an important contribution to make to road safety? -single choice reply-(optional)

Comments -open reply-(optional)

Any measures tackling traffic accidents is welcomed by UEAPME Transport Forum. Transport of goods and passengers do need to face professional upgrade to cope with the international activity but most accidents involving trucks occur and are actually caused by cars and motorbikes. Lorry drivers are already more qualified and have more experience in road transport compared to the other drivers.

The current Directive provides some minimum training requirements but does not provide specific rules on the mutual recognition for the profession of drivers. The horizontal Directive 2005/36/EC on the recognition of professional qualifications applies therefore by default to the profession of drivers, but only partially fills the void. As far the drivers' profession is concerned, Directive 2005/36/EC does not provide for automatic recognition rules based on harmonised minimum training requirements.

No, a higher level of recognition should be pursued

2. Do you think that the level of mutual recognition of the profession currently stipulated in the Directive is sufficient or should a higher level of recognition be pursued? -single choice reply-(optional)

Comments -open reply-(optional)

The standards of training requirements should be equal or at least at the same level throughout the EU.

The profession of driver frequently suffers from the image as a low qualification profession, with professionals operating in this sector being considered as easily replaceable workforce. The establishment of an increased harmonisation of requirements of higher

Yes

training and qualification standards to become a professional driver is meant to increase the consideration and the value of the profession and thereby also its attractiveness for young people entering the labour market.

3. Do you think that the setting up of an increased harmonisation of requirements would increase the consideration of the profession of driver? -single choice reply-(optional)

Comments -open reply-(optional)

The creation of a single market, with equal possibilities of access for all citizens of the EU and with no discrimination based on nationality or on the differences of requirements in the various Member States is a key objective of the European Union. The harmonisation of qualification and training requirement for drivers, intends to ensure fair and equal conditions for undertakings and drivers across the EU. However, there is substantial room for further harmonisation by establishing for example a common framework for the training and the testing, by further harmonising the content of the training, and setting common requirements for training centres and instructors. The harmonisation of all of these aspects could further contribute to levelling the playing field at higher quality levels than today for undertakings and drivers throughout the EU, while at the same time also increasing road safety and improving the preparation of drivers.

Yes

4. Do you think that the establishment of a common framework for the training and the testing, further harmonisation of the content of the training, and the setting of common requirements for training centres and instructors could further contribute to the objectives of the Directive? -single choice reply-(optional)

Comments -open reply-(optional)

To date the harmonization is insufficient in regards to the contents of the driver training because of the difference in the Member States' competence of qualifying training centers.

The impact of the Directive

The Directive was adopted to guarantee initial qualification and periodic training of drivers of certain road vehicles to increase safety on European roads. The European Commission wishes to hear the

No, not at all

stakeholders' opinion as to if and to what extent the Directive has actually met this objective and contributed to road safety (e.g. by improving the knowledge of road traffic regulations, changing driving attitudes, improving compliance with working time periods or increasing the awareness of risks).

5. Do you think that the Directive has contributed to increasing safety on European roads? Please explain your answer in the comments section. -single choice reply- (optional)

Comments -open reply-(optional)

It is difficult and still too early to evaluate the impact of this Directive because the permanent training of drivers will become compulsory only as of September 2016. A particular attention should be given to light vehicles and their driving permits, which are the main cause for traffic accidents but which are completely excluded from the scope of the regulation with regards to the initial and periodic training.

The initial qualification and the periodic training stipulated in the Directive are intended to ensure that professional drivers have the necessary qualifications to drive their vehicles, thereby contributing to the development of the professionalism of the sector.

Yes, but only marginally

6. Do you think that the Directive has contributed to the development of the level of professional competence of drivers? -single choice reply-(compulsory)

Comments -open reply-(optional)

Equal standards of the content of the periodic training are needed but have not been met yet. This Directive is still the first step for achieving a fair playing field in road traffic.

The common qualification and training requirements set in the Directive are also intended to facilitate the free movement of workers in the sector within the EU by creating a comparable level of qualification, which addresses concerns that professionals from another Member State might not have the same level of competences.

No, not at all

7. Do you think that the Directive has facilitated the mobility of drivers in the transport sector? -single choice reply-(optional)

Comments -open reply-(optional)

The Mobility of workers as an cross-border movement is not developed in the transportation sector.

