



2017/2085(INI)

27.6.2017

AMENDMENTS

1 - 38

Draft opinion
Daniel Dalton
(PE606.030v01-00)

Saving Lives: Boosting Car Safety in the EU
(2017/2085(INI))

Amendment 1

Kerstin Westphal, Lucy Anderson, Arndt Kohn, Christel Schaldemose, Biljana Borzan, Evelyne Gebhardt, Maria Grapini, Olga Sehnalová, Liisa Jaakonsaari, Marlene Mizzi, Marc Tarabella, Sergio Gaetano Cofferati

Draft opinion

Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Recognises that improving road safety in the EU begins with ensuring that existing and future provisions can be implemented and checked effectively; calls, in that regard, for increased best practice sharing and independent and peer reviews of type approval and technical services in the Union; calls, in addition, for greater post-market surveillance of vehicles on roads across the Union to ensure that they continue to conform to safety criteria;

Amendment

1. ***Takes note that 25.500 people died in 2016 on European roads and a further 135,000 were seriously injured, causing a devastating human suffering but also economic costs;*** recognises that improving road safety in the EU ***is of utmost importance to reduce the amount of fatalities and serious injuries and*** begins with ensuring that existing and future provisions can be implemented and checked effectively; ***therefore welcomes the list of safety technologies published by the Commission for inclusion in the next revision of the rules; calls on the Commission to come up with an ambitious proposal of the General Safety Regulation and Pedestrian Protection Regulation within the next six months;*** calls, in that regard, for increased best practice sharing and independent and peer reviews of type approval and technical services in the Union; calls, in addition, for greater ***and more independent*** post-market surveillance of vehicles on roads across the Union to ensure that they continue to conform to safety criteria;

Or. en

Amendment 2

Marcus Pretzell

Draft opinion

Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Recognises that improving road safety in the EU begins with ensuring that existing and future provisions can be implemented and checked effectively; calls, in that regard, for increased best practice sharing and independent and peer reviews of type approval and technical services in the Union; ***calls, in addition, for greater post-market surveillance of vehicles on roads across the Union to ensure that they continue to conform to safety criteria;***

Amendment

1. Recognises that improving road safety in the EU begins with ensuring that existing and future provisions can be implemented and checked effectively; calls, in that regard, for increased best practice sharing and independent and peer reviews of type approval and technical services in the Union;

Or. de

Amendment 3
Igor Šoltes

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Recognises that improving road safety in the EU begins with ensuring that existing and future provisions can be implemented and checked effectively; calls, in that regard, for increased ***best practice sharing and independent and peer reviews of type approval and*** technical services in the Union; calls, in addition, for greater post-market surveillance of vehicles on roads across the Union to ensure that they continue to conform to safety criteria;

Amendment

1. Recognises that improving road safety in the EU begins with ensuring that existing and future provisions can be implemented and checked effectively; calls, in that regard, for increased ***European-level oversight of type approval authorities and greater independence of*** technical services in the Union; calls, in addition, for greater post-market surveillance of vehicles on roads across the Union to ensure that they continue to conform to safety criteria; ***recalls that vehicles have been found to perform differently in tests performed in laboratory settings compared to on-road tests;***

Or. en

Amendment 4
Carlos Coelho

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1

Draft opinion

1. Recognises that improving road safety in the EU begins with ensuring that existing and future provisions can be implemented and checked effectively; calls, in that regard, for increased best practice sharing and independent *and peer* reviews of type approval and technical services in the Union; calls, in addition, for greater post-market surveillance of vehicles on roads across the Union to ensure that they continue to conform to safety criteria;

Amendment

1. Recognises that improving road safety in the EU begins with ensuring that existing and future provisions can be implemented and checked effectively; calls, in that regard, for increased best practice sharing and independent *joint* reviews of type approval and technical services in the Union; calls, in addition, for greater post-market surveillance of vehicles on roads across the Union to ensure that they continue to conform to safety criteria;

