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Preface

This annual report 2016 describes the state of the art of National Access Points in Europe as well as relevant aspects in the area of metadata, level of service, DATEX II and other issues related to the delegated regulations for priority actions A, B, C and E.

This report is the result of work carried out as part of the sub-activity 4.6 of the EU EIP project dealing with the topic of “Monitoring and Harmonisation of National Access Points”.

The purpose of this report is to share the knowledge and experiences on the implementation of National Access Points, following the delegated regulations 2013/885, 2013/886 and 2015/962. By sharing the available knowledge and experiences of those Member States that already have implemented National Access Points, or have started developing plans for implementing National Access Points, other Member States can benefit from this knowledge and experience. At the same time this could lead to a more harmonized implementation of National Access Points across Europe.

Monitoring

This report provides an overview of the current status of implementation of National Access Points in Europe (chapter 2), as well as that it provides a first overview with respect to common features for NAPs (chapter 3), metadata (chapter 4), harmonisation of declaration of compliance (chapter 5), DATEX II (chapter 6) and other harmonisation issues (chapter 7).

Furthermore this report contains a number of annexes, including Annex 1 showing the web-links to the National Access Points (if available) and the contact points for the National Bodies responsible for the assessment of compliance.

Harmonisation

In 2016 there was a strong focus to harmonize declaration of compliance for action C. In close cooperation with TISA a model of declaration has been set up and published. It is expected that this model solves the problem of administrative burden for NAP’s, National Bodies, Service Providers as well as Data Providers.

Readers who think that they have valuable information that can be used for the Annual NAP report 2017 are kindly requested to send an e-mail to Mr. R. Jorna (r.jorna@mobycon.nl). Especially information on new National Access Points and National Bodies is highly appreciated.
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1. Introduction

This chapter describes the scope and objectives of the EU EIP project and more specifically sub-activity 4.6 of the EU EIP project dealing with the monitoring and harmonisation of National Access Points in Europe.

1.1. Scope and objectives of EU EIP

The “EU ITS Platform” (EU EIP) is the place where National Ministries, Road Authorities, Road Operators and partners from the private and public sectors of almost all EU Member States and neighbouring countries, cooperate in order to foster, accelerate and optimise current and future ITS deployments in Europe in a harmonised way.

The “EU ITS Platform” brings together the majority of the European key players, cooperating to establish an open “forum”, aiming at providing valid contribution for the future strategy and policy recommendation for better development and deployment of ITS service along European road Corridors.

The “EU ITS Platform” (EU EIP) is the follow up of actions already supported by TEN-T programme (2012-EU-50005-S European ITS Platform and 2013-EU-50001-S European ITS Platform+). The EU EIP runs a five-year period from 2016 till 2020.

By monitoring, processing, evaluating and disseminating results delivered by the ITS Road Corridor projects (the Works projects that will be co-founded by EC within the CEF MAP ITS Call 2014), the EU ITS Platform can be considered as the technical European ITS "Knowledge Management Centre", contributing significantly to the most effective use of ITS standards and specifications.

1.2. EU EIP Harmonisation cluster (activity 4)

Activity 4 of the EU EIP project aims at progressing ITS harmonisation through three lines of action:

- Continued development of tools for interoperable ITS.
- Extension of ITS harmonisation into new areas.

Regarding the strategic data exchange domain, EU EIP will aggregate, harmonise the various user requirements and ensure dissemination of results and recommendations through strong liaison and cooperation with relevant organizations such as DATEX II, TISA,
POLIS, ETSI, INSPIRE, Amsterdam Group, C-ITS Platform, TN-ITS and other potential stakeholders.

Monitoring and Harmonisation of National Access Point (SA 4.6) is one of the sub-activities within this harmonisation cluster.

1.3. Monitoring and Harmonisation of National Access Point (sub-activity 4.6)

This sub-activity is intended to monitor the on-going implementation of NAPs, to learn from each other and to harmonise NAP services across Europe. This activity builds on the earlier work in EIP and EIP+, which has resulted in the following relevant deliverables:

- EIP: Harmonised concept of National Access Point for Truck Parking & Safety Related Traffic Information
- SPA – Coordinated Metadata Catalogue

Currently NAPs are being implemented in various Member States, but they vary in approach, data availability (links, metadata, database), assessment of compliance, etc. Sub-activity 4.6 runs a three –year period from 2016 till 2018. Therefore sub-activity 4.6 aims at monitoring the developments of National Access Points, contribute to the harmonisation and act as a knowledge centre for among others Member States, NAP operators and Nominated Bodies (National bodies) with respect to Single Points of Access.

The objectives of the sub-activity therefore are the following:

- Monitor development of NAPs across Europe, identify improvement needs, make recommendations
- Harmonise the approach towards NAPs in Europe, in particular in the field of Metadata in the scope of ITS specifications
- Knowledge exchange between the various Member States in the field of NAPs

The tasks of sub-activity 4.6 are:

- Task 1: Monitoring of NAP developments in Europe concerning the implementations for priority actions B, C and E (and possibly later also A).
- Task 2: Validation of features and level of service for NAPs to see if and to what extent quality criteria are applied by the NAPs and to find out if these quality criteria function well.
- Task 3: Recommendations for harmonisation of NAP approaches will be formulated with respect to (among others) metadata, DATEX II, common approaches on quality
assurance and other harmonisation issues arising from discussions with MS and other stakeholders.

The following 11 Member States are involved in sub-activity 4.6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NL (Lead)</td>
<td>Rijkswaterstaat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT (Active)</td>
<td>IMT / Infraestruturas de Portugal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO (Active)</td>
<td>ITS Romania, RNCMR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE (Active)</td>
<td>BASi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK (Active)</td>
<td>Transport Scotland, Highways England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR (Active)</td>
<td>Centre d’études et d’expertise sur les risques, l’environnement, la mobilité et l’aménagement (CEREMA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE (Participant)</td>
<td>Trafikverket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FI (Participant)</td>
<td>Finnish Transport Agency (FTA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FI (Participant)</td>
<td>Finnish Transport Safety Agency (TRAFI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK (Participant)</td>
<td>Vejdirektoratet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT (Participant)</td>
<td>Autovie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE (Follower)</td>
<td>Transport Infrastructure Ireland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.1: Member States involved in sub-activity 4.6

1.4. Methodology

This report is mainly based on the feedback of a survey among implementers of National Access Points, data providers, data users and other relevant sources (among others workshops with Next-ITS and TISA). In total 12 NAP implementers completed the NAP template. In addition questionnaires were sent out on metadata, DATEX II, quality assessment, etc. In total 8 data providers, 1 data user and 7 NAP implementers responded to this questionnaire. In addition, a separate questionnaire was issued concerning the common features and level of service for NAPs, which resulted in additional feedback of seven completed questionnaires.

The following figures schematically shows how the various tasks were allocated to the partners involved in sub-activity 4.6 of the EU EIP project.
In addition to the survey among stakeholders, especially with respect to the harmonized Declaration of Compliance, input was collected from a series of workshops:

- with the Next-ITS project
- with the European Commission
- with TISA.

This process is further described in chapter 5.

In addition, chapters 4 (Metadata) and 6 (DATEX II) build on the work earlier carried out in EIP and EIP+.
2. State of the art of National Access Points in Europe

This section describes the status of implementation of National Access Points in Europe, based on a survey carried out in the second half of 2016. This deliverable will be updated every year until 2018, which will thus show the (expected) progress made in implementing the delegated regulations 2013/885, 2013/886 and 2015/962 and later also the delegated regulation on NAP for multimodal travel information. The following section describes the methodology applied. After that the status of the NAPs for truck parking, safety-related traffic information, real-time traffic information and multimodal travel information will be presented.

2.1. Methodology for monitoring the status of implementation of NAPs in Europe

In the first half of 2016 a template has been created to describe the status of the NAPs per country. Typically the template describes:

- Ministry responsible for implementing the NAP and contact details.
- Nominated body for assessment of compliance, contact details, procedure for assessment of compliance.
- Status of implementation, including the website of the NAP.
- Description of the NAP (operational or planned):
  - Please list which of the data required by the regulation is available, language.
  - Are there/will there be any quality requirements? If yes, please give some examples.
  - Data available in the NAP or only web-links?
  - Data exchange via DATEX, other?
  - Metadata and/or discovery service available?
  - Number of organisations (public, private) using/providing data to the NAP.

This template is intended to describe per country the current status of implementation of the delegated regulations 2013/885, 2013/886 and 2015/962. Depending on the proximity of the implementing body, the template was completed through face-to-face interviews, telephone or e-mail.

In total 12 Member States have responded to the survey. This does not necessarily mean that the other countries have not implemented an NAP. However, since we did not receive information, we were not able to report the status of NAPs in these countries. If Member States have established an NAP, but this NAP is not listed in this report, they can report...
this to the authors of this report. In the annual report 2017 this new NAP information will then be included.

The information is used to draw a picture of the current status of National Access Points in the EU, to draw conclusions on harmonisation needs and to share the knowledge and experience among Member States.

This chapter presents the results of the 2016 survey. The report will be updated in 2017 and 2018, thus providing an annual overview of status of NAPs on a country by country basis.

Annex 1 gives an overview of current status of National Access Points, indicating the web links to the National Access Points and contact points for the National Bodies responsible for the assessment of compliance.

2.2. Status of NAP for Truck parking

In total 12 Member States have responded to the survey about the current status of implementation of the National Access Point for the provision of information services for safe and secure parking places for trucks and commercial vehicles, in short ‘NAP for truck parking’. The delegated regulation on this topic (2013/885) was adopted in 2013. The table below shows the status of implementation in 2016. Only four countries have a (partly) operational NAP, i.e. Belgium, Germany, The Netherlands and Sweden. Four other countries have concrete plans to implement an NAP (Austria, Denmark, Poland and Portugal). The four remaining countries have no plans (yet).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Status of implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Planned (Q4 2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Partly operational (in Flanders only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>Not operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Planned (Q4 2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Not operational or planned*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Not operational or planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Planned (Q3 2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Planned (Q4 2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*) Finland has stated to the EC that they don’t have parking places that would fall under the delegated regulation EU 2013/885. (Letter to EC 14.10.2014/ LVM2014-00470)

Table 2.1: Status of implementation NAP for truck parking
All other countries did not reply to the survey. This does not necessarily mean that they have not implemented an NAP for truck parking. However, in some countries it was not even possible to get in contact with persons responsible for establishing the NAP. Not one country shares an NAP with another country.

Annex 1 gives an overview of the web links to the National Access Points and contact points for the National Bodies responsible for the assessment of compliance.

In the countries with an operational NAP only static truck parking information is available, in particular about the number of parking places. In some countries also information is accessible about safety and equipment. Six countries state that the information is available in the NAP, two state that they provide links to the data. Dynamic truck parking information is not available in any of the NAPs.

Most NAPs have no quality requirements for the data. This means that in most cases the data providers are responsible for the data. Those countries that reported quality requirements mention for example up-to-dateness, use of DATEX, use of metadata. In eight NAPs data is provided via DATEX format. A discovery service or metadata is available for three NAPs, for three other NAPs this is planned/under discussion. Three NAPs don’t have a discovery service or metadata.

Seven NAPs provide the data for free to the end-users. One Member State leaves it to the data owner (Austria), whereas Portugal leaves it to the NAP operator IMT. The language of the NAP is mostly the national language plus English. Only the Netherlands and Poland have a NAP only in the national language.