The setting of common qualification and training requirements in the Directive has the objective to ensure that equal conditions for competition apply and that there is a level playing field for drivers and undertakings in all Member States.

Yes, but only marginally

8. Do you think that the Directive has contributed to the

creation of a level playing field for drivers and undertakings? -single choice reply-(optional)

Comments -open reply-(optional)

This Directive is the first step for achieving a fair level playing field.

Scope of the Directive and Exemptions

The Directive contains a definition of its scope as well as a list of vehicles and uses to which it does not apply. Both must be taken into account in order to establish the applicability of the Directive to any given case. Notwithstanding the differences in the objective, an alignment with the definition of the scope and the exemptions contained in Regulation (EC) No 561/2006 on the harmonisation of certain social legislation relating to road transport regulating inter alia the working and rest periods of drivers could provide more clarity. Alternatively, a separate system of exemptions not related to other EU legislative measures could be elaborated.

The scope and exemptions should be aligned with Regulation 561/2006/EC

9. Do you think that the alignment of the scope and the exemptions of Directive 2003/59/EC with the ones stipulated in Regulation 561/2006/EC would best increase clarity on the scope of the Directive? Alternatively, do you think that a separate system of exemptions would be the most adequate option? -single choice reply-(optional)

Comments -open reply-(optional)

The Directive should align with Regulation 561/2006/EC to better settle the qualification and training, which should be extended to all professional drivers, including drivers of light vehicles under 3.5 tonnes. Enlarging the scope of the Regulation should also be taken into consideration.

As part of the review process consideration could be given to broadening the scope of application of the Directive to all holders of C or D driving licences or to include also certain professional drivers holding other types of driving licences. The inclusion of other professional drivers could mean for instance the inclusion of taxi drivers or drivers of vans of up to 3.5 tonnes.

To all professional drivers, including drivers of certain vehicles requiring other licences.

When considering this issue, two factors must be taken into consideration: on the one hand, the importance of a wide application of the Directive for the purpose of increasing road safety, and, on the other hand, the importance of not imposing a disproportionate

administrative, economic or social burden on the administrations, undertakings and individuals concerned.

10. Who do you think the regime of qualification and training of the CPC should apply to? -single choice reply- (optional)

Which other vehicles? -single choice reply- (optional)

Others (e.g. auto rickshaws)

Comments -open reply- (optional)

An eventual extension of the scope would certainly generate further costs and bureaucracy but still all professional drivers need an adequate training independently of the costs for the sake of the traffic safety.

Access to professional driving

A system of gradual access to professional driving requiring the various categories of C and D driving licences could be an option to regulate the access of young drivers in such a way that access to more challenging categories of heavy vehicles would be granted only after sufficient experience has been gained in less challenging categories. Such a system is already in place for motorcycles requiring category A driving licences, stipulating the access to heavy motorcycles either gradually by progressing through lower categories or through direct access at a higher age. The application of a similar type of model based on a choice between progressive and direct access to professional driving with C and D licences could be considered.

No

11. Do you think the CPC training should be structured in such a way to offer an option between gradual access to professional driving at an earlier age on the basis of training and experience and direct access at a higher age? -single choice reply- (optional)

Comments -open reply- (optional)

UEAPME Transport Forum strongly supports the idea of a 1-year period training before obtaining the drivers' licence C/CE and the CPC, both to be acquired within a certain time period.

Expanding also on question 4, a reorganisation of the training based on a system of modules structured on the basis of what the driver knows, understands and is able to do at the end of each of these modules (so-called "learning outcomes") could make the functioning of this system easier. The modules could rely on a common methodology and a common way of testing. The quality of the content of the modules might usefully be assured by applying the European Quality

The current system should be maintained

Assurance Reference Framework for Vocational Education & Training (EQAVET) . For each completed module drivers could receive validation and recognition in the form of credits. The credits system could assure additional flexibility in the acquisition of knowledge by drivers and also allow drivers to easily transfer the credits already acquired from one Member State to another were they to move during the training. Alternatively, the current system leaving Member States and in some case single training centres the freedom to organise the training as they wish, could be maintained.

12. Do you think that a new structure of the training based on modules should be introduced or do you favour the current free system? -single choice reply-(optional)

Comments -open reply-(optional)

Mutual recognition and certification of training

There are two main options considered to overcome this problem. The first one would be on the basis of a mutual recognition of the CPC to stipulate that drivers can go back to their home country and have the code 95 marked on the basis of a CPC obtained abroad. Alternatively, all Member States, also those which currently mark the code 95 in the driving licences could be required to issue a separate driver qualification card to holders of foreign driving licences, who obtained a CPC in their country.