Or. en

Amendment 5
Curzio Maltese

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1a. Recognises that 25,500 people lost their lives on EU roads in 2016 and a further 135,000 were seriously injured, causing a devastating human suffering; stresses that fatality reduction rates have plateaued in recent years and unless further efforts are made, it is unlikely that the EU's target of halving the number of road deaths between 2010 and 2020 will be met;

Or. en

Amendment 6
Carlos Coelho

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

(1a) Welcomes this report from the Commission and calls on it to table specific legislative proposals as soon as possible with a view to improving vehicle safety;

Or. pt

Amendment 7
Carlos Coelho

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1b. Considers that improving road safety requires a coherent and integrated approach and calls for the mainstreaming of road safety issues in all relevant policy areas, including environmental awareness, consumer policy and cooperation in police and judicial matters;

Or. pt

Amendment 8
Carlos Coelho

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 c (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1c. Stresses that a coherent of road safety policy must include all factors, such as drivers' behaviour, road

infrastructures and the vehicle safety features; to this end, it is essential to have access to high quality comparable data that can be used for the purposes of behavioural anticipation and the development of technical solutions, while respecting the data privacy of users;

Or. pt

Amendment 9
Carlos Coelho

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 d (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1d. Acknowledges the progress made by the Union in reducing road accidents and associated costs thanks to its vehicle safety legislation introduced over the years;

Or. pt

Amendment 10
Carlos Coelho

Draft opinion
Paragraph 1 e (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

1e. Considers that technical inspections in the Member States should include verification that vehicle safety features are fully operational; this should apply to both active and passive safety features;

Or. pt

Amendment 11
Marcus Pretzell

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. *Stresses that when non-conformities are identified, European consumers should be able to count on rapid, appropriate and coordinated corrective measures, including Union-wide vehicle recall where necessary;*

Amendment

deleted

Or. de

Amendment 12

Kerstin Westphal, Lucy Anderson, Arndt Kohn, Christel Schaldemose, Biljana Borzan, Evelyne Gebhardt, Maria Grapini, Olga Sehnalová, Liisa Jaakonsaari, Marlene Mizzi, Marc Tarabella, Nicola Danti, Sergio Gaetano Cofferati

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Stresses that when non-conformities are identified, European consumers should be able to count on rapid, appropriate and coordinated corrective measures, including Union-wide vehicle recall where necessary;

Amendment

2. Stresses that when non-conformities are identified, European consumers should be able to count on rapid, appropriate and coordinated corrective measures, including Union-wide vehicle recall where necessary; *stresses, further, that jointly with the vehicle recall, consumers being harmed by non-conformity of type approval should be adequately compensated by financial means, and that recall programmes only should not be seen as an appropriate measure of compensation in general; considers that by withdrawal of the type approval due to noncompliance or nonconformity, the owner of the affected vehicle should have the right of full reimbursement of the manufacturer for*

the damage caused by the purchase of this vehicle;

Or. en

Amendment 13
Igor Šoltes

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Stresses that when non-conformities are identified, European consumers should be able to count on rapid, appropriate and coordinated corrective measures, including Union-wide vehicle recall where necessary;

Amendment

2. Stresses that when non-conformities are identified, European consumers should be able to count on rapid, appropriate and coordinated corrective measures, including Union-wide vehicle recall where necessary, *as well as have recourse to compensatory remedies such as refunds, replacements and repairs with the use of courtesy cars;*

Or. en

Amendment 14
Curzio Maltese

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Stresses that when non-conformities are identified, European consumers *should be able* to count on rapid, appropriate and coordinated corrective measures, including Union-wide vehicle recall where necessary;

Amendment

2. Stresses that when non-conformities are identified, European consumers *have the right* to count on rapid, appropriate and coordinated corrective measures, including Union-wide vehicle recall *and adequate compensation* where necessary;

Or. en

Amendment 15
Carlos Coelho

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2

Draft opinion

2. Stresses that when non-conformities are identified, European consumers should be able to count on rapid, appropriate and coordinated corrective measures, including Union-wide vehicle recall where necessary;

Amendment

(Does not affect the English version.)

