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Preface

This annual report 2017 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, assessment of compliance and other issues related to the Commission Delegated Regulations (EU):

Action A – Multimodal travel information services  No. 2017/1926
Action B - Real-time traffic information services  No. 2015/962
Action C - Road safety-related traffic information free of charge to users  No. 886/2013
Action E - Save and secure truck parking  No. 885/2013

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 Commission Delegated Regulations. 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 an overview with respect to common features for NAPs (chapter 3), metadata (chapter 4), harmonisation of declaration of compliance (chapter 5), DATEX II (chapter 6), Multimodality (chapter 7) and other harmonisation issues (chapter 8).

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

Where in 2016 there was a strong focus to harmonize declaration of compliance for action C, in 2017 the focus was on harmonizing the declaration of compliance for action B. 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 have new information about National Access Points and National Bodies that can be used for the Annual NAP report 2018 are kindly requested to send an e-mail r.jorna@mobycon.nl.
Management Summary

This report describes, for each specific chapter, the works and achievements that took place in 2017, as well as the tasks planned to 2018.

The main difference from last year report is the inclusion of a new chapter dedicated to Delegated Regulation 'A' for multimodal travel information.

These are the most important points identified in 2017:

- In 2017 many new National Access Points have been realised. Nevertheless quite a few Member States still have to establish their first National Access Point;
- In May 2017 a public-private Data Task Force was established on sharing safety related traffic data between OEM’s and traffic authorities. The Data Task Force will start a Proof of Concept based on a selection of use cases on SRTI to evaluate, validate and test general principles for data sharing, access and use;
- An overview of the NAPs across Europe shows that these NAPs vary largely in their scope and set up. Some NAPs build on earlier experiences of Traffic Information Centres, whereas other NAPs are created completely from scratch;
- Following the Uniform Declaration of Compliance for priority action ‘C’, in 2017 an Uniform Declaration of Compliance has been agreed upon for priority action ‘B’ Real-time traffic information services, which is supported by EU EIP, TISA and the European Commission;
- The 2017 NAP survey confirms that all implementations use DATEX II to exchange truck parking information, safety related and dynamic/real-time traffic information;
- On 21 October 2017 a new Delegated Regulation (EU) on the provision of EU-wide multimodal travel information services was adopted (2017/1926);
- Several countries across Europe are taking their first steps in introducing Multimodal Travel Information in their respective National Access Points;
- November 23rd 2017 the CROCODILE 2 and EU EIP projects jointly organized a workshop on the state-of-the-art of National Access Points in Central Europe. During the workshop 11 countries cooperating in the CROCODILE 2 project presented the state of their implementations of National Access Points, following the adoption of the Delegated Regulations 885/2013, 886/2013 and 2015/962. A timeslot was reserved to present and discuss the new delegated regulation on Multimodal Travel Information Services.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document Information</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preface</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Summary</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Introduction</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1. Scope and objectives of EU EIP</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2. EU EIP Harmonisation cluster (activity 4)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3. Monitoring and Harmonisation of National Access Point (sub-activity 4.6)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4. Methodology</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. State of the art of National Access Points in Europe</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1. Methodology for monitoring the status of implementation of NAPs in Europe</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2. Status of NAP for Safe and Secure Truck Parking</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3. NAP – Safety-Related Traffic Information</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4. Status NAP for Real-Time Traffic Information</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5. Status of NAP for Multimodal Travel Information</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6. NAP Interactive Map</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7. Conclusions on the current state-of-the-art on NAPs in Europe</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Validation of common features and level of service for National Access Points  

3.1. Task purpose and scope  
3.2. Methodology  
3.3. Progress and achievements  
3.3.1. NAP Common Features and Level of Service - Support Document  
3.4. Challenges  
3.5. Next steps  

4. Metadata  

4.1. Task purpose and scope  
4.2. Previous activities and initial findings  
4.3. Next steps  

5. Harmonisation of the Declaration of compliance  

5.1. Why a harmonised approach?  
5.2. Uniform Declaration of Compliance Form  
5.3. How to use this Uniform Declaration of Compliance Form?  
5.4. Evaluation of the Uniform Declaration of Compliance Form after 3 years  
5.5. Support from TISA, EU EIP and the European Commission  
5.6. Next step  