Other

13. How do you think the training should be certified as regards drivers obtaining the CPC in another Member State? -single choice reply-(optional)

Please specify "Other" -open reply-(optional)

An international Driver Qualification Card of a completely harmonized format would be more practical to certify the training and professional qualification as well as other important information as the expiry date or the type of the qualification (transport of goods or passengers).

Comments -open reply-(optional)

The code 95 in the driving card certifies the possession of the CPC, completely missing information such as the type of qualification. If there is no possibility to create an international card, an enlargement of the information on the drivers' licence should be requested.

At the moment no common format for the CPC exists. If the CPC were to become a mutually recognised document, the absence of a common format for the document could lead to difficulties. National authorities could have difficulties in determining the validity of a

Yes

CPC issued by another Member State and the risk of fraud could increase. A harmonised format for the CPC as a document would address these risks.

14. Do you think that the establishment of a harmonised format of the CPC as a document becomes necessary, if the CPC becomes a mutually recognised document?

-single choice reply-(optional)

Comments -open reply-(optional)

Structure and content of the training

Specificity of the CPC

15. Do you think that training for the CPC should be explicitly separated from other forms of training in order to preserve the specificity of the CPC training and its objectives? -single choice reply-(optional)

No

Comments -open reply-(optional)

Every driver should have general compulsory training and other more specific courses (e.g. ADR, lift truck, ATP..) to be taken if and when needed, since the specific needs may change in time.

16. Do you think the CPC test should be explicitly separated from the driving licence test? -single choice reply-(optional)

No

Comments -open reply-(optional)

Initial qualification and training

The possibility of choosing between two options for the initial qualification, allows Member States to select the option they deem most suitable for their country. At the same time the absence of a mandatory training under the second option leads to the concern that the higher level of preparation which the CPC should certify might not really be obtained.

No

17. Do you think that all drivers should have to undergo a minimum initial training before obtaining the CPC?

-single choice reply-(optional)

Comments -open reply-(optional)

The subjects to be covered during the initial and the periodic training are organised around three main themes: 'Advanced training in rational driving based on safety regulations', 'Application of regulations', and 'Health, road and environmental safety, service,

Yes, somewhat

logistics'. Annex I lists the single subjects to be covered in these three areas. They are meant to provide drivers with the necessary competences to improve road safety and at the same time make a useful contribution to their professionalisation.

18. Are the subjects listed in Annex I for the initial and periodic training relevant for the objectives of the Directive? If there are subjects you consider irrelevant, please indicate them. -single choice reply-(optional)

Comments -open reply-(optional)

A wider list of subjects of great scope should be drafted to allow professionals prepare for all kind of transport since the job drivers have to fulfill are wide and different.

19. Are there other subjects which in your view are relevant to the training but are currently not listed in the Annex?

Yes

If yes, please list them and explain why. -single choice reply-(optional)

Please list the missing subjects and explain why they should be listed -open reply-(optional)

Specific training: transport of abnormal cargo (large, wide, heavy), transport of liquids, LHV Safety measures: first aid, fire performance

Comments -open reply-(optional)

Section 2 of Annex 1 stipulates that during the initial training a driver must drive for at least 20 hours individually. Of these 20 hours a driver may drive up to 8 hours maximum on a top-of-the-range simulator, but there is no obligation to do so. The use of simulators during the periodic training is currently not regulated at all in the Directive.

No

20. Do you think that the use of top-of-the-range simulators during the training is useful and should therefore be mandatory? -single choice reply-(optional)

Comments -open reply-(optional)

Simulators may be useful for gathering some initial experience on situations that one cannot encounter every day such slippery and icy roads and other dangerous situations. However they cannot substitute real life road traffic which implies a combination of different factors and it would also be impossible and unthinkable to make the simulator use mandatory for all drivers.

In the Directive there is no provision regulating the use of e-learning instruments during the training. The on-going technological progress in the decade since the Directive was approved has led to an ever increasing use of e-learning. The European Commission is interested in stakeholders' view on e-learning to understand if it can make an important contribution to

Yes

the training of drivers and replace parts of the in-house training or if it does not meet the requirements to guarantee high quality levels of training.