Or. pt

Amendment 16
Marcus Pretzell

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2a. Stresses that the digital single market should not serve as a cover for pressing ahead with large-scale vehicle automation; takes the view that the watchword for vehicle regulation must be 'free citizens who are free to drive', eschewing any drift towards a socialistic transport regime under which independent driving is only possible with a special permit; points out that drivers taking sole responsibility for their actions have set an example by making Europe's roads the safest in the world; warns against replacing this example with the spectre of robotic vehicles; stresses that private ownership is the overriding principle with regard to vehicles also and that environmental factors must not serve as a pretext for motorists being drawn into a collaborative economy;

Amendment 17
Curzio Maltese

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2a. Stresses that the revision of General Safety Regulation 661/2009 and the Pedestrian Protection Regulation 78/2009 represent the most direct and effective measures the EU has to further reduce road deaths and injuries;

Or. en

Amendment 18
Curzio Maltese

Draft opinion
Paragraph 2 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

2b. Recognises that the share of deaths of unprotected road users is increasing as car occupants have benefited from improved vehicle safety and, consequently, a renewed focus on vulnerable road users (pedestrians and cyclists) is needed;

Or. en

Amendment 19
Curzio Maltese

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Believes that full cost-benefit analysis in the form of adequate ex ante impact assessments by the Commission is essential for any new Union safety requirements, and that particular consideration should be given to ***their potential impact on the price of new cars for European consumers, as well their effect on vehicle emissions***; recommends, furthermore, that the implementation of new Union road safety requirements be synchronised with the activities of the UN Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE);

Amendment

3. Believes that full cost-benefit analysis in the form of adequate ex ante impact assessments by the Commission is essential for any new Union safety requirements, and that particular consideration should be given to ***carefully balancing the likely costs to industry and wider societal benefits with regard to lives saved and injuries prevented***; recommends, furthermore, that the implementation of new Union road safety requirements be synchronised with the activities of the UN Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE); ***recalls that, according to the final report of the European Commission COM(2016)0787, the cost of road fatalities and injuries is estimated to be at least €100 billion a year and hundreds of families continue to be shattered every year due to road accidents***;

Or. en

Amendment 20

Matthijs van Miltenburg, Dita Charanzová, Jasenko Selimovic

Draft opinion

Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Believes that full cost-benefit analysis in the form of adequate ex ante impact assessments by the Commission is essential for any new Union safety requirements, and that particular consideration should be given to their potential impact on the price of new cars for European consumers, as well their effect on vehicle emissions; recommends, furthermore, that the implementation of new Union road safety requirements be synchronised with the activities of the UN

Amendment

3. Believes that full cost-benefit analysis in the form of adequate ex ante impact assessments by the Commission is essential for any new Union safety requirements, and that particular consideration should be given to their potential impact on the price of new cars for European consumers, as well their effect on vehicle emissions; recommends, furthermore, that the implementation of new Union road safety requirements be synchronised with the activities of the UN

Economic Commission for Europe
(UNECE);

Economic Commission for Europe
(UNECE); ***recommends that Europe
should remain ambitious as a global
leader in order to come to higher, global
safety standards and less road casualties;***

Or. en

Amendment 21
Igor Šoltes

Draft opinion
Paragraph 3

Draft opinion

3. Believes that full cost-benefit analysis in the form of adequate ex ante impact assessments by the Commission is essential for any new Union safety requirements, and that particular consideration should be given to their potential impact on the price of new cars for European consumers, as well their ***effect on vehicle emissions***; recommends, furthermore, that the implementation of new Union road safety requirements be synchronised with the activities of the UN Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE);

Amendment

3. Believes that full cost-benefit analysis in the form of adequate ex ante impact assessments by the Commission is essential for any new Union safety requirements, and that particular consideration should be given to their potential impact on the price of new cars for European consumers ***and their effect on vehicle emissions***, as well ***as their impact on the transition to sustainable transport***; recommends, furthermore, that the implementation of new Union road safety requirements be synchronised with the activities of the UN Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE);

Or. en

Amendment 22
Matthijs van Miltenburg, Dita Charanzová, Jasenko Selimovic

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Is of the opinion that any new Union safety measures should be