6. DATEX II  

6.1. Role of DATEX II in National Access Points  
6.2. Objective and methodology  
6.3. Feedback from the monitoring templates
6.4. Conclusions and next steps

7. Priority action A – Multimodal Travel Information

7.1. Introducing Delegated Regulation No. 2017/1926
7.2. First steps in multimodal travel information
7.2.1. Netherlands
7.2.2. Portugal
7.2.3. Germany
7.3. Next steps

8. Other relevant issues

8.1. Purpose and scope
8.2. Methodology
8.3. Identified requirements and recommendations
8.3.1. Near real time updating and completeness of the information
8.3.2. Coherence and consistency of the information
8.3.3. NAP added value
8.4. Next steps

9. Summary and conclusions

Annexes

Annex 1: Overview of National Access Points and National Bodies
Annex 2: Overview of system architecture NAP
Annex 3: NAP Quality of Service questionnaire
Annex 5: Uniform Declaration of Compliance ITS Action B (two types) + Explanatory document
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 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>SE (Active)</td>
<td>Trafikverket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR (Participant)</td>
<td>Centre d’études et d’expertise sur les risques, l’environnement, la mobilité et l’aménagement (CEREMA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FI (Participant)</td>
<td>Finnish Transport Agency (FTA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FI (Participant)</td>
<td>Finnish Transport Safety Agency (TRAFL)</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). The NAP template was redistributed among the NAP implementers and updated according to the progress occurred along the year of 2017.

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 NAP implementers, National Bodies and TISA members.

Chapters 4 (Metadata) and 6 (DATEX II) build on the work earlier carried out in EIP and EIP+.

Chapter 7 is related to the new Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) the provision of EU-wide multimodal travel information services (No. 2017/1926) which was adopted on 21 October 2017.
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 2017. This deliverable will be updated every year until 2018, which will thus show the (expected) progress made in implementing the delegated regulations 885/2013 (safe and secure truck parking), 886/2013 (safety related traffic information), 2015/962 (real-time traffic information) and 2017/1926 (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 2017 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):
  - Availability of the data required by the delegated regulation
  - Language(s) of the NAP
  - Presence of any quality requirements
  - 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 885/2013, 886/2013, 2015/962 and 2017/1926. Depending on the proximity of the implementing body, the template was completed through face-to-face interviews, telephone call or e-mail.

In total 20 Member States have responded to the survey, which is an increase of 8 compared to 2016. This does not necessarily mean that the other countries have not implemented an NAP. However, since we did not receive information from these countries, 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 2018 this new NAP information will then be included.

The information is used to get 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 2017 survey. The report will be updated in 2018, thus providing on 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.

Highlight:

In 2017 many new National Access Points have been realised. Nevertheless quite a few Member States still have to establish their first National Access Point.

2.2. Status of NAP for Safe and Secure Truck Parking

In total 21 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 (885/2013) was adopted in 2013. The table below shows the status of implementation in 2016 and 2017. In 2016 only four countries have a (partly) operational NAP, i.e. Belgium, Germany, The Netherlands and Sweden. Four other countries had concrete plans to implement an NAP (Austria, Denmark, Poland and Portugal). The four remaining countries had no plans (yet). In 2017 this picture has changed significantly. Nine countries currently have an operational NAP, i.e. Austria, Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, The Netherlands, Slovenia, Spain and Sweden. Five other countries have concrete plans to implement an NAP (Croatia, Greece, Poland, Portugal and Romania). The six remaining countries have no plans (yet).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Status of implementation 2016</th>
<th>Status of implementation 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Planned (Q4 2016)</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Partly operational (Flanders only)</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>Slightly operational (Q4 2016)</td>
<td>Planned (Q4 2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>Not operational</td>
<td>Not operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>Not operational</td>
<td>Not operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Planned (Q4 2016)</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.1: Status of implementation NAP for truck parking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Implementation Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Not operational or planned*)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Planned (Q4 2018)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>Planned (Q4 2018)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Not operational</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Not operational or planned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Planned (Q3 2018)</td>
<td>Planned (Q4 2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Planned (Q4 2017)</td>
<td>Planned (Q1 2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>Planned (Q4 2018)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>Not operational</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)

From five countries no information was received. 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. Only in Germany dynamic data on the available parking places are added for some regions. In all eight countries with an operational NAP the information is available in the NAP.