Most NAPs deliver static parking information to the European Access Point or are planning to do so. Cyprus and the UK don’t and Finland and Norway didn’t answer the question.

Monitoring of the use of the NAP is planned for six NAPs. Two NAPs will not monitor the use of the NAP, one of them (the Netherlands) for privacy reasons. In most countries the data users are unknown, also because the service is not yet available.

In seven countries a National Body for assessment of compliance has been nominated, in one country this is not the case. Four countries didn’t answer this question. However, only in The Netherlands there is a clear procedure for the assessment of compliance. Most other countries are in the process of planning the assessment of compliance.

Data providers are mostly public organisations/road operators. In some cases there are private data providers or there are plans to include private data providers.

Apart from the national NAPs, the European Commission established a European Access Point for truck parking (http://data.europa.eu/euodp/en/data/dataset/etpa). All Member States are stimulated to provide their truck parking data to the European Portal. So far only
A limited number of Member States have done so, i.e. Austria, Belgium, Czech Republic, Denmark, Germany, The Netherlands, Slovenia, Sweden and Switzerland. The content of the European Access Point for Truck parking is visualized in figure 2.1 below.

Figure 2.1: European Access Point for truck parking

2.3. NAP – Safety-Related Traffic Information

In total 12 Member States have responded to the survey about the current status of implementation of the National Access Point for the provision of road safety-related minimum universal traffic information free of charge to users, in short ‘NAP for safety-related traffic information’. The delegated regulation on this topic (2013/886) was adopted in 2013. As the table below shows, six countries have an operational NAP for SRTI, i.e.
Denmark, Finland, Germany, The Netherlands, Norway and Sweden. Austria, Poland, Portugal and the UK have concrete plans to implement an NAP. In Belgium and Cyprus the NAP for SRTI is not yet operational or planned.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Status of implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Planned (Q4 2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>Not operational or planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Planned (Q3 2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Planned (Q4 2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.2: Status of implementation NAP for safety-related traffic information

All other countries did not reply to the survey. This does not necessarily mean that they have not implemented an NAP for safety-related traffic information. In some countries it was not possible to get in contact with persons responsible for establishing the NAP. Not one country shares its NAP with another country.

Annex 1 gives an overview of the web links to the National Access Points and contact points for the National Bodies responsible for the assessment of compliance. Annex 2 provides the system architectures of some NAPs for truck parking.

The delegated regulations mention eight types of safety-related information that should be provided: (a) temporary slippery road; (b) animal, people, obstacles, debris on the road; (c) unprotected accident area; (d) short-term road works; (e) reduced visibility; (f) wrong-way driver; (g) unmanaged blockage of a road; (h) exceptional weather conditions.

Most countries state that they provide all information types, although exceptions exist. For example, in Finland information on wrong way driving is not provided by FTA. Cyprus and Denmark state that they don’t or rarely have exceptional weather conditions. Two countries (Germany, Finland) state that the information is available in the NAP, six state that they provide web-links to the data. The Portuguese NAP is planning to offer both options.

Most NAPs have quality requirements already or have plans for quality requirements for the data. Three countries (Austria, Finland, Sweden) reported quality requirements, for example completeness of minimum metadata set, the quality of data developed in
EIP/EIP+, or merely the requirements mentioned in the delegated regulation. The Netherlands, Poland and Portugal have no quality requirements for the data. Denmark, Germany, Norway and the UK plan to have quality requirements. In eight NAPs data is provided via DATEX format. Metadata is available for eight NAPs, for two other NAPs (Portugal, UK) this is foreseen.

The language of the NAP is mostly the national language plus English. The Netherlands and Norway have a NAP only in the national language, although in Norway more languages are foreseen.

Monitoring of the use of the NAP is either planned or already happening for seven NAPs. Two NAPs (Denmark, The Netherlands) will not monitor the use of the NAP. In Sweden it is still to be decided. For those countries that already have an operational NAP for safety-related traffic information some figures can be presented on the number of data providers and data users:

- Denmark: two organisations provide information. Approximately 10 organisations (mostly private) use the data at the moment.
- Finland: one public organisation provides information. Several public and private organisations use the information (actual amount cannot be specified)
- The Netherlands: two private and one public organisation provide information. Most private service providers use the NAP SRTI in their services.
- Norway: one public organisation provides information. There are more than 130 subscribers to the NPRA DATEX node.
- Sweden: one public organisation provides information. The number of users of the NAP is unknown.

In nine countries a National Body for assessment of compliance has been nominated, in one country (Germany) this is not yet the case. Of these nine, five countries (Finland, Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, UK) already have a procedure in place for the assessment of compliance. Four other countries (Austria, Germany, Denmark, Portugal) are in the process of planning the assessment of compliance. In the Netherlands and Norway a more in-depth evaluation of the NAP has been carried out.

### 2.4. Status NAP for Real-Time Traffic Information

In total 12 Member States have responded to the survey about the current status of implementation of the National Access Point for the provision of EU-wide real-time traffic information services, in short ‘NAP for real-time traffic information’. The delegated regulation on this topic (2015/962) was adopted in 2015. It shall apply from 13 July 2017, so at the time of the survey there was no obligation yet to have a NAP on RTTI up and running. The table below shows that only three countries have a (partly) operational NAP
for RTTI, i.e. Cyprus, Finland and Germany. Seven other countries (Austria, Denmark, The Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Sweden and the UK) have concrete plans to implement an NAP. In Belgium and Poland the NAP for RTTI is not yet operational or planned.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Status of implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Planned (Q4 2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>Partly operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Planned (Q2 2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>Planned (Q3 2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Planned (Q3 2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Planned (Q4 2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Planned (Q1 2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.3: Status of implementation NAP for real-time traffic information

All other countries did not reply to the survey. This does not necessarily mean that they have not implemented an NAP for safety-related traffic information. In some countries it was not possible to get in contact with persons responsible for establishing the NAP. Not one country shares its NAP with another country.

The delegated regulation distinguishes three types of information:
- Static road data
- Dynamic road status data
- Traffic data.

At this stage not all countries have specified the type of data that will be accessible via the NAP for RTTI. Those who did mentioned the following:
- Austria: The NAP will be capable of presenting metadata on data according to specification B.
- Cyprus: Level of Traffic (Speed & Volumes) on primary road network of Cyprus.
- Denmark: The intention is to provide all types of dynamic road status data and traffic data listed in the Delegated Regulation (Annex on Data Categories). The types of static road data to be provided are to be decided.
- Finland: Static road data (partially), dynamic road status data (partially) and traffic data (partially).
- Portugal: Incidents, road conditions, traffic volume (%), average speed, traffic congestion, travel times, VMS messages.
- Sweden: static and dynamic road data.
Germany states that the information is available in the NAP for RTTI, four countries (Austria, Cyprus, Sweden, UK) state that they provide web-links to the data. Finland and Portugal are planning to offer both options. Belgium, Denmark and The Netherlands have not decided yet.

For most Member States it is yet to early to decide on quality requirements for the data to be made available. Only Austria, Finland, Sweden and UK so far have stated that there are/will be some form of quality requirements, e.g. completeness of minimum metadata set, or merely the requirements mentioned in the delegated regulation B.

DATEX II will be the most common format for exchanging dynamic road status data and traffic data. For static/GIS data other formats will be used such as ESRI shape, WMS/WFS-interfaces, TMC-code.

Four countries (Austria, Cyprus, Germany, Finland) have stated that the use of the (meta)data is/will be free of charge. For the UK this applies for the public sector data. Denmark and Portugal still have to decide on whether or not to charge for the data.

The language of the NAP for RTTI is mostly the national language and English. But not all countries have decided already on this aspect.

Monitoring of the use of the NAP is planned in most Member States and already happening in some. The following list provides some examples of (potential) information providers and information users:

- Cyprus: The planned NAP will expand to cover data from municipalities, police, port and airport authorities, public transport operators, etc. Users can be found in the Public Works Department, police, Nicosia municipality, 2-3 universities and (under development) 6-8 private companies via web service to receive raw data and develop their own services.
- Denmark: At the very least two Divisions of the DRD will provide data to the NAP.
- Finland: One public body is providing data. Several public and private organisations (actual amount cannot be specified are users of the data.
- Portugal: All road operators will provide data to the NAP.
- United Kingdom: Initially the National Access Point will direct users to data from Highways England and the devolved Governments in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland.

According to the delegated regulation on RTTI no National Body is required. Nevertheless, some Member States foresee to nominate a National Body comparable to the NAP for SRTI, or still have to decide upon this issue.
2.5. Status of NAP for Multimodal Travel Information

The delegated regulation on multimodal travel information has not yet been adopted by the European Commission. Nevertheless, this will most likely be the case in 2017. Therefore this section gives a first glance on how five Member States are already preparing themselves on this delegated regulation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Status of implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Planned (2017/2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>Planned (Q2 2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Planned (2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Planned (Q3 2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Pre-study ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.4: Status of implementation NAP for multimodal travel information

All other countries did not reply to the survey or left this section blank. This does not necessarily mean that they have not implemented an NAP for multimodal traffic information.

In Austria AustriaTech is responsible for implementing the NAP for multimodal travel information. In Cyprus this is the Ministry of Transport, Communications and Works. In Finland the Finnish Transport Administration will implement the NAP for MMTI, in Sweden this will be most likely the Swedish Transport Administration. In Austria and Cyprus the National Bodies will be the same as the Implementing Body, whereas in Finland this role will possibly be executed by the Finnish Transport Safety Agency (to be decided).

Most countries will provide web-links to the information as well as metadata. Data exchange will take place using DATEX II for road data, NETeX, GFTS and SIRI are mentioned for other modes, INSPIRE for GIS.

2.6. Conclusions on the current state-of-the-art on NAPs in Europe

Based on the survey it can be concluded that only a limited number of Member States so far comply with the delegated regulations 2013/885 and 2013/886, even though these delegated regulations entered into force in 2015.

With respect to the NAP on truck parking, from the Member States that have participated in the survey only four countries have a (partly) operational NAP, i.e. Belgium, Germany, The Netherlands and Sweden. Four other countries have concrete plans to implement an NAP (Austria, Denmark, Poland and Portugal).
In the case of NAPs for safety-related traffic information six countries have an operational NAP (i.e. Denmark, Finland, Germany, The Netherlands, Norway and Sweden). Austria, Poland, Portugal and the UK have concrete plans to implement an NAP for SRTI.

For both types of NAP (truck parking and SRTI) it are mainly the public authorities that deliver the data. Data from private parties, either as actual data or as weblinks or metadata, are rather limited so far.

Even though the delegated regulation 2015/962 will enter into force in July 2017, already three countries have a (partly) operational NAP for RTTI, i.e. Cyprus, Finland and Germany. Seven other countries (Austria, Denmark, The Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Sweden and the UK) have concrete plans to implement an NAP.

For the NAP on multimodal travel information it is still to early to make any conclusions, apart from the fact that some countries already have started preparations.
3. Validation of common features and level of service for National Access Points

3.1. Task purpose and scope

This task aims to identify and develop agreement of common features and Level of Service (LoS) that will facilitate effective NAP functioning and make the NAP a straightforward, valuable resource for users. This section below provides a summary of the task, 2016 activities, findings and progress; and the next steps for 2017.