Amendment

4. Is of the opinion that any new Union safety measures should be

proportional to the design and production challenges facing small-volume and bespoke manufacturers;

proportional to the design and production challenges facing small-volume and bespoke manufacturers; *is of the opinion that the Euro NCAP should always reflect the actual car safety of a specific model and strongly rejects the current practice where the normally high-ranked models actually perform less well in real life, because they are stripped of the non-mandatory advanced safety features in specific countries;*

Or. en

Amendment 23
Igor Šoltes

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4

Draft opinion

4. Is of the opinion that any new Union safety measures should **be proportional to** the design and production challenges facing small-volume and bespoke manufacturers;

Amendment

4. Is of the opinion that any new Union safety measures should **take into consideration** the design and production challenges facing small-volume and bespoke manufacturers;

Or. en

Amendment 24
Curzio Maltese

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

4a. Recognises that while almost all cars tested by Euro NCAP consumer testing programme are awarded 5 stars, cars that only meet the minimum EU legal requirements today would receive zero stars; recognises also that the majority of

Amendment

car manufacturers successfully responded to the challenge of meeting new Euro NCAP requirements; believes that type approval requirements need to be updated; believes that regulation is needed to ensure that safety benefits are spread equally to all EU citizens, since indeed not all car models sold in Europe are tested by Euro NCAP, and not all of the same type are sold with the same standards of safety equipment;

Or. en

Amendment 25
Carlos Coelho

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4a. Takes the view that any new vehicle safety requirements should encourage innovation and investment within the EU, stimulate the competitiveness of our industries and help generate employment;

Or. pt

Amendment 26
Carlos Coelho

Draft opinion
Paragraph 4 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

4b. Considers that improved safety features have already proved to be an additional asset for the European automotive industry, gaining it recognition as the producer of the world's

safest vehicles, bearing in mind that consumer safety, far from being a burden, is a quality guarantee for European products;

Or. pt

Amendment 27

Kerstin Westphal, Arndt Kohn, Christel Schaldemose, Biljana Borzan, Evelyne Gebhardt, Maria Grapini, Liisa Jaakonsaari, Marlene Mizzi, Marc Tarabella, Sergio Gaetano Cofferati

Draft opinion Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Welcomes the improvements that market-led technological developments have already brought to Union road safety, and encourages the continued exploration of the opportunities the digital revolution offers in that regard; calls for continuing research and the development of new standards in autonomous emergency braking, lane keeping assistance and reverse detection technologies for motor vehicles, and front-end blind spot cameras and detection for HGVs.

Amendment

5. Welcomes the improvements that market-led technological developments have already brought to Union road safety, and encourages the continued exploration of the opportunities the digital revolution offers in that regard; ***reminds regarding the digital revolution and the rising importance of automated and connected driving, the protection of the consumer's data in the vehicle should have the highest possible standards and where the data processing and forwarding is not mandatory for the safe functioning of the vehicle, consumers must be able to stop the data transfer to the vehicle manufacturer easily***; calls for continuing research and the development of new standards in autonomous emergency braking, lane keeping assistance and reverse detection technologies for motor vehicles, ***high vision cabins*** and front-end blind spot cameras and detection for HGVs; ***calls for a better and a more effective collection and exchange of information and data between all stakeholders regarding the research of the real cause of the accidents;***

Or. en

Amendment 28

Matthijs van Miltenburg, Dita Charanzová, Jasenko Selimovic

Draft opinion

Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Welcomes the improvements that market-led technological developments have already brought to Union road safety, and encourages the continued exploration of the opportunities the digital revolution offers in that regard; calls for continuing research and the development of new standards in autonomous emergency braking, lane keeping assistance and reverse detection technologies for motor vehicles, and front-end blind spot cameras and detection for HGVs.