21. Do you think that e-learning could make a useful contribution to the training and can therefore partially replace in-house training? -single choice reply-(optional)

Comments -open reply-(optional)

Given the possibility to perfectly control e-learning (e.g. by e-ID reader) Member States should be allowed to recognize e-learning. However e-learning can only substitute a part of the CPC training.

Compulsory periodic training

This raises the issue of guaranteeing sufficient uniformity in the periodic training across all Member States and the necessity to assure that all relevant aspects are covered and that the CPC cannot be obtained on the basis of subjects that have little to do with the CPC training. This could be achieved through a uniform European training syllabus for the periodic training, which would also regulate the inclusion of practical training in the periodic training.

Yes

22. Do you think there should be a uniform European syllabus for the periodic training? -single choice reply-(optional)

Comments -open reply-(optional)

A non restrictive European syllabus would better fit the CPC training. First priority is the equal quality/level of trainings.

In the same way the Directive does not specify the content of the periodic training clearly, it does not specify if the driver has to undergo a test after the completion of the 35-hours of periodic training either. In most Member States course attendance only suffices for the issuing of the CPC and no test is foreseen to verify if the driver has really acquired the necessary knowledge of the subjects covered during the periodic training.

No

23. Do you think that there should be a test after the periodic training? -single choice reply-(optional)

Comments -open reply-(optional)

It would be better have an evaluation both at the beginning and at the end of the course rather than a test after the training. In no case other tests should be put in place.

The organisation of the periodic training in the Member States varies not only in content but also in the way the 35 hours of periodic training are distributed over the 5-years period. The Directive only stipulates that the single training periods must be at least 7 hours. Some

Distribute it over the whole 5-years period

countries have not regulated the distribution at all, leaving the freedom to distribute it over the whole 5-years period, some have determined that 7 hours of training have to be completed each year, while others have stipulated that the 35 hours of periodic training have to be completed within a limited fixed period of time (e.g. in one block or within 10 months).

24. Do you think that the most efficient way of organising the periodic training is to concentrate it in a limited fixed period at the end of the 5 years period or to distribute it over the whole 5-year period? -single choice reply-(optional)

Comments -open reply-(optional)

Nevertheless Member States should still have the possibility to choose between the two possibilities currently regulated in the Directive.

Further to question 11 no mechanism for the recognition of periodic training partially undergone in another Member State is currently foreseen (e.g. a driver undergoes 10 hours of periodic training in Member State A and then moves to Member State B and would like to have these 10 hours of periodic training counted towards the 35 hours of periodic training he has to undergo every five years). The recognition of this partial periodic training undergone in another Member State is not mandatory. It is important to understand if stakeholders see a need for the creation of such a mechanism of mutual recognition.

Yes

25. Do you think that a mechanism for the mutual recognition of parts of periodic training undergone in another Member State should be created? -single choice reply-(optional)

Comments -open reply-(optional)

Approval of training centres and instructors

The training centres providing the initial and periodic training must be approved by the Member States' competent authorities. Annex I section 5 of the Directive lists the documents which must support the application and the conditions under which the competent authority must give approval. Approval can be given only in response to a written application. At the same time it is left to the competent authorities of the Member States to determine what "a suitable qualification and training programme is", and what characteristics the premises where the courses are given, the teaching materials

Yes

and the vehicle fleet used need to have in order to be considered adequate. The European Commission is interested in hearing from stakeholders if they consider a more detailed regulation of approved training centres (e.g. by means of common quality standards) as necessary to guarantee the same high levels of quality of the training in the whole of the EU.

26. Do you think that the Directive should regulate more in detail the requirements training centres have to meet in order to become an approved training centre? -single choice reply-(optional)

Comments -open reply-(optional)

Harmonization and standardization regarding the equipment and qualification of training centers and instructors are necessary steps to achieve a fair playing field throughout EU.

The requirements to be met by the instructors are not specified in the Directive either. The Directive only requires training centres to communicate to the competent national authorities the instructors' qualification and field of activity, but leaving it to the national authorities to determine on the basis of which criteria the instructors' qualifications can be deemed satisfactory.

Yes

27. Do you think that the Directive should regulate the requirements instructors have to meet in order to become approved instructors? -single choice reply-(optional)

Comments -open reply-(optional)

Other comments

28. Are there any other aspects of the Directive you would like to comment on? -open reply-(optional)