From the previous EIP and EIP+ projects it is acknowledged that MS have, or are intending to, implement their NAPs using different structures, models, methods of data access / search tools, data checking methodologies. This chapter will describe the various features of NAP implementations, as well as that it will show the results from the access point implementer interviews on how these are progressing and functioning.

This chapter is the result of carrying out task 2 of SA46 of the EU EIP project: Validation of common features and level of service for national access points - relates to the formulation, agreement and validation of common features and Levels of Service (LoS) for NAPs which can contribute to a better service and end user experience (this is not validating the quality of data supplied to and / or requested from the NAP).

These features should be linked to the aims of the delegated regulations requiring access points: improving the accessibility, exchange, re-use and update of data required for the provision of high quality and continuous services.

In the SA46 workplan this task was originally titled “Validation of common quality criteria”, during initial development and discussion it was decided the term “quality criteria” should be replaced by “common features and level of service” to better reflect the scope and aims of the task. The overview of common features and level of service for the National Access Points could serve as a checklist for NAP implementers when developing an NAP, or for the operators of NAPs when evaluating their own performance.

3.2. Methodology

This task has three subtasks as defined in the work plan:

- 2.1: Identify current features / LoS and check whether they are functioning well
- 2.2: Recommendation of a set of features and LoS for national access points
- 2.3: Recommendations report
Subtasks 2.1 and 2.2 have been progressed in 2016.

For sub-task 2.1 the Task 1 structured interviews and surveys asked if existing NAP features and levels of service information were monitored and requested examples / documentation for these.

For subtask 2.2 a questionnaire was circulated to the SA4.6 group members and national implementer contacts. The purpose of the questionnaire was to help gather options on potential NAP aspects that could be categorised as common features and developed for NAP LoS (see annex 4). This was not a questionnaire on the actual / planned NAP implementation, only opinions on the relevance of the topics. The questionnaire was constructed of seven operational and implementation areas, with respondents asked to rate the relevance of 33 attributes. The seven areas were:

1. Functional - including scalability, security, hosting, management and maintenance
2. Technical – including provision of data descriptions, user registration, subscription services
3. Layout and design – including NAP landing page and providing information on the ITS Directive / delegated regulations
4. Communication – including collecting feedback, responding to and informing users
5. Monitoring – usage and request analytics
6. Language – providing aspects of the NAP in multiple languages
7. Additional features – including access to archived data, customisable data requests

By analysing the attributes rated most relevant by respondents it would be possible to make an initial list of features that could be developed towards common, tangible, quantifiable, NAP features and LoS.

In addition to the questionnaire, in November 2016 a short paper was drafted to outline potential common NAP features and LoS. This paper was intended to provide a more simplified overview of the topics the group were considering. These included NAP standards, organisation, navigation, machine readability, permanence, performance checking, language, security, design, data tidiness, data accessibility and documentation. This paper was used within the SA4.6 group to generate further discussion.

3.3. Feedback and initial findings

This section summarises existing NAP LoS, the initial results of the questionnaire and SA4.6 views on the aims and future focus of common NAP features and LoS.
3.3.1. **EXISTING ACCESS POINT LoS FEATURES**

Information on the existing NAP LoS in Germany and the Netherlands was provided.

### 3.3.1.1. MDM, GERMANY

In Germany the Mobility Data Market Place (MDM) aims to support the data exchange between data providers and data users; providing a central portal, offering collected information about available online traffic data from individual data providers. The MDM have drafted General Terms and Conditions / Conditions of Use\(^1\). This contains a MDM Service Level, defining the Service Level Agreement (SLA) for the IT operator of the technical platform. These includes service levels for 11 parameters covering aspects of availability, response times, service maintenance and outages. Table 4.4 below shows selected examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance metric</th>
<th>Service level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating time of the services</td>
<td>24 x 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance window</td>
<td>Daily from 11 pm to 3 am for a duration of 30 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call acceptance time</td>
<td>60 seconds (average) and 120 seconds (maximum)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 3.1: extracts from the MDM Service Level*

These requirements are continuously monitored and reported on a monthly basis. Since the SLA was implemented the service levels have for the most part been met and ensured the technical platform is functioning as required.

### 3.3.1.2. NDW, THE NETHERLANDS (UPDATE IF MORE DETAIL AVAILABLE)

In the Netherlands, the NDW has drafted a document outlining their approach and methodology to deliver actions (c) and (e). This lists the following requirements for the access points:

- The information model is extensible and customisable.
- The service is expandable and customisable.
- The service architecture and technology choices for the access point for action (e) to be aligned with the point of action (c).
- A process is defined to allow renewal and growth of the access point, this growth path will be progressed in agreement between the client and contractor.
- The access point has a cost-efficient design.
- The access point collects and gives access to data and metadata, access point is not responsible for the data.

The access point ensures the quality of the data and the metadata. An analysis of these tasks will take place in consultation with the Department of Road Transport (RDW), which has been appointed as supervisory body. Where available the quality criteria that have been established in the framework of EIP may be taken into account.

The access point monitors the use of the access point, both on the incoming and outgoing sides and reports to the client.

Access point reports on service and performance to the supervisory body.

The access point monitors changes to the quality against the (meta) data quality statement provided and reports to the supervisory body.

The access point has a controller, business operations and accounting that is integrated in the NDW. The client-contractor is accountable to Ministry of Infrastructure and the Environment.

For action (e) only - whether a car park is open, full or closed has been added to the list of parking data that the access point should be able to hold. This is a semi-static data type. In the data model this will need to be taken into account.

Another important aspect is the provision of a service / help desk and additional support features to minimise the effort required by data providers to include their truck parking data in the access point.

3.3.2. INTERVIEW AND SURVEY FINDINGS

Due to the limited feedback in 2016 a full analysis was not feasible but it was possible to gain insight using the aspects were there was a general consensus of importance (ranked between 3 and 5 on the importance scale). This gave indicative findings and provides direction for progressing Task 2. The table below, Table 3.2, lists the aspects ranked as most relevant:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional</th>
<th>provision of data description / metadata</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>• performance: monitoring and collection of performance related statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• capacity / scalability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• service management and organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• service maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>• respond to user questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• provision of technical user support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• announcement of service maintenance (with possible effect on availability)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>• provision of some sections / features (i.e. search, results) in additional languages</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2 – 2016 NAP features and LoS questionnaire - highest ranked features
3.3.3. ADDITIONAL SA 4.6 OPINIONS

The short paper was used to generate further discussion and collect opinion on central themes. In terms of technical aspects it was considered important that:

- NAP should be accessible over the internet using standard protocols
- Data should be machine-readable and should be described by machine-readable data definitions (schemas)
- Data and data definitions should be defined using standard formats and data models

NAP implementers are also examining how to create successful, well-used access points. Today, some organisations do not see the benefits of using a NAP, they are unclear how to use it and of the effort / costs involved. In order to overcome these issues communication is essential, therefore features and LoS around contact emails, Q&A, service promotion, data provider and user support features, general NAP information, EU harmonisation and wider NAP communities should be considered.

3.3.4. CHALLENGES

A number of challenges have been encountered in 2016. There was limited feedback on the topic of common NAP features and LoS, this in part was anticipated as NAP implementations are in their infancy, with many implementers yet to define their service requirements or performance targets. Moving forward greater engagement will be required. There are also a wide range of implementation options being considered, different and diverse drivers behind the services leading to different viewpoints on NAP features and LoS.

All NAP features and LoS proposals should be easily understood, straightforward to validate or measure (easily collected metrics), show they benefit the NAP and NAP user, if they are to be agreed and accepted.

3.4. Next steps

The table below outlines 2017 actions to be progressed for Task 2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timescale</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Output</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan – Dec</td>
<td>Continue to gather existing NAP LoS features / documentation from SA4.6 partners and existing NAP providers</td>
<td>Collect, compare / review, disseminate current practices, input to 2017 Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb - March</td>
<td>Development of Task 2 Proposal Paper – update this following feedback and include the elements highlighted in the questionnaire. Identify stakeholders for workshop</td>
<td>Task 2 Proposal Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March - April</td>
<td>Small group web conference to discuss these initial findings and elaborate. Proposed participants are EU EIP SA4.6 members and willing NAP operators</td>
<td>Updating of Task 2 Proposal Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>NAP common features and LoS workshop, coordinated in conjunction with Metadata task</td>
<td>Workshop report - discussion on features, common understanding, feedback and develop consensus. Updating of Task 2 Proposal Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June – Sept</td>
<td>Review and feedback of common features and LoS</td>
<td>Updated Task 2 Proposal Paper and inputs to the 2017 report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 3.3 – Task 2 overview for 2017*
4. Metadata

4.1. Task purpose and scope

A Metadata dataset describes the administration, organisation, and content of a dataset and of a data service. Metadata datasets are therefore crucial elements to make National Access Points accessible and searchable.

Metadata represent a recurring element of Delegated Regulations of the ITS Directive. Metadata have been mentioned for Priority Action b so far (Delegated Regulation EC 2015/962). It is also anticipated that Metadata will be mentioned in the upcoming Delegated Regulation for Priority Action a.

A need to harmonise Metadata descriptions and structures has been identified for the following reasons:
- to help to make data available and searchable for pan-European service providers,
- to ensure Metadata to be machine-readable in a later stage, and
- to ensure a common understanding of the listed data content.

In the context of EU EIP sub-activity 4.6, harmonisation approaches are therefore to be discussed in the field of Metadata.

In particular, recommendations have to be elaborated in terms of definitions and structures of Metadata for existing and upcoming NAPs across Europe. This work is based on the analyses of previous activities in this field and further feedback from NAP operators.

In this report, conclusions from the analyses so far are summarised and preliminary findings for the upcoming harmonisation efforts are given.

4.2. Previous activities

Within the earlier work in EIP and EIP+, a proposal of a harmonised set of metadata applicable for the priority actions b, c and e has been developed. The result was a joint effort of Austria, Germany and the Netherlands, called the “Coordinated Metadata Catalogue”, where a ‘minimum set of metadata’ was proposed. This first harmonisation effort relates to agreements on:
- clear labelling, definitions, enumerations and remarks concerning mandatory fields,
- a context to structure the metadata by building groups, and
- a commonly used “master” language (English).

However, it was stated that there may be additionally “national” fields, which are not used across all MS.
The focus here was to define what information about the data at the NAP is necessary and appropriate to describe the data and to make it findable for a search function. In this effort, definitions (Metadata descriptions, Metadata structure, etc.) from existing Metadata sets (e.g. Inspire, DCAT-AP) were re-used to avoid incompatibilities. In particular, the following definitions and recommendations were made:

- Definition of data elements which are necessary to describe a dataset in a minimal but adequately way
- Definition of wordings and semantics
- Definition of predefined categorisation
- Definition of data field name
- Definition of data value type
- Recommendations of data field length

The following table show an overview of the described Metadata elements.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Data field</th>
<th>Data type</th>
<th>Mandatory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metadata information</td>
<td>date of metadata</td>
<td>DateTime</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>metadata language</td>
<td>predefined</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>contact point for metadata (name, company, address, email, website, phone)</td>
<td>specific text</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content information</td>
<td>name of publication</td>
<td>free text</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>description of publication</td>
<td>free text</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dataset type category</td>
<td>predefined</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dataset detailed type</td>
<td>predefined</td>
<td>yes for self-validation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dataset language</td>
<td>predefined</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporal information</td>
<td>start date of publication</td>
<td>date</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>end date of publication</td>
<td>date</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical coverage</td>
<td>area covered by publication</td>
<td>predefined</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>network coverage</td>
<td>predefined</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibilities / Contact information</td>
<td>Publisher (name, company, address, email, website, phone)</td>
<td>specific text</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>data owner (name, company, address, email, website, phone)</td>
<td>specific text</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditions for use</td>
<td>contract or license</td>
<td>predefined</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>conditions for use</td>
<td>URL</td>
<td>yes if con/lic is used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access information</td>
<td>structure of dataset</td>
<td>predefined</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Access interface</td>
<td>predefined</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>communication method</td>
<td>predefined</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>access URL</td>
<td>URL</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality information</td>
<td>update frequency</td>
<td>predefined</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>quality indicator</td>
<td>URL + free text</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National body validation date</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 4.4: Overview on Metadata elements from the Coordinated Metadata Catalogue*
The Coordinated Metadata Catalogue was presented during the “EIP+ activity 3.2 SPA workshop” on 24th September 2015 in Bucharest. A follow-up workshop was held on 23rd October 2015 in Amsterdam/Schiphol.