Amendment

5. Welcomes the improvements that market-led technological developments have already brought to Union road safety, and encourages the continued exploration of the opportunities the digital revolution offers in that regard; ***emphasises that the protection of personal data is fundamental, and underlines that public administrations should handle personal data securely in line with the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) and the EU Rules on Privacy; considers it important to further explore the principle of data ownership;*** calls for continuing research and the development of new standards in autonomous emergency braking, lane keeping assistance and reverse detection technologies for motor vehicles, and front-end blind spot cameras and detection for HGVs; ***calls for phasing in specific measures which significantly increase vehicle safety.***

Or. en

Amendment 29

Igor Šoltes

Draft opinion

Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Welcomes the improvements that ***market-led*** technological developments have already brought to Union road safety,

Amendment

5. Welcomes the improvements that technological developments have already brought to Union road safety, and

and encourages the continued exploration of the opportunities the digital revolution offers in that regard; calls for continuing research and the development of new standards in autonomous emergency braking, lane keeping assistance and reverse detection technologies for motor vehicles, and front-end blind spot cameras and detection for HGVs.

encourages the continued exploration of the opportunities the digital revolution offers in that regard; calls for continuing research and the development of new standards in autonomous emergency braking, lane keeping assistance and reverse detection technologies for motor vehicles, and front-end blind spot cameras and detection for HGVs; ***stresses the importance of protecting personal data in this context, and reiterates the need for compliance with Regulation 2016/679.***

Or. en

Amendment 30
Curzio Maltese

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5

Draft opinion

5. Welcomes the improvements that market-led technological developments have already brought to Union road safety, and encourages the continued exploration of the opportunities the digital revolution offers in that regard; calls for continuing research ***and the development of new standards in autonomous emergency braking, lane keeping assistance and reverse detection technologies for motor vehicles, and front-end blind spot cameras and detection for HGVs.***

Amendment

5. Welcomes the improvements that market-led technological developments have already brought to Union road safety, and encourages the continued exploration of the opportunities the digital revolution offers in that regard; calls for continuing research ***looking at the safety implications of the transitional phase of mixed automated and semi-automated vehicles and interaction with vulnerable road users.***

Or. en

Amendment 31
Daniel Dalton

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5a. *Calls on the Commission to bring forward requirements administered under type approval processes to improve pedestrian and cyclist awareness and safety as regards heavy duty vehicles with large blind-spot zones; acknowledges requirements in the weights and dimensions Directive 96/63/EC as amended by Directive (EU) 2015/719 and encourages that the mandate given to the Commission is reviewed to ensure it is fit for purpose or renewed in future legislation in order that legal certainty is given to allow action in this area;*

Or. en

Amendment 32
Curzio Maltese

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5a. *Believes that ambitious safety standards benefit the automotive industry by helping European vehicle producers and suppliers maintain their global lead in safety technology; believes that this strengthens their competitive position on the global market but also increases export opportunities.*

Or. en

Amendment 33
Carlos Coelho

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5a. *Calls on the Commission to consider the inclusion in future proposals of mandatory tyre pressure monitoring systems, fire extinguishers, hammers/window glass breakers and seatbelt cutters, in all vehicles;*

Or. pt

Amendment 34
Maria Grapini

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 a (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5a. *welcomes the mandatory nature of the provisions being sought by the classification body, which could contribute to more uniform levels of protection, and stresses the importance thereof;*

Or. ro

Amendment 35
Curzio Maltese

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5b. *Welcomes the list of safety technologies published by the Commission in December for inclusion in the next revision of the rules; recognises that making driver assistance technologies such as Automated Emergency Braking and Intelligent Speed Assistance standard features will also help*

Europe's pathway to higher levels of automation; calls for standardising and independently testing of such features to prepare the ground for self-driving vehicles.

Or. en

Amendment 36
Carlos Coelho

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5b. Maintains that the EU and its research centres should play a leading role in the development of autonomous vehicles, which will revolutionise the automobile sector, especially in terms of road safety, being expected to save thousands of lives every year, as well as contributing to the digitalisation of the Internal Market.

Or. pt

Amendment 37
Daniel Dalton

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5b. Recognises the added value of retrofitting older vehicles where appropriate with additional safety features included in newer models; believes that incentivising retrofitting through tax reductions and lower insurance premiums could be an effective tool in enhancing vehicle safety in Europe;

Amendment 38
Maria Grapini

Draft opinion
Paragraph 5 b (new)

Draft opinion

Amendment

5b. Considers that all EU citizens should be given better access to vehicles meeting high safety standards.