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 or the LABEL service criteria. In almost all operational and planned NAPs data is/will be provided via DATEX II format. A discovery service or metadata is available for only three NAPs, for three other (planned) NAPs this is planned/under discussion.

Most 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 France, The Netherlands and Poland have a NAP just in the national language.
Monitoring of the use of the NAP is done or planned for most NAPs. In The Netherlands the use of the NAPs will not be monitored for privacy reasons.

In five countries with an operational NAP a National Body for assessment of compliance has been nominated. Five other countries are planning to do so. In The Netherlands there is already a procedure for the assessment of compliance. Many 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). Czech Republic and Norway provide static truck parking information only to the European Access Point; these countries have no own NAP for truck parking. 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](image)

2.3. NAP – Safety-Related Traffic Information
In total 21 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 (No. 886/2013) was adopted in 2013. The table below shows the status of implementation in 2016 and 2017. In 2016 six countries stated they had an operational NAP for SRTI, i.e. Denmark, Finland, Germany, The Netherlands, Norway and Sweden. Austria, Poland, Portugal and the UK had concrete plans to implement an NAP. In Belgium and Cyprus the NAP for SRTI was not yet operational or planned. In 2017 this picture has changed significantly. Currently 14 countries have an operational NAP for SRTI, i.e. Austria, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Ireland, The Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Slovenia Spain and Sweden. Six other countries have concrete plans to implement an NAP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Status of implementation 2016</th>
<th>Status of implementation 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Planned (Q4 2016)</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>Planned (Q4 2019)</td>
<td>Planned (Q4 2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>Not operational or planned</td>
<td>Not operational or planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Planned (Q4 2018)</td>
<td>Planned (Q4 2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Planned (Q3 2018)</td>
<td>Planned (Q3 2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Planned (Q4 2017)</td>
<td>Planned (Q1 2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>Planned (Q4 2018)</td>
<td>Planned (Q4 2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Six 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 SRTI.

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. Five countries (Czech Republic, Germany, Finland, Slovenia, Spain) state that the information is available in the NAP. The others 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. Six countries (Austria, Denmark, Finland, Norway, Sweden) reported quality requirements, for example completeness of minimum metadata set, the quality of data developed in EIP/EIP+, ‘best effort’, validated information or merely the requirements mentioned in the delegated regulation. The Netherlands, Poland, Portugal and Slovenia have no quality requirements for the data. Germany, Greece, Ireland and the UK plan to have quality requirements. In all countries with an operational NAP data is provided via DATEX format, but also other formats are used in some cases, such as data files, xml, RSS, GEO-RSS, JSON. Metadata is available for most NAPs, where the EIP Metadata Catalogue and DCAT-AP are mentioned as examples, but also search function based on key words. For two NAPs (Portugal, UK) metadata is foreseen.

The language of the NAP is mostly the national language plus English. France, The Netherlands, Norway and Spain 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)
- In France 38 road operators/authorities provide information.
• Hungary: 5 road operators/authorities provide data and two live data feeds from ASFINAG and DARS. Waze and TomTom use data from the NAP.
• 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 (NPRA) provides information. There are 280 subscribers to the NPRA DATEX node.
• Poland: Two organisations provide data to the NAP, i.e. the national road operator and Gliwice municipal road administration. Five organisations use SRTI data from the NAP, including the national road operator, Gliwice municipal road administration, and traffic safety providers.
• Portugal: all road operators will provide SRTI information in the future.
• Slovenia: Two organisations are providing data. Six public and five private organisations use data from the NAP.
• Spain: Among others Traffic Management Centres and traffic police provide information to the NAP.
• Sweden: one public organisation and two private organisations provide information. The number of users of the NAP is unknown.

In ten countries a National Body for assessment of compliance has been nominated, in a few other countries this is not yet the case. Of these ten countries, five countries (Finland, Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, UK) already have a procedure in place for the assessment of compliance. Other countries (e.g. Austria, Czech Republic, Germany, Ireland, Portugal, Sweden) are in the process of planning the assessment of compliance. Belgium, Denmark, The Netherlands, Norway, Finland and France use a Declaration of Compliance, of which the first four countries use (or plan to use) the harmonized declaration of compliance developed by EU EIP together with TISA.

**Highlight:**

*In May 2017 the Data Task Force was established on sharing safety related traffic data between OEM’s and traffic authorities. The Data Task Force will start a Proof of Concept based on a selection of use cases on SRTI to evaluate, validate and test general principles for data sharing, access and use.*

2.4. Status NAP for Real-Time Traffic Information

In total 21 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 applies from 13 July 2017. The table below shows that already 13 countries have a (partly) operational NAP for RTTI (Austria, Czech Republic, Cyprus, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Ireland, The Netherlands, Norway, Slovenia, Spain and Sweden). Five other countries (Croatia, Greece, Portugal, Romania and the UK) have concrete plans to implement an NAP. In Belgium, Hungary and Poland the NAP for RTTI is not yet operational or planned.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Status of implementation 2016</th>
<th>Status of implementation 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Planned (Q4 2016)</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td></td>
<td>Planned (Q4 2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>Partly operational</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td></td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Planned (Q2 2017)</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td></td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Planned (Q4 2018)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td></td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>Planned (Q3 2017)</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Planned (Q3 2017)</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Planned (Q4 2017)</td>
<td>Planned (Q1 2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td></td>
<td>Planned (Q4 2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td></td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td></td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Planned (Q1 2017)</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Some 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, most countries indicate that they provide access to all three types of information, but not always all specific categories as mentioned in the delegated regulation. For example:

- **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**: All currently available data are provided.
- **Finland**: Static road data (partially), dynamic road status data (partially) and traffic data (partially).
- **France**: static data are available on the national road network. Dynamic and circulation data will be accessible on the national road network and Ile-de-France. Data speeds and travel time on the national road network will be made available soon.
- **Ireland**: vehicle speed, traffic flow, traffic concentration, VMS messages, weather station data, travel times
- **Norway**: The types of the static road data include in particular the categories: a), b), c), d), g), h), j), and l). Dynamic road status data include in particular: a), b), c), e), f), j), o), p) and Traffic data include in particular: d) travel times.
- **Portugal**: Incidents, road conditions, traffic volume (%), average speed, traffic congestion, travel times, VMS messages.
- **Slovenia**: Static road data (except paragraphs (e), (j), (k), (l) and (m)), dynamic road status data (except paragraph (d), (l), (m), (n) and (o)) and traffic data (except paragraph (d)).
- **Sweden**: static and dynamic road data.

Nine countries (Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Slovenia) state that the information is (or will be) available in the NAP for RTTI, seven countries (Austria, Cyprus, Ireland, Norway, The Netherlands, Spain, Sweden, UK) state that they provide web-links to the data. Finland, Greece, Portugal and Romania are planning to offer both options.

For most Member States it is yet to early to decide on quality requirements for the data to be made available. Only Austria, Denmark, Finland, Spain, Sweden and UK so far have stated that there are/will be some form of quality requirements, e.g. completeness of minimum metadata set, quality of traffic information as defined in EIP+ and EU EIP, validated information 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.

Most countries state that the use of the (meta)data is/will be free of charge. For the UK this applies for the public sector data. Data providers can decide to charge for their data.
The language of the NAP for RTTI is mostly the national language and English. Only in Norway the NAP will be not available in English.

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
- Croatia: 5 motorway operators (3 public, 2 private) will be providing data.
- Denmark: two Divisions of the DRD provide data to the NAP. There are five test users.
- Finland: One public body is providing data. Several public and private organisations (actual amount cannot be specified) are users of the data.
- France: Apart from Directorate of Roads and concession operators, also Michelin Travel Partner provides data (speed data; location and length of traffic jams)
- Greece: Certh/HIT and Egnatia Odos S.A. will provide data to the NAP. Other data providers will be contacted.
- Ireland: only Transport Infrastructure Ireland provides metadata.
- Norway: NPRA and EV Norway provide data.
- Portugal: All road operators will provide data to the NAP.
- Slovenia: three public and one private organisation provide data. The data are used by six public and five private organisations.
- Spain: Among others Traffic Management Centres and traffic police provide information to the NAP.
- Sweden: STA is the only provider and user of 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 a National Body is not required. Nevertheless, most Member States have nominated (or will nominate) a National Body comparable to the NAP for SRTI.

2.5. Status of NAP for Multimodal Travel Information

The delegated regulation on multimodal travel information has only been adopted recently (21 October 2017) by the European Commission. Therefore, this section gives a first glance on how Member States are already preparing themselves for this delegated regulation.
Eight countries have concrete plans for implementing a NAP for multimodal travel information. 12 other countries are in the process of making decisions or have not started yet. The first set of travel and traffic data should be made available through the NAP on 1 December 2019 at the latest.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Status of implementation 2016</th>
<th>Status of implementation 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>Planned (Q2 2018)</td>
<td>Planned (Q2 2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Planned (Q3 2018)</td>
<td>Planned (Q1 2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>Planned (Q4 2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>Planned (Q4 2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>Planned 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Pre-study ongoing</td>
<td>Pre-study ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.4: Status of implementation NAP for multimodal travel information

In Austria AustriaTech is responsible for implementing the NAP for multimodal travel information. In Croatia this is Croatian Roads Ltd and in Cyprus this is the Ministry of Transport, Communications and Works. In Denmark the Danish Transport, Construction and Housing Authority will implement the NAP for MMTIS, and in Finland this will be the Finnish Transport Agency, Certh/HIT and the National Transport Authority will do the same in respectively Greece and Ireland. In Sweden, the Swedish Transport Administration most likely will be responsible for implementing the NAP and the Department of Transport will do the same in UK.

Most countries have not yet decided about whether or not to nominate a National Body for the assessment of compliance. However, in Austria, Cyprus and Denmark the National Bodies will be the same as the Implementing Body. In Finland this role will possibly be executed by the Finnish Transport Safety Agency (to be decided) and in Slovenia it will be the National Traffic Management Centre.

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.

The role of road authorities in implementing the NAP for MMTIS varies. In most cases they will be merely data providers and data users.

In chapter 7 more specific attention will be paid to the National Access Points for Multimodal Travel Information Services.
Highlight:

On 21 October 2017 the new Delegated Regulation on the provision of EU-wide multimodal travel information services was adopted (2017/1926).

2.6. NAP Interactive Map

During the meetings and discussions with different stakeholders, it was found that there are very few people/institutions that know that at European level, more and more countries have implemented or are in the process of implementing NAPs. Although they can find information about them in the Annual Reports of Activity 4.6, a fairly small percentage has access to them and very few know exactly where to look for information about NAPs. In addition, the fact that each country uses different names and web addresses makes it harder to access or find information about NAPs. In fact, if you want to find a National Access Point or information about it using a search engine (Google, Yahoo, etc.), you will have the big surprise that these search engines will not find the information you are looking for or to returned results that have nothing to do with a National Access Points.

So it has been decided that we have to find a solution to promote the existence of National Access Points in Europe. And how can this be done? Which is the easiest way to promote National Access Points? Using a web service, a web service which is user friendly.

For this was created an interactive map. The map will be posted on the official website of the EU-EIP project. By clicking on the country that has already implemented a National Access Point, the visitor/user will be automatically redirected to the country's National Access Point. In order to make this page even more visible, it would be preferable to add a few keywords so that in search of the internet with a search engine, this map will be the first returned result. But this aspects will be discussed with the owners of the official site to see if is possible.
In addition, was also added the list of NAPs web address that were known at the time of creating the interactive map.

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

Based on the survey it can be concluded that an increasing number of Member States comply with the delegated regulations 885/2013, 886/2013 and 2015/962, but also that quite a few countries still have to do a lot of work.

With respect to the NAP on truck parking, from the Member States that have participated in the survey eight countries currently have an operational NAP, i.e. Austria, Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, The Netherlands, Slovenia and Sweden. Five other countries have concrete plans to implement an NAP (Croatia, Greece, Poland, Portugal and Romania). The six remaining countries have no plans (yet).
In the case of NAPs for safety-related traffic information currently 13 countries have an operational NAP for SRTI, i.e. Austria, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Ireland, The Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Slovenia and Sweden. Six other countries have concrete plans to implement an NAP.

For both types of NAP (truck parking and SRTI) it is 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 entered into force in July 2017, already 12 countries have a (partly) operational NAP for RTTI (Austria, Czech Republic, Cyprus, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Ireland, The Netherlands, Norway, Slovenia and Sweden). Five other countries (Croatia, Greece, Portugal, Romania and the UK) have concrete plans to implement an NAP. In Belgium, Hungary and Poland the NAP for RTTI is not yet operational or planned.

For the NAP on multimodal travel information it is still early to make any conclusions. Eight countries have concrete plans for implementing a NAP for multimodal travel information. 12 other countries are in the process of making decisions or have not started yet. The first set of travel and traffic data should be made available through the NAP on 1 December 2019 at the latest.

**Highlight:**

An overview of the NAPs across Europe shows that these NAPs vary largely in their scope and set up. Some NAPs build on earlier experiences of Traffic Information Centers, whereas other NAPs are created completely from scratch.
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, 2017 activities, findings and progress; and the next steps for 2018.

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 2017.

Following the questionnaire and interview exercises undertaken in 2016, there was consensus on three functional NAP areas to develop:

- technical aspects,
- communication and
- language.

3.3. Progress and achievements

In 2017 the task was progressed by:

- short discussion papers,
- internal meeting presentations and group discussion,
- NAP implementer feedback,
- NAP information gathering at workshops throughout the year, and
- development of a NAP Common Features and Level of Service - Support Document.
There was a 2017 round of SA 4.6 group questionnaires, but no additional feedback on the NAP quality and level of service aspects was received.

3.3.1. NAP COMMON FEATURES AND LEVEL OF SERVICE - SUPPORT DOCUMENT

Highlight:

A NAP Support Document has been written for organisations involved in the implementation of National Access Points. It describes a set of features to encourage good practice, help make existing and future National Access Point services available to a wide audience, facilitate data sharing, and to promote the discovery of datasets.


Each feature has a description, reasons for being included, examples, and benefits.
We are looking for feedback and comments to help improve and update the document so please download, read, and let us know what you think!

Contacts: Jacqueline Barr - jbarr@ibigroup.com

The key deliverable of this task in 2017 was the NAP Common Features and Level of Service - Support Document. This built on, and expanded on, the three key areas highlighted from the 2016 work. The document has been written for organisations responsible for NAPs, and is intended to support the development and utilisation of access points for information services as set out in the Commission delegated regulations of the ITS Directive, where an access point is specified.

Reviewing, revising and updating the feature list over the course of the year developed a stable document describing a set of 18 features. These were devised to support good practice, help make existing and future National Access Point services available to a wider audience, facilitate data sharing, and promote the discovery of datasets.
The features are grouped into five subsets:

1. **Access**
   
   There are five features; including gaining access to the NAP, navigation, language, NAP security and data publisher registration.

2. **Communication**
   
   There are four features; including user help facilities, informing users of terms and conditions, raising awareness and promoting the NAP.

3. **Finding datasets**
   
   There are three features; covering discovery services and metadata to help data consumers find datasets.

4. **Update and maintenance**
   
   There are three features; covering maintenance of the NAP service (e.g. IT, hardware, software), updating NAP metadata, and NAP monitoring and evaluation.

5. **Dataset information**
   
   There are three features; including adding dataset descriptions, documentation and using standard / controlled vocabularies.

The features are described as either required or nice to have. The required features are considered to have higher priority to current NAP development. Each feature has a description, reasons for being included, examples, and benefits. An example is shown below:
2.1.3. **NAP is provided in the National Language and Commonly Used Language(s) of the Member State**

**Description**

Text in the NAP is provided in national language and commonly used language(s) of the Member State. Providing NAP text in additional languages will further increase accessibility.

This feature is considered required.

**Reason**

The NAP will be easily understood and accessible by, at minimum, native speaking data consumers and data publishers.

By providing the dataset information and descriptions in multiple languages, the NAP is more accessible to the whole of Europe.

**Example**

Austrian NAP ([http://www.mobilitaetsdaten.gv.at](http://www.mobilitaetsdaten.gv.at)) provides information in German and English.

![Example feature from the NAP Common Features and Level of Service - Support Document](image)

Figure 3.1: Example feature from the NAP Common Features and Level of Service - Support Document

There is also a simple checklist for NAP implementers to record and comment on the features and their current NAP deployments, as shown below:
3.4. Challenges

Currently there are a limited number of functioning NAPs, with many in planning and pre-implementation stages, therefore feedback to date has been limited. There are a mixture of NAP structures / set-ups, with some created specifically to meet the requirements of the delegated regulations, some are existing B2B services, and some are linking to open data initiatives; collating a single set of features to be satisfied by all may be difficult. Further engagement and feedback on the Support Document will help refine and adapt it to be of maximum benefit to NAP implementers.
3.5. Next steps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timescale</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan 2018</td>
<td>Publishing of 2017 Support Document on EU EIP website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb-May 2018</td>
<td>NAP implementer document review / testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2018</td>
<td>Analysis of completed checklists and feedback from NAP implementers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep 2018</td>
<td>Updated 2018 Support Document</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 3.1 – Overview for 2018*
4. Metadata

4.1. Task purpose and scope

Metadata describe the administration, organisation, and content of a dataset and of a data service. Metadata datasets are therefore crucial elements to make NAPs accessible and searchable. The most visible Metadata representation are the dataset descriptions in NAP portals, see the example from the Mobility Data Marketplace (MDM, German NAP) below.

Figure 4.1: Metadata as part of the data set description in a NAP portal

Metadata represent a recurring element of Delegated Regulations of the ITS Directive. Metadata have been mentioned so far for Priority Action b (Delegated Regulation EC 2015/962) and for Priority Action a (Delegated Regulation EC 2017/1926). It is recommended that Metadata should also have the same relevance for all other Delegated Regulations.

There is a need to harmonise Metadata descriptions and structures 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 being discussed in the field of Metadata. In particular, recommendations are being elaborated in terms of how to implement Metadata in existing and upcoming NAPs across Europe.

The activities of EU EIP sub-activity 4.6 are based on:

- results from the former projects EIP and EIP+, in particular the “Coordinated Metadata Catalogue” as a proposal for a harmonised set of Metadata,
- evaluation of Metadata approaches in the Member States so far, and
- identification of needs and requirements in order to further develop a recommended, harmonised Metadata approach across Europe.

4.2. Previous activities and initial findings

As an on-going work of EU EIP sub-activity 4.6, the current practice and experiences of individual NAPs in terms of Metadata approaches are being reviewed and evaluated. These are the findings from the first analyses:

- 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.

An important milestone towards a further harmonisation of Metadata across the European NAPs was a workshop on Metadata, organised by EU EIP Activity 4.6 in Frankfurt/Germany on 8th June 2017. This workshop aimed to enable stakeholders share their views and to establish a common understanding for the upcoming activities of EU EIP Activity 4.6.

1 For more details on the “Coordinated Metadata Catalogue” see the Annual NAP Report 2016.
As an outcome of this workshop, it has become evident that a complete Metadata harmonisation across all NAPs would be quite challenging, as individual NAP environments are quite varied regarding system architectures, functionalities and IT / Open Data frameworks. Therefore, some balance has to be found between the harmonisation needs on the one hand, and the consideration of the individual NAP environments in the other hand.

**Highlight:**

A Metadata Guideline report has been written for support. This document gives guidance how to apply Metadata in existing and future NAPs. The intended audience are organisations responsible for NAPs as well as NAP users with interest in Metadata usage within NAPs.


We are looking for feedback and comments to help improve and update the document so please download, read, and let us know what you think!

Contacts: Peter Lubrich - lubrich@bast.de)

### 4.3. Next steps

EU EIP sub-activity 4.6 is further offering a platform to elaborate recommendations for Metadata harmonisation. The on-going work in this context is shown in the figure below.

![Recommendations for Metadata harmonisation](image)

*Figure 4.1: concept for work of sub-activity 4.6 for Metadata harmonisation*
The technical guidance refers to specific Metadata standards. In particular, the “Coordinated Metadata Catalogue” (as a previous project of EIP and EIP+) is further assessed regarding its usability. Together with the authors of the Catalogue, it is also discussed how the catalogue may be revised in order to meet future requirements.

In addition, EU EIP sub-activity 4.6 is elaborating a strategic guidance for NAP operators in form of a “Metadata Guideline”. This guideline depicts and discusses alternative Metadata approaches for individual NAP environments, taking into account higher-level considerations for NAP implementations. In particular, the following issues are discussed:

- Summary of existing Metadata standards relevant for NAPs
- Review of current practice of Metadata implementation in individual NAPs
- Discussion of considerations of individual NAP environments in form of a “NAP Checklist” with regard to Metadata
- Recommendations to help NAP operators find the right choice on a Metadata approach.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timescale</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Output</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>Finalisation of “Metadata Guideline”</td>
<td>Publication of “Metadata Guideline”; Follow-up/review process with NAP operators and stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan – Dec</td>
<td>Continue to review existing NAP Metadata approaches</td>
<td>Collect, compare / review, disseminate current practices</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2—Task 3.1 overview for 2018
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. Similarly, Delegated Regulation No. 2015/962 requests Member States to manage a National Access Point for real-time traffic data.

Both Delegated Regulations also describe the obligation of Member States to carry out an assessment of compliance with these delegated regulations. In the NAP Annual Report 2016 the Uniform Declaration of Compliance for Delegated Regulation 886/2013 was described. A zip-file with three documents (introductory letter, uniform declaration of compliance, explanatory note) can be downloaded HERE.

This chapter describes an EU-wide harmonised approach towards the assessment of compliance for Delegated Regulation 2015/962.

5.1. Why a harmonised approach?

Without a harmonised approach, road authorities, road operators, digital map producers and service providers 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 organisations responsible for carrying out the assessment of compliance could possibly be facing discussions with a whole range of road authorities, road operators, digital map producers and service providers 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 sessions with TISA and a workshop with Member State representatives, road operators, service providers and data 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

---

2 Joint TISA/EU EIP sessions to discuss the self-declaration for priority action 'B' on 15 June 2017, 12 July 2017, 7 September 2017 and 25 September 2017
3 Traveller Information Services Association, www.tisa.org
4 Joint TISA/ EU EIP workshop, 20 November 2017, Brussels.
that participated in the workshops agreed and recognised the urgent need for a ‘Uniform Declaration of Compliance Form’, that would be accepted by all parties.

5.2. **Uniform Declaration of Compliance Form**

Through a joint effort of TISA and EU EIP a Uniform Declaration of Compliance Form has been developed for Delegated Regulation (EU) No. 2015/962. This uniform Declaration of Compliance Form is based on the Declaration of Compliance Form for Safety Related Traffic Information (886/2013), which was agreed upon in February 2017. The Uniform Declaration of Compliance Form was then discussed with the stakeholders (public and private). First of all, it was ensured that the Declaration of Compliance Form would be in line with the (minimum) requirements set out in article 11 of the Delegated Regulation. Secondly, the form was developed in such a way that the administrative burden for all parties involved will be minimized, but nevertheless providing sufficient information for a solid assessment of compliance. This has resulted in two different Declarations of Compliance, based on the different requirements for the various parties mentioned in the Delegated Regulation (EU) No. 2015/962:

- One Declaration of Compliance for road authorities and road operators;
- One Declaration of Compliance for digital map producers and service providers.

In case an organisation fulfils the role of both road authority/road operator and service provider, this organisation has to complete both forms.

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.

The Uniform Declaration of Compliance Forms and the explanatory note can be found respectively in Annex 4 (for SRTI) and Annex 5 (RTTI).

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

The stakeholders recommend that this Uniform Declaration of Compliance Form will be used from now on by all road authorities, road operators, digital map producers and service providers 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 organisations responsible for the assessment of compliance can use this Uniform Declaration of Compliance Form as the standard Declaration of Compliance
form in their country. They can use the English form and simultaneously make a translation into their own national language. Road authorities, road operators, digital map producers and service providers can use either the English language form or the national language form.

This form should be used only for the purpose of the assessment of compliance. Forms should not be published without prior consent of the organization that completed the declaration of compliance.

Member States adopting these Uniform Declarations of Compliance should add the organization name and address of the organization responsible for the assessment of compliance at the bottom of the Declaration. In this way road operators, road authorities, digital map producers and service providers know where to send the Declaration to and/or who to contact for further information.

5.4. Evaluation of the Uniform Declaration of Compliance Form after 3 years

At the moment of writing (December 2017) not all countries have established a National Access Point as described in Delegated Regulation No. 2015/962. Also, only a limited number of road authorities, road operators, digital map producers and service providers have already provided a Declaration of Compliance to organisations responsible 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 No. 2015/962.

It is proposed to use the Uniform Declaration of Compliance Form for a pilot period of three years, i.e. 2018-2020. Shortly before the completion of this three-year period, an evaluation shall be carried out with national organisations responsible for the assessment of compliance, road authorities, road operators, digital map producers and service providers, 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