Austria and the Netherlands had decided to implement this set of metadata within their NAP and to collect experiences for one year (2016) to identify further adaptation needs. Germany intends to modify the metadata of the Mobility Data Marketplace (MDM) in accordance to the harmonised set after this first period of evaluation.

4.3. Feedback and initial findings

Before harmonisation approaches regarding Metadata descriptions and structures are discussed, the current practice and experiences in the individual NAPs were reviewed and evaluated. This review and evaluation relates to MS which already have installed NAPs. The following results are based on questionnaires and interviews with NAP operators.

4.3.1. Existing NAP Metadata Approaches

4.3.1.1. MDM, Germany

Germany operates the Mobility Data Market Place (MDM) as the German NAP since 2011. Experiences from the MDM operation were considered within the development of the Coordinated Metadata Catalogue. However, the agreed Metadata descriptions and structures are only matched partially within the MDM, as shown in the following table.

In the long term, an adaption of the MDM towards a harmonised set of Metadata descriptions and structures is aimed. The motivation here is to enable cross-national machine-readability of individual NAPs. A challenge for the harmonisation process is seen in the current incompatibilities of geo-referencing systems.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Data field</th>
<th>Used in MDM?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metadata information</td>
<td>date of metadata</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>metadata language</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>contact point for metadata (name, company, address, email, website, phone)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content information</td>
<td>name of publication</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>description of publication</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dataset type category</td>
<td>Yes, but different categories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dataset detailed type</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dataset language</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporal information</td>
<td>start date of publication</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>end date of publication</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical coverage</td>
<td>area covered by publication</td>
<td>Yes, but different definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>network coverage</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibilities / Contact information</td>
<td>Publisher (name, company, address, email, website, phone)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>data owner (name, company, address, email, website, phone)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditions for use</td>
<td>contract or license</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>conditions for use</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access information</td>
<td>structure of dataset</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Access interface</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>communication method</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>access URL</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality information</td>
<td>update frequency</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>quality indicator</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National body validation date</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5: Comparison of Metadata elements from the Coordinated Metadata Catalogue with the MDM
4.3.1.2. **Mobilitätsdaten, Austria**
In Austria, the NAP “Mobilitätsdaten” ([www.mobilitaetsdaten.gv.at](http://www.mobilitaetsdaten.gv.at)) was launched in November 2016. The Metadata descriptions and structures from the Coordinated Metadata Catalogue have been fully implemented.

4.3.1.3. **NDW, The Netherlands**
The Metadata descriptions and structures from the Coordinated Metadata Catalogue have been fully implemented.

4.3.1.4. **Open Data Portal, Ireland**
Transport-related data are provided via an Open Data Portal (data.gov.ie). Metadata is structured according to the DCAT Application Profile for Data Portals in Europe (DCAT-AP). The aim is to ensure compatibility and interoperability between datasets published by any public bodies.

4.3.1.5. **Open Data Portal, UK**
Transport-related data are provided via Open Data Portal (data.gov.uk). Metadata is structured according to e-GMS as the UK e-Government Metadata Standard.

ITS UK has created specific proformas to collect metadata from UK data providers for Priority Action c of the Delegated Regulation. It is anticipated that the UK Metadata will include many of the metadata elements of the Coordinated Metadata Catalogue. The UK will provide feedback on the Coordinated Metadata Catalogue to the authors.

4.3.1.6. **Open Data Portal, Finland**
The Open Data Portal ([www.opendata.fi](http://www.opendata.fi)) has implemented Metadata according to the Coordinated Metadata Catalogue.

4.3.1.7. **Poland**
The (not yet established) Polish NAP will implement the Metadata catalogue created by CROCODILE project. It is the same Metadata catalogue like in the Coordinated Metadata Catalogue but in a slightly older version.
4.3.1.8. PORTUGAL
For the (not yet established) Portuguese NAP, the Metadata approach is still being discussed.

4.3.1.9. OPEN DATA PORTAL, SWEDEN
The (not yet established) Swedish NAP will consider the Coordinated Metadata Catalogue. However, improvements of the Catalogue are seen as required. Eventually, the Coordinated Metadata Catalogue will be used as an input together with DCAT-AP.

4.3.2. CONCLUSIONS
In general, the individual approaches in establishing Metadata structures vary to a certain extent. The Metadata approach seems to depend particularly on the status of the NAP implementation and the general Open Data frameworks of the individual MS.

The Coordinated Metadata Catalogue is known to all NAP operators that have been interviewed. However, only in a few cases the Coordinated Metadata Catalogue has been fully implemented in a NAP. In many cases, the DCAT-AT standard (as an Open Data standard) has been used for interoperability and compatibility reasons. This is particularly the case when transport-related data are implemented in Open Portals, which bundle all data from any public agency. (Only few countries have established specific transport-related portals with adopted Metadata structures.)

A need for European harmonisation of Metadata descriptions and structures has been identified by all MS which have been interviewed. However, no clear preference for an existing Metadata standard that should be used as a base for the harmonisation effort could be identified.

4.4. Next steps
In the upcoming work of sub-activity 4.6, recommendations for harmonization of NAP approaches are to be formulated, including further metadata harmonisation. This work will be concluded under Task 3.1. A dedicated Metadata Workshop for stakeholders is planned in June 2017.

This work will be based on an evaluation from the Metadata approaches so far. This includes feedback from NAP operators which implemented the Coordinated Metadata Catalogue. Further, an inventory of wishes/requirements regarding Metadata harmonisation is foreseen, to be provided by activity partners and external stakeholders.
The existing Metadata sets will be analysed in order to:

- define improvements of the current set of Metadata based on experiences and further requirements and
- identify needs for extensions with respect to data covered by priority action “A”.

Finally, the use of the harmonised Metadata set will be promoted in other MS.

The table below outlines 2017 actions to be progressed for Task 3.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timescale</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Output</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan – Dec</td>
<td>Continue to review existing NAP Metadata approaches</td>
<td>Collect, compare / review, disseminate current practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>Workshop on Metadata aimed at NAP operators and NAP users.</td>
<td>Discuss features, common understanding, develop consensus.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6 – Task 3.1 overview for 2017
5. Harmonisation of the Declaration of compliance

Delegated Regulation No. 886/2013 establishes the specifications necessary to ensure compatibility, interoperability and continuity for the deployment and operational use of data and procedures for the provision, where possible, of road safety-related minimum universal traffic information free of charge to users of the trans-European road network in accordance with Directive 2010/40/EU. The Delegated Regulation requests Member States to manage a National Access Point for safety-related traffic data as specified in the Delegated Regulation.

The Delegated Regulation also describes the obligation of Member States to carry out an assessment of compliance of the above mentioned parties with this delegated regulation. Public and private road operators, traffic information service providers, data owners/suppliers and broadcasters dedicated to traffic information shall submit a declaration of compliance with the requirements set out in Articles 3 to 8 of the Delegated Regulation.

This describes an EU-wide harmonised approach towards the assessment of compliance for Delegated Regulation 886/2013.

5.1. Why a harmonised approach?

Without a harmonised approach, road operators, traffic information service providers, data owners/suppliers and broadcasters run the risk that -if operating in more than one country- they will have to submit a declaration of compliance in different formats, different languages, under a variety of different rules.

Similarly, the National Bodies responsible for carrying out the assessment of compliance could possibly be facing discussions with a whole range of road operators, service providers, data owners/suppliers and broadcasters that operate within their territory, that might submit their own declarations of compliance in different languages and in a variety of formats.

During a series of dedicated workshops\(^2\) with Member State representatives, road operators and traffic information service providers and data owners/suppliers on the topic of assessment of compliance and how to ensure clear guidelines on applying the

---

\(^2\) Next-ITS workshop (Stockholm, 27 April 2016)
TISA workshop (Brussel, 22 June 2016)
TISA-EU EIP workshop (Brussel, 21 September 2016)
EC DG MOVE workshop (Brussel, 29 September 2016)
TISA-EU EIP workshop (Brussel, 7 November 2016)
Delegated Regulation at the national level, this problem was identified and discussed. All stakeholders that participated in the workshops agreed and recognised the urgent need for a 'Uniform Declaration of Compliance Form', that would be accepted by the road operators, traffic information service providers, data owners/suppliers and broadcasters as well as by the National Bodies designated for the assessment of compliance.

5.2. Uniform Declaration of Compliance Form

Through a joint effort of TISA\(^3\) and EU EIP\(^4\) a Uniform Declaration of Compliance Form has been developed (see annex 5). Three existing examples of Declaration of Compliance forms, from The Netherlands, France and Denmark, were taken as a starting point and served as the basis. The Uniform Declaration of Compliance Form was then discussed with all the stakeholders (public and private) that participated in these dedicated workshops. First of all, it was ensured that the Declaration of Compliance form would be in line with the (minimum) requirements set out in article 9 of the Delegated Regulation. Secondly, the form was developed in such a way that the administrative burden for all parties involved would be minimized, but nevertheless providing sufficient information for a solid assessment of compliance. Last, but not least, an explanatory note was drafted (see annex 5), providing more insight in those aspects of the Delegated Regulation that -following the discussion with the stakeholders- where deemed to be in need of additional explanation.

5.3. How to use this Uniform Declaration of Compliance Form?

The stakeholders agreed that this Uniform Declaration of Compliance Form shall be used from now on by all public and private road operators, traffic information service providers, data owners/suppliers and broadcasters across Europe as the only form for declaration of compliance. This means that one Uniform Declaration of Compliance form can be used per country, as well as that one Uniform Declaration of Compliance form can be used for a number of countries (jointly).

Similarly, the National Bodies designated for the assessment of compliance can use this Uniform Declaration of Compliance Form as the standard Declaration of Compliance form in their country. They shall use the English form and simultaneously make a translation into their own national language. Road operators, traffic information service providers, data owners/suppliers and broadcasters shall use either the English language form or the national language form.

---

\(^3\) Traveller Information Services Association, [www.tisa.org](http://www.tisa.org)

\(^4\) European ITS Platform, [www.its-platform.eu](http://www.its-platform.eu)
5.4. Evaluation of the Uniform Declaration of Compliance Form after 3 years

At the moment of writing (December 2016) only few countries have established a National Access Point as described in Delegated Regulation 886/2013. Probably also only a limited number of road operators, traffic information service providers, data owners/suppliers and broadcasters dedicated to traffic information have already provided a Declaration of Compliance to National Bodies designated for the assessment of compliance. Therefore, currently only very limited experience has been gained with the Declaration of Compliance in the context of Delegated Regulation 886/2103.

It is proposed to use the Uniform Declaration of Compliance Form for a pilot period of three years, i.e. 2017-2019. Shortly before the completion of this three-year period, an evaluation shall be carried out with National Bodies, road operators, traffic information service providers, data owners/suppliers and broadcasters, in order to assess whether the form has addressed the identified challenges or it needs to be modified.

5.5. Support from TISA, EU EIP and the European Commission

The Uniform Declaration of Compliance Form is supported by TISA, the EU EIP project and the European Commission (DG MOVE). The principle and model of the Uniform Declaration of Compliance Form is accepted by all stakeholders who participated in the dedicated workshops as the most efficient and effective way to ensure compliance with article 9 of the Delegated Regulation 886/2013. The Form will thus contribute to compatible, interoperable and continuous deployment and use of road safety-related minimum universal traffic information across Europe.

5.6. Next step

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timescale</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Output</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan – Dec</td>
<td>Setting up harmonised Declaration of Compliance Priority Action E. To be defined with who.</td>
<td>Harmonised Declaration of Compliance Priority Action E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan - Dec</td>
<td>Setting up harmonised Declaration of Compliance Priority Action B, together with TISA.</td>
<td>Harmonised Declaration of Compliance Priority Action B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1: Next steps for harmonisation of declaration of compliance
6. DATEX II

6.1. Role of DATEX II in National Access Points

DATEX II was developed as a standardised solution to communicate and exchange traffic information among traffic centres, service providers and information broadcasting companies. The usage of DATEX II for data exchange is mentioned in Delegated Regulations for priority actions b), c) and e).

For example, in delegated regulation 2013/885 in article 5 it is stated: “Public or private parking operators and service providers shall share and exchange data referred to in paragraph 1 of Article 4. For these purposes they shall use DATEX II (CEN/TS 16157) format or any DATEX II compatible international machine-readable format.

Similarly, in delegated regulation 2013/886 in article 7 it is stated: “Public and/or private road operators and/or service providers shall share and exchange the data they collect pursuant to Article 6. For that purpose, they shall make these data available in the DATEX II (CEN/TS 16157) format or any fully compatible and interoperable with DATEX II machine-readable format through an access point.

However, profiles or recommendations are only available as follows:

- **action e)** – Delegated regulation EU 885/2013 – Safe and Secure Truck Parking
  - DATEX II Profiles available
  - Parking Publications are part of DATEX 2.3
    - The profiles can be found at: [http://www.datex2.eu/content/act-e-truck-parking](http://www.datex2.eu/content/act-e-truck-parking), login is required.

- **action c)** – Delegated regulation EU 886/2013 – Safety Related Information
  - Recommendations are available
  - DATEX II Guide for Road-Safety Related Traffic Content in DATEX II.
    - Link: [http://www.datex2.eu/content/act-c-safety-relevant-traffic-information](http://www.datex2.eu/content/act-c-safety-relevant-traffic-information), login is required.

- **action b)** – Delegated regulation EU 962/2015 – Real-Time Traffic Information
  - During the EIP+ project it was concluded that profiles or recommendations for priority action (b) were too complex to be completed during the EIP+ project period. Elements of the EasyWay 2012 TIS Deployment Guidelines have been identified as being the same as data types included in priority action (b); these were found in EW-TIS-DG03_05 Traffic Condition and Travel Time Information and EW-TIS-DG02 Forecast and Real-Time Event Information. These profiles are a good basis for further enhancement.
    - For static data the INSPIRE Directive (2007/2/EC) has drafted detailed technical documentation of transport network specification which includes many of the...
static data elements in priority action (b). Further development in this is required to link the work of INSPIRE to priority action (b).

Furthermore, DATEX II will publish profiles containing minimum and extended information sets. The minimum sets will contain the same traffic events as the extended one. However, the extended profiles will be able to carry much more details of the traffic situation.

DATEX II is developing a test and reference environment, which will become available in 2017 for validating implementer profiles versus EU harmonised profiles. This validation tool might be extended to validate real DATEX II messages against reference profiles.

In the CROCODILE project (https://crocodile.its-platform.eu/) a ‘Man in the middle’ has been developed called Middleware system. This system maps SRTI data of more advanced data sources to simpler data clients. Especially for those parties having not implemented the entire list of possible SRTI relevant events, this middleware enables the exchange of information for triggering Traffic Management Plans (TMPs) cross border.

6.2. Objective and methodology

This activity is focused on identifying the needs and experiences of NAP implementers with respect to using DATEX II for data exchange. The main objectives of the activity are:

- Organize interviews with NAP implementers and service providers on DATEX II needs and implementation experiences.
- Analyse DATEX II needs for NAP and formulate proposals towards the DATEX II organisation.
- Develop conclusions/recommendations for DATEX II needs for NAP.

The survey organized this year by SA4.6 on the development and implementation of NAP resulted in information about DATEX II usage. Firstly, in the monitoring template, countries were asked if they use DATEX II for data exchange or other protocol.

Secondly, in the questionnaires sent to data providers, data users and implementers, the following dedicated question was included: “Are you satisfied with using the current DATEX II profiles and recommendations for providing the data in the EU Regulations? Are there any technical issues that you believe should be solved?”.

In addition, useful input could be retrieved from the DATEX II User Forum, which was organised in Dublin on 13/14 September 2016. One session was dedicated to the use of DATEX II in the implementation of National Access Points. The presentations from this
User Forum can be downloaded from http://www.datex2.eu/content/datex-ii-user-forum-dublin-2016-report.

The activity is done in close cooperation with SA4.5 (Liaison for data exchange) which ensures the link between EU EIP and the DATEX II organisation. Main goal of the SA4.5 consists on centralising all EU EIP new user needs regarding DATEXII model and to disseminate information to the DATEXII organisation. At the last meeting of the DATEX II organisation it was agreed that SA4.5 will act as the unique interface between the DATEX II organisation and EU EIP. Additionally, the DATEX II activity will also maintain a direct link with the DATEX II organisation through ITS Romania/ELECTRONIC SOLUTIONS experts that are involved in the DATEX II organisation.

6.3. Feedback from the monitoring templates

Filled in monitoring templates were received from FI, AT, CY and UK. Parking information is implemented only in Austria and they use DATEX II for data exchange. For SRTI and RTTI, AT mentioned that the question is unclear, however for the other countries where the services are implemented they use DATEX II for data exchange. FI and AT mentioned explicitly that DATEX II is not used for static traveller information data.

6.4. Feedback from the questionnaires

6.4.1. DATA PROVIDERS

Answers were received from FI, PT, DE (Strassen NRW and TomTom) and NE. In NL and PT there seem to be no problems in using DATEX II as required in the delegated regulations.

From FI it was mentioned that DATEX II is a bit heavy to utilize so there is a need for "light-datex". This issue is already taken up by the DATEX II organisation. In their 2017-2018 work plan the development of a light version is foreseen.

Strassen NRW mentioned the importance of harmonizing profiles, otherwise everybody would use their own. They also experienced that Level A of DATEX II (standard model) does not always guarantee a complete and clear reproduction of data coming from the Traffic Management Centre. Therefore, consideration of user needs and harmonized profiles are needed for the further development of data handling.
An interesting answer was received from TomTom which does not use DATEX II, instead they use XML containers to provide information about traffic situation (traffic flow, incidents, construction sites, etc.).

6.4.2. NAP IMPLEMENTERS

Answers were received from FI, IE and UK. IE mentioned that their NAP implementation does not use DATEX, so no judgement on DATEX II profiles can be made.

NAP implementers from FI mentioned the same comments as data providers.

UK does not have any issues regarding DATEX II. It is however interesting that they mention using DATEX II for static RTTI. This could be a mistake because DATEX II is not suited for this kind of data, as it is confirmed in the implementation monitoring templates from FI and AT.

6.5. Findings from the DATEX II User Forum in Dublin

DATEX II User Forum represents the main DATEX event, every two years, addressed directly to the end users.

The last DATEX II User Forum, held in Dublin, 13-14 September 2016, has as a main topic DATEX support to the Single Point of Access; Six papers from the total of nineteen were dedicated to the description of existing National Access Point or to the vision of preparation or plan for new NAP.

The main findings resulting from selected papers are:

- **Pat Maher** – Director Network Management CEDR: “DATEX II User Forum, Dublin, 13-14 September 2016”
  - Taking under its umbrella the DATEX II Programme, CEDR present its interest in DATEX II:
    - Improving traffic management and traffic information (end-to-end, in close collaboration with public/private actors)
    - Strong ties to ITS Directive Delegated Acts and recurrent elements (e.g. National Access Point)
    - Providing support on Board level, since DATEX II is deeply anchored in the NRA Priorities

- **John McCarthy** – Senior Advisor, Department of Transport, Tourism and Sport: “ITS Ireland National Access Point”
  - Goal: one common NAP for Transport; open data portal (www.data.gov.ie)
- NAP Metadata and Discovery Services
- DATEX II user needs: Filtering of messages from DATEX node – need for a DATEX “light”
  - Bo Bjerkholt – Swedish Transport Administration: “DATEX Activity 6 enhanced usability”
    - Strong demand from road operators to open up their data to the app developers (as NAP) in order to achieve maximum usability
    - Propose:
      - New Ways of using of data
      - New group of users who consume the data
      - Developing a DATEX II light version
  - Jonas Jäderberg – Viati, Sweden: “EU delegated act deployments in Sweden”
    - Action C – Safety Related Traffic Information
      - STA existing DATEX II services, no dedicated service for Action C
      - Tagging of safety related messages, DATEX 2.3 approved extension
    - Action E – Safe and secure Truck Parking
      - Dedicated DATEX II service for Action E
      - STA truck parking on major roads
      - Uses DATEX II 2.3 extensions for Parking
    - Action C – Real-Time Traffic Information
      - STA have static data in current DATEX II services or other services
      - new data have been identified (e.g. traffic data, variable speed limits)
  - Swedish NAP-Portal
    - STA will host the NAP (www.trafficdata.se)
    - Options: build our own or use CKAN (decision is CKAN)
  - Ronald Ziegler, Jorg Dubbert, ave GmbH, Germany “DATEX II Truck Parking from Scratch”
    - The task: number of vacant spaces for 3 truck parking sites
    - Where to: MDM – Mobility Data Marketplace
    - How: DATEX II, XML, SOAP
    - Static content: Parking table
    - Dynamic content: number of vacant spaces; tendency
    - MDM Connection:
      - Web-based registration
      - Web-Service: SOAP 1.1
      - Payload: DATEX II XML
      - Model: push
6.6. Conclusions and next steps

The feedback received shows that all the countries that have implementations use DATEX II to exchange Parking, SRTI and RTTI information (dynamic and traffic). It is worth noting that FI, CY and UK use DATEX II for RTTI even though harmonized profiles are not yet developed. Since CY and FI are not involved in DATEX project, SA4.6 should support the exchange of information between them and the DATEX project.

It can be said that in general there are no cases with major problems regarding the use of DATEX II. However, the need for uniform profiles and harmonization is confirmed. There was also a comment that DATEX II could be a bit heavy to use, so this is an issue that also needs to be taken into account by the DATEX project for the future developments.

Regarding the feedback received on this first survey of the SA4.6 it can be noticed that in general the implementation is not very widespread and as such also there are not too many experiences regarding the use of DATEX II profiles. It is possible that next year more information will be available as other countries start implementing NAP.

As many countries planned or intend to implement National Access point or harmonised regional approach of NAP are feasible for implementing ITS Corridors, the continuation of presentation of DATEX II support for NAP could be necessary:

- Either as a dedicated Session at the next DATEX II User Form, Netherlands, 2018
- Either as an NAP – DATEX II Workshop
7. Other relevant issues

7.1. Purpose and scope

In complement to the precedent activities, this activity intends to find other requirements or recommendations not identified in the previous sections, in order to respond completely to task 3 of SA4.6 of the EU EIP project:

Recommendations for harmonisation of NAP approaches will be formulated, including further metadata harmonisation (started under EIP and EIP+), DATEX II, common approaches on quality assurance (e.g. self-assessment of the data providers) and other harmonisation issues arising from discussions with MS and other stakeholders.

7.2. Methodology

As referred before, a questionnaire was circulated to the SA4.6 group members and national implementer contacts. Other two questionnaires, oriented to data providers and NAP end users were also circulated in the same universe.

From the analysis of the answers to these questionnaires and from the discussion of the group, some other issues, not included in the previous big groups, were identified as relevant to the project. In the following points these “new” issues will be described.

7.3. Identified requirements and recommendations

From the analysis of the questionnaires, and from the discussion of the group the following relevant issues where identified:

7.3.1. Near real time updating and completeness of the information

In order to make National Access Point an effectively useful instrument, the information available must be up to date as much as possible and must represent a geographic covered area as complete as possible. To achieve these goals, data providers have a very important role as well as the technical capacity of the NAP system to integrate and make available the information to end-users. Data providers must be involved in the improvement of these two parameters by representing in the NAP portal, which entities are providing data and at what level of updating time of the information.
In the countries where NAP is still in development and where the discussion is active between all the stakeholders, this question must be discussed in order to have a perspective of what will be the coverage of the NAP. Data providers should be motivated, not only to provide their information, but also to provide it as much “real-time” as possible.

In running SPA systems, these two parameters must be measured and the NAP implementer should promote the improvement of them, not only by integrating new data providers, but also by improving the quality of the existing ones.

This issue is related with the quality and utility of the information available in the National Access Point as an ITS service. For more information on the quality of data we refer to Activity SA4.1 of the EU EIP project: Determining Quality of European ITS Services.

7.3.2. Coherence and consistency of the information

Several data providers are road operators, private or public. It’s very common that they publish in their own internet sites traffic information for the public in general. It’s very important that the information published privately by each one of the data providers, will be the same information provided to the NAP. Otherwise, the information of the NAP will not be coherent with parallel information, decreasing the credit of the NAP information to end users.

In order to guarantee this coherence, data providers must be alerted for this question, not only those who are already providing data, but also those who intend to do it in the future.

For the NAPs already in place, the implementer should be capable to detect this type of incoherencies (at least by sample) and to alert the respective data provider.

7.3.3. NAP added value

By receiving information from several data providers, NAP should be capable to treat received data and to make it useful to the end user.

Data providers have to supply, at least the absolute minimum information described in the regulation but, in many cases, they have more available information.

These possibilities of adding value to the information, not by “creating data”, but through providing more data than the absolute minimum should be analysed with the objective of making the available information more rich and useful for end users.

For each data provider, if possible, the NAP implementer, should try to find which data he has, and that he is open to supply, more than the minimum. For example, a new
questionnaire, directly oriented to this question, could be distributed in order to try to enrich as much as possible the information of the NAP.

### 7.3.4. PRIORITY ACTION A – MULTIMODAL TRAVEL INFORMATION

The delegated regulation on multimodal travel information has not yet been adopted by the European Commission. Nevertheless, this will most likely be the case in 2017. Therefore, in this document, this subject should be introduced.

From a road operator perspective, priority action A, should consider some relevant issues such as:

- Actors involved (road, rail, shipping ports, airports);
- For each transport mean, what is the information that can be relevant for road operator;
- For each transport mean, which are the existing standard protocols to exchange relevant (for road operator) information;
- Specific (for each transport mean) and common (can be used between several transport means) metadata;
- Which roads and streets should be considered;
- How to integrate all these information, and how to present it to the end user;

These and other issues should be described in detail during 2017.

### 7.4. Next steps

The table below outlines 2017 actions to be progressed in this subject:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timescale</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Output</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>Promote a discussion with SA 4.1 group to discuss about REAL TIME UPDATING AND COMPLETENESS OF THE INFORMATION</td>
<td>Update of this document and dissemination of the good practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan – Jun</td>
<td>Prepare and distribute new interviews with more oriented/chirurgic questions to SPA implementers and data providers.</td>
<td>Update of this document and dissemination of the good practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan – Dec</td>
<td>Detail priority action A</td>
<td>Update of this document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan – Dec</td>
<td>Evaluate possibilities to increase the quality of the information available.</td>
<td>Update of this document and dissemination of the good practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan – Dec</td>
<td>Identified new issues that could be relevant to NAP</td>
<td>Update of this document and dissemination of the good practices.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Summary and conclusions

Current status of NAP implementation

Based on a 2016 survey among Member States and NAP implementers it can be concluded that a limited number of Member States so far comply with the delegated regulations 2013/885 and 2013/886, even though these delegated regulations entered into force in 2015.

The individual Member States show different progress levels of NAP implementation. However, there seem to be a certain dynamic, as many Member States are working on the installation of new NAPs or on the enhancement of existing NAPs.

With respect to the NAP on truck parking, from the Member States that have participated in the survey only four countries have a (partly) operational NAP, i.e. Belgium, Germany, The Netherlands and Sweden. Four other countries have concrete plans to implement an NAP (Austria, Denmark, Poland and Portugal).

In the case of NAPs for safety-related traffic information six countries have an operational NAP (i.e. Denmark, Finland, Germany, The Netherlands, Norway and Sweden). Austria, Poland, Portugal and the UK have concrete plans to implement an NAP for SRTI.

For both types of NAP (truck parking and SRTI) it are mainly the public authorities that deliver the data. Data from private parties, either as actual data or as weblinks or metadata, are rather limited so far.

Even though the delegated regulation 2015/962 will enter into force in July 2017, already three countries have a (partly) operational NAP for RTTI, i.e. Cyprus, Finland and Germany. Seven other countries (Austria, Denmark, The Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Sweden and the UK) have concrete plans to implement an NAP.

For the NAP on multimodal travel information it is still to early to make any conclusions, apart from the fact that some countries already have started preparations.

Looking into the details of the individual NAP implementations, the individual technical approaches differ very often. This refers to the general NAP functionalities, the definition of Common Features/Quality of Service, use of DATEX and Metadata structures.

Common features and Level of Service

Due to the limited feedback in 2016 a full analysis was not feasible but it was possible to gain insight using the aspects were there was a general consensus of importance (ranked between 3 and 5 on the importance scale). This gave indicative findings and provides
direction for defining common features and levels of service for NAPs. The table below lists the aspects ranked as most relevant:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional</th>
<th>provision of data description / metadata</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>performance - monitoring and collection of performance related statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>capacity / scalability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>service management and organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>service maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>respond to user questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>provision of technical user support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>announcement of service maintenance (with possible effect on availability)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>provision of some sections / features (i.e. search, results) in additional languages</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition it was considered important that:
- NAP should be accessible over the internet using standard protocols
- Data should be machine-readable and should be described by machine-readable data definitions (schemas)
- Data and data definitions should be defined using standard formats and data models
- Communication with the users and stakeholders is essential (contact emails, Q&A, service promotion, data provider and user support features, general NAP information, EU harmonisation and wider NAP communities).

**Metadata**

In general, the individual approaches in establishing Metadata structures vary to a certain extent. The Metadata approach seems to depend particularly on the status of the NAP implementation and the general Open Data frameworks of the individual MS.

The Coordinated Metadata Catalogue is known to all NAP operators that have been interviewed. However, only in a few cases the Coordinated Metadata Catalogue has been fully implemented in a NAP. In many cases, the DCAT-AT standard (as an Open Data standard) has been used for interoperability and compatibility reasons. This is particularly the case when transport-related data are implemented in Open Portals, which bundle all data from any public agency. (Only few countries have established specific transport-related portals with adopted Metadata structures.)
A need for European harmonisation of Metadata descriptions and structures has been identified by all MS which have been interviewed. However, no clear preference for an existing Metadata standard that should be used as a base for the harmonisation effort could be identified.

In the upcoming work of sub-activity 4.6, recommendations for harmonization of NAP approaches are to be formulated, including further metadata harmonisation. This work will be based on an evaluation from the Metadata approaches so far. This includes feedback from NAP operators which implemented the Coordinated Metadata Catalogue. Further, an inventory of wishes/requirements regarding Metadata harmonisation is foreseen, to be provided by activity partners and external stakeholders.

The existing Metadata sets will be analysed in order to:

- define improvements of the current set of Metadata based on experiences and further requirements and
- identify needs for extensions with respect to data covered by priority action “A”.

Finally, the use of the harmonised Metadata set will be promoted in other MS.

**Harmonisation of SPA – requirements with respect to DATEX II**

The aim of requirements with respect to DATEX II is:

- To assure SPA data exchange harmonisation based on exiting DATEX II protocol
- To define new requirements
- To propose DATEX II development

This activity is focused on identifying the needs and experiences of SPA implementers with respect to using DATEX II for data exchange.

The activity will be done in close cooperation with SA4.5 (Liaison for data exchange) which provides the direct relation with the DATEX II organisation. A memorandum of understanding on the continued co-operation and dialogue between the DATEX II organisation and the EU ITS Platform has been signed. The memorandum establishes the responsibility of both parts to assure an efficient cooperation and is based on:

- **Aim of DATEX II PSA**: in 2020 DATEX II - The information model for road traffic and travel information in Europe.
- EU EIP SA 4.5 "Liaison and harmonisation on interfaces for data exchange" has two objectives:
  - to collect user requirements coming from the ITS corridor projects and EW DGs
  - to forward the information related to new user requirements to the DATEX II organisation
- **Actions**
  - Direct relations between EU EIP SA 4.5 and DATEX II PSA
- EU EIP SA 4.5 will be in charge to collect and aggregate all new user needs coming from EU ITS Platform and ITS Road Corridor projects
- The DATEX II PSA will be in charge to the technical implementation and realization of the **agreed** requirements.
- EU EIP SA4.5 will provide to DATEX II PSA the annual consolidated user requirements list (using the agreed template) and DATEX II PSA will reply in four months

**Harmonized declaration of compliance**

During a series of dedicated workshops with Member State representatives, road operators and traffic information service providers and data owners/suppliers on the topic of assessment of compliance and how to ensure clear guidelines on applying the Delegated Regulation at the national level, this problem was identified and discussed. All stakeholders that participated in the workshops agreed and recognised the urgent need for a ‘Uniform Declaration of Compliance Form’, that would be accepted by the road operators, traffic information service providers, data owners/suppliers and broadcasters as well as by the National Bodies designated for the assessment of compliance.

A harmonised approach would be beneficial for road operators, traffic information service providers, data owners/suppliers and broadcasters as well as for the National Bodies responsible for carrying out the assessment of compliance. It will avoid the risk of having to submit or process declarations of compliance in different formats, different languages, under a variety of different rules.

Through a joint effort of TISA and EU EIP a Uniform Declaration of Compliance Form has been developed. The Uniform Declaration of Compliance Form was then discussed with all the stakeholders (public and private) that participated in these dedicated workshops. First of all, it was ensured that the Declaration of Compliance form would be in line with the (minimum) requirements set out in article 9 of the Delegated Regulation. Secondly, the form was developed in such a way that the administrative burden for all parties involved would be minimized, but nevertheless providing sufficient information for a solid assessment of compliance. Last, but not least, an explanatory note was drafted, providing more insight in those aspects of the Delegated Regulation that -following the discussion with the stakeholders- where deemed to be in need of additional explanation.

**Other aspects**

Finally, a number of other aspects were identified that also will need attention in the coming years:
In order to make National Access Point an effectively useful instrument, the information available must be up to date as much as possible (‘near real time’) and must represent a geographic covered area as complete as possible. Data providers must be involved in the improvement of these two parameters by representing in the NAP portal, which entities are providing data and at what level of updating time of the information.

It’s very important that the information published privately by each one of the data providers, will be the same information provided to the NAP. Otherwise, the information of the NAP will not be coherent with parallel information, decreasing the credit of the NAP information to end users.

Data providers have to supply, at least the absolute minimum information described in the regulation but, in many cases, they have more available information. These possibilities of adding value to the information, not by “creating data”, but through providing more data than the absolute minimum should be analysed with the objective of making the available information more rich and useful for end users.

The delegated regulation on multimodal travel information has not yet been adopted by the European Commission. Nevertheless, this will most likely be the case in 2017. Therefore, priority action A should be analysed from the perspective of the road operator, and what it will mean for them. These and other issues will be described in detail during 2017.
Annexes
Annex 1: Overview of National Access Points and National Bodies

This annex gives an overview of the National Access Points and National Bodies responsible for assessment of compliance in Europe with respect to the Delegated Regulations 2013/885 (truck parking), 2013/886 (SRTI) and 2015/962 (RTTI). Status per December 2016.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country name</th>
<th>National Access Point</th>
<th>Contact National Body</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Austria      | http://www.mobilitaetsdaten.gv.at/  
http://www.mobilitydata.gv.at/ |                       |
| Belgium      | http://data.its.be/  
(truck parking) |                       |
| Bulgaria     |                       |                       |
| Croatia      |                       |                       |
| Cyprus       | www.traffic4cyprus.org.cy (MMTI) |                       |
| Czech Republic | http://registr.dopravniinfo.cz/en/  
(not operational yet) |                       |
| Denmark      | http://www.vejdirektoratet.dk/DA/vejsektor/yeleser/roadgivning-og-salg/trafikbutikken/Sider/default.aspx (SRTI) | Department for Planning and Environment of the Planning Division of DRD |
| Estonia      |                       |                       |
| Finland      | Static road data (Digiroad): http://www.liikennevirasto.fi/web/en/open-data/digiroad  
Dynamic road status data & traffic data (Digitraffic): www.digitraffic.fi  
Contact details: Anna Schirokoff (anna.schirokoff@trafi.fi) |
| France       | http://www.bison-fute.gouv.fr/action-c.html (SRTI)  
http://www.bison-fute.gouv.fr/action-e.html (truck parking)  
| Germany      | https://service.mdm-portal.de/  
(truck parking, SRTI, RTTI) |                       |
<p>| Greece       |                       |                       |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country name</th>
<th>National Access Point</th>
<th>Contact National Body</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td><a href="https://data.gov.ie">https://data.gov.ie</a></td>
<td>Inclusion of ITS Directive requirements coordinated by DTTAS (Department of Transport, Tourism And Sport) – Margaret Malone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td><a href="http://www.trafficinfo.lt">http://www.trafficinfo.lt</a></td>
<td>Lithuanian Road Administration <a href="mailto:lra@lra.lt">lra@lra.lt</a> phone +370 5 232 9600 J. Basanavičius g. 36 LT-03109 Vilnius, Lithuania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td><a href="https://nt.ndw.nu/#/parking-overview">https://nt.ndw.nu/#/parking-overview</a> (truck parking) <a href="https://nt.ndw.nu/#/traffic-overview">https://nt.ndw.nu/#/traffic-overview</a> (SRTI)</td>
<td>RDW, attn. ITS Toezicht IV PO Box 30 000 9640 RA Veendam The Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td><a href="http://data.europa.eu/euodp/en/data/dataset/etpa">http://data.europa.eu/euodp/en/data/dataset/etpa</a> (truck parking, not operational yet) <a href="http://www.data.norge.no">www.data.norge.no</a> and <a href="http://www.vegvesen.no">www.vegvesen.no</a> (SRTI)</td>
<td>For SRTI: Norwegian Road Supervisory Authority (RSA) Contact details: <a href="mailto:post@vegtilsynet.com">post@vegtilsynet.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Not yet, expected Q4 2017</td>
<td>IMT Contact details: Av. das Forças Armadas, 40 1649-022 LISBOA Phone - +351 217 949 000 <a href="mailto:imt@imt-ip.pt">imt@imt-ip.pt</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>Not yet, tender in progress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>nap.dgt.es <a href="http://www.trafikverket.se">www.trafikverket.se</a> for act c and e</td>
<td>Swedish Transport Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country name</td>
<td>National Access Point</td>
<td>Contact National Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>select; English - operation - SPA</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ylva.lidberg@transportstyrelsen.se">ylva.lidberg@transportstyrelsen.se</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td><a href="https://data.gov.uk/">https://data.gov.uk/</a></td>
<td>Inclusion of ITS Directive requirements coordinated by Department for Transport – Suku Phull Current focus on SRTI and RTTI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table A1.1 Overview of NAP contact details*
Annex 2: Overview of system architecture NAP for truck parking

Figure A2.1 Architecture for Austrian NAP for truck parking

Figure A2.2a Architecture for Belgian NAP for truck parking (current)
Figure A2.2b Architecture for Belgian NAP for truck parking (planned)

Figure A2.3 Architecture for German NAP for truck parking
Figure A2.4 Architecture for Dutch NAP for truck parking

Figure A2.5 Architecture for Swedish NAP for truck parking
Annex 3: Overview of system architecture NAP for safety-related traffic information

Figure A3.1 Architecture for Austrian NAP for Safety-Related Traffic Information

Figure A3.2 Architecture for Danish NAP for Safety-Related Traffic Information
Figure A3.3 Architecture for Finnish NAP for Safety-Related Traffic Information

Figure A3.4 Architecture for Dutch NAP for Safety-Related Traffic Information
Figure A3.5 Architecture for Swedish NAP for Safety-Related Traffic Information

Figure A3.6 Architecture for UK's NAP for Safety-Related Traffic Information
Annex 4: NAP Quality of Service questionnaire

EU EIP SA46 Monitoring and Harmonisation of Single Point of Access
Task 2: SPA Quality of Service - operational and implementation measures

Task 2 - SPA Quality of Service

Stage 1 - Opinion gathering exercise to identify potential SPA quality of service features relating to implementation and operation.

From previous EIP and EIP+ projects it is acknowledged that MS have, or are intending to, implement SPAs using different structures, models, methods of data access / search tools, data checking methodologies etc.

The aim of this task is to identify the features of SPA implementations that Member States believe are relevant to the quality of SPA service. Using this feedback, and further dialogue with SPA organisations, we will then develop these features into quality of service criteria. This will allow SA4.6 to track the progress and functioning of SPA implementations.

This purpose of the table below is to identify the potential operational and implementation attributes that are considered relevant to SPA implementations. It is not a questionnaire on the actual / planned SPA implementation, only opinions on the relevance of the topics below. Relevance is to be indicated using the 1-5 scale (1- least relevant to 5 - very relevant). If you have no view on any features please leave blank. Space below each section can be used to add any comments or observations.

Please circulate this table to those involved in SPA organisation and return to Ronald Jorna (r.jorna@metyeelan.nl).

Thank you for your input.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organisation:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact details:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Question</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there existing quality of service requirements for your SPA? (Yes/No)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, can the details be provided to SA4.6?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevance</th>
<th>Least</th>
<th>Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mark 1-5 with an x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Functional</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 provision of data description / metadata (manual input by data provider, other...)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 data exchange</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- refers to where data exchange take place i.e. at the portal, per link to externals, machine to machine with SPA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 access to logging data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 request user registration (i.e. gain general access to SPA / specific functionalities)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 payments - user transaction / payment logging and processing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 subscription services offered by SPA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7 special user features</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- for example if the SPA offers user personalisation - save preferences, create</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Technical</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1. performance - monitoring and collection of performance related statistics (availability, downtime → consequences for other systems)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2. capacity / scalability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3. KPIs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4. method of delivery of results (push / pull - API / web download / data portal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5. hosting (data consumption, speed requirements)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6. security features</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7. level/s of access to SPA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8. back-up / recovery system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9. platform the SPA is based on (i.e. open source: CKAN <a href="http://ckan.org">http://ckan.org</a> or commercial)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10 service management and organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11 service maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments / observations on section above:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>3. Layout &amp; design (the usability / user friendliness)</strong></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1. design of SPA landing page - any similar features across Member State SPAs for pages relating to priority action areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2. provide users with on background in ITS Directive / highlight links between datasets and ITS Directive - provide users with the context of the data referenced in the SPA, relevance of the ITS Directive and priority action areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments / observations on section above:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>4. Communication</strong></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1. collect or post user suggestions / comments / user ratings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2. user help centre (FAQs, SPA wiki)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3. respond to user questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4. provision of technical user support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5. announcement of service maintenance (with possible effect on availability)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6. newsletters / inform users of changes or updates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments / observations on section above:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>5. Monitoring</strong></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1. usage / requests analytics &amp; reporting (standard or custom) - downloads, page views, keyword analysis etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**6. Language**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1.</td>
<td>Single / multiple languages in the portal (entire site / some sections only)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.</td>
<td>Single / multiple languages usable for searching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3.</td>
<td>Single / multiple languages used for the data description (especially for presentation of search result)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**7. Additional services**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.1.</td>
<td>Access to archived data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2.</td>
<td>Customisation of data (e.g. filtering by area, adaptation of data format, adaptation of geographical referencing)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3.</td>
<td>Monitoring of data quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments / observations on section above:**

**Additional feedback / comments:**
Annex 5: Uniform Declaration of Compliance ITS Action C + Explanatory document

This form and the explanatory document are available on www.its-platform.eu and www.tisa.org

Declaration of Compliance, ITS Action C – Road Safety-Related Traffic Information
Country: ____________________________

The undersigned ____________________________ <natural person> declares, acting in this as authorised representative of
________________________________________ <trading entity>
referred to hereafter as ____________________________ <trading name>
known in the ____________________________ <national registry of companies or similar>
under number __________ <number>,
________________________________________ <trading name> in accordance with the Regulation mentioned above:

1. are providing, or starting from ____________________________ <dd/mm/yyyy> will provide road safety-related
   traffic information according to the events or conditions defined in Article 3 and indicated below, namely¹:
   ☐ temporary slippery road;
   ☐ animals, people, obstacles or debris on the road;
   ☐ unprotected accident area;
   ☐ short-term road works;
   ☐ reduced visibility;
   ☐ wrong-way driver;
   ☐ unmanaged blockage of a road;
   ☐ exceptional weather conditions
   in accordance with the content and requirement for updating defined in Article 4;

2. according to Article 5, will make this information available for:
   ☐ all sections of the road network as designated by the Member State

¹ Cross what is applicable.
the road network as described in the appendix

3. will make this information available based on its role as
   □ Data Supplier
   □ Information Service Provider

4. will conform to the guidelines as stipulated in Article 6 concerning the collection of data about the
detection of events or conditions listed in Article 3;

5. will conform to the guidelines as stipulated in Article 7 concerning availability, exchange and reuse of data
(incl. non-discrimination, timeliness and provision via the national access point);

6. will conform to the guidelines as stipulated in Article 8 concerning the dissemination of information (incl.
   with priority, wide reach, where possible free of charge);

7. will conform to the requirements of Article 9 (2) sub b and c and inform about the access point, the
   conditions for use of the data and the format of the data in an appendix;

8. will conform to the requirements of Article 9 (2) sub d and inform about the means of dissemination of the
   information to end users in an appendix;

9. will cooperate with ______________________ <name of designated National Body> to conduct
   assessment of compliance as described in Article 9;

10. will ensure that this Declaration is up to date and valid;

11. will immediately send an amended Declaration to the designated National Body after any change in the
    service provision;

\[\text{In case of a different road network, please clarify this road network for each applicable category of safety message in an appendix.}\]

\[\text{One organisation may fulfil both roles. If you tick both boxes, this declaration should also cover both roles.}\]

\[\text{Availability via the National Access Point only applies to Data Suppliers.}\]

\[\text{This paragraph only applies to Data Suppliers.}\]

\[\text{This paragraph only applies to Information Service Providers.}\]

\[\text{As soon as possible, but no later than three months after the change.}\]
The following documents are enclosed in support of this Declaration:

Mandatory:
- Information about the entity’s access point to the road safety-related traffic data and the conditions for its use and its format.
- Information about the entity’s means of disseminating the road safety-related traffic data to end users.

Optional:
- Overview of road network for which data or service provision is made available as supplement to paragraph 2 of this Declaration;
- Quality manual or procedure description with respect to data collection/information provision in the context of road safety-related traffic information;
- Key Performance Indicators in relation to data collection/information provision in the context of road safety-related traffic information;
- Description of quality level for the service provision in the context of road safety-related traffic information;
- Other: ______________________________________
  ______________________________________
  ______________________________________
  ______________________________________

Signed ___________________________________ <date>

<signature>

Please send this Declaration with appendices to:
<Name and address of designated National Body>
Explanatory terms and definitions for Uniform Declaration of Compliance – Action C

Definitions of Data Suppliers/Owners and Information Service Providers

The service provision in the context of the COMMISSION DELEGATED REGULATION (EU) No 886/2013 (Priority Action C) stemming from the European ITS Directive 2010/40/EU, involves two kinds of entities: Data Suppliers/Owners and Information Service Providers.

Data Suppliers/Owners

Those entities private or public that are holders and collectors of data that fall within the scope of the Delegated Regulation 886/2013 (Priority Action C) are Data Suppliers/Owners according to the law. These entities have direct access to at least one of the eight categories of Safety-Related Traffic Information (SRTI). By direct access is meant, the direct detection of events or identification of conditions, and collection of this data (characterized by the location of the event/condition; the appropriate SRTI category of the event/condition with a short description; and, where appropriate, driving behavior advice) by the entity’s own means. The police is, in many Member States, a Data supplier/owner. The same applies to automobile clubs and road authorities.

Note: An entity which may have direct access to the GPS probe data but not to the nature of the event (being one the 8 categories of SRTI), is not considered a Data Supplier/Owner for the purposes of the Delegated Regulation. Those entities who use crowd sourcing or driver’s feedback in order to enhance the quality of their traffic information and therefore have direct access to at least one of the eight categories of SRTI are characterised as Data Suppliers/Owners according to the law.

Information Service Providers

Those entities private or public that deliver this safety-related traffic information to end users through any delivery channel, or broadcasters dedicated to traffic information are Information Service Providers. These entities do not have direct access to data of the eight categories of SRTI. By direct access is meant, the direct detection and collection of this data by the entity’s own means. These entities may have indirect access to SRTI however, by sourcing from Data Suppliers/Owners directly or via third parties (other Information Service Providers).

---

1 Text based on the Dutch ITS Policy Guideline (point 1.4) in Government Gazette 2015 No. 17410 (26 June 2015), The Netherlands.
2 Text based on the Dutch ITS Policy Guideline (point 1.5) in Government Gazette 2015 No. 17410 (26 June 2015), The Netherlands.
An entity may fulfil both roles (Data Supplier/Owner and Information Service Provider). Both Data Suppliers/Owners and Information Service Providers have to submit a declaration of conformance with the national body designated for the assessment of compliance. In addition, Data Suppliers/Owners must register with the national access point as well.

Those entities who source safety-related traffic information content from an Information Service Provider, and then merely pass this content on as-is (i.e. wholly unmodified) to end-users via a (possibly proprietary) distribution channel, are not considered themselves to be an Information Service Provider. Rather they act as a dissemination ‘channel’ towards the end-user, e.g. as does a radio station which provides air-time to a service provider to announce traffic reports. Such entities need not submit a declaration of conformance themselves. Instead, the originating Information Service Provider is responsible to describe, in its declaration of conformance, this dissemination channel by which the information reaches the end user³.

**Position of Data Suppliers/Owners and Information Service Providers in the SRTI value chain**

In *Figure A5.1*, a simplified Intelligent Transport Systems (ITS) value chain is depicted (source TISA⁴) for which only the highest aggregation level is provided. This ITS value chain in its simplified form is also applicable for SRTI. *Table 7* provides the terms and definitions of this value chain.

Along this simplified value chain, Data Suppliers/Owners take a role in detecting and processing SRTI events or conditions (the *Content* segment in *Figure A5.1*), whereas Information Service Providers cover the Service provision part (traffic-enabled navigation systems or car radios cover the Service Presentation segment, for example).

Figure A5.1: Simplified ITS value chain (source TISA) as applicable to SRTI.

Note that the different parts of the value chain reflect a logical, or functional, segmentation. In some cases, a stakeholder may in fact cover several stages of this value chain, and e.g. be both a Data Supplier/Owner and an Information Service Provider.

Table 7: Terms and definitions related to Figure A5.1 (the event definition is adapted to the needs of the Commission Delegated Act)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>In the context of the Commission Delegated Act 886/2013, either one of the traffic situations (e.g. short-term roadworks) or conditions (e.g. temporary slippery road) falling under one of the eight categories of SRTI as specified in Article 3 of the Commission Delegated Act 886/2013.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content detection</td>
<td>The observation of an event with the help of measurement equipment, or alternatively as being observed by humans (e.g. an accident as seen by a witness and reported to the police). Content detection also includes the gathering of information and events using communication equipment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content processing</td>
<td>The accumulation of information or events in a content management system, where all information is processed and evaluated. This stage often involves plausibility checks and quality control.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service provision</td>
<td>The processed content is enriched with content from other sources, reformatted and prepared for transmission to the end-user, then transmitted as a service to the end-user by means of wireless communication (e.g. radio, mobile cellular transmissions) or wired communication (e.g. internet via physical, cabled connections).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service presentation</td>
<td>The Service is received with an appropriate device, such as radio, mobile phone, navigation device or a personal computer. After reception, relevant messages are extracted from the service and rendered into the form most appropriate for presentation to the end-user (e.g. icons on a navigation devices map display, or message lists on a mobile phone, or audio output).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Obligations of Data Suppliers/Owners

Data Suppliers/Owners are obliged to make themselves known as Data Supplier/Owner to the National Access Point (NAP) and the national body designated for the assessment of

---

5 Text almost identical to that found in the Dutch ITS Policy Guideline (point 3) in Government Gazette 2015 No. 17410 (26 June 2015), The Netherlands.
compliance (if different). They must register with the NAP and make available the SRTI data that falls within the scope of the Regulation, insofar as they have the said data available, via the NAP.

Further, an up-to-date Declaration of Compliance must be submitted to the national body designated for the assessment of compliance, which proves that the data provision has taken place according to the requirements in the Regulations. If there are changes (in the data provision, for example) that are relevant to the Declaration of Compliance, an amended Declaration of Compliance must be submitted as soon as possible, but no later than 3 months after the occurrence of the change.

Note: this description above is a summary of the obligations and content in broad terms. For an exact description of obligations please enquire with the national body designated for the assessment of compliance of the applicable Member State(s).

Obligations of Information Service Providers

When Information Service Providers make safety-related traffic information available, they must comply with the requirements in the Regulations. One of these requirements for example is the timely provision and updating of safety-related traffic information.

Further, an up-to-date Declaration of Compliance must be submitted to the national body designated for the assessment of compliance, which states that the service provision has taken place according to the requirements in the Regulations. If there are changes (in the service provision, for example) which are also relevant to the Declaration of Compliance, an amended Declaration of Compliance must be submitted as soon as possible, but no later than 3 months after the occurrence of the change.

Note: this description above is a summary of the obligations and content in broad terms. For an exact description of obligations please enquire with the national body designated for the assessment of compliance of the applicable Member State(s).

Free of charge, where possible (Action C)

According to the Delegated Regulation on Priority Action C, (Delegated Regulation no. 886/2013 (15 May 2013), ‘free of charge’ means “the provision of the road safety-related minimum universal traffic information service at no extra cost for the end users at the point of use”.

6 Ibid.
The Delegated Regulation 886/2013 also states that the provision of SRTI can be free of charge to users "where possible". The legislator in this regulation was (and is) fully aware that these are private entities whose core business is to hold and collect data on the eight categories of SRTI. The intention of the legislator has not been to stop this business but to make sure that SRTI will reach the end user (the driver) at no extra cost.

The entities that will generally be able to publish their SRTI at no cost are generally public entities within the category of Data Suppliers/Owners who commonly operate under an ‘open data’ policy. These include public authorities, the police and the national bodies collecting data within the scope of the eight SRTI categories. Data Suppliers/Owners who invest in collecting (and selling) this kind of data, are not obliged to publish it for free (but shall make it available via the NAP on a non-discriminatory basis).

Information Service Providers are under no obligation to publish SRTI in a separate feed but they are not allowed to charge extra fees for SRTI provided to the end-user either. If the SRTI forms part of the entire traffic information, then the fee of the ‘package’ of traffic information may apply only to the non-SRTI related part of this package (of traffic information).

As a result, the only entities affected within the value chain of content detection-content processing-service provision-service presentation of SRTI, are those of Public Authorities in their role of Data Suppliers/Owners, who generally will provide their data as ‘open data’ at no cost when publishing SRTI and those of Information Service Providers who cannot charge an extra fee when providing SRTI to the drivers (“end-users at the point of use” as stated in Article 2 of the delegated regulation).

Choice of language for providing and filling in the Declaration of Compliance

It is strongly recommended for national bodies designated for the assessment of compliance to provide the Declaration of Compliance in at least the English language (to address internationally operating entities) next to, if they so wish, also the national language of the Member State. Respondents should be permitted to fill in the Declaration of Compliance in either language.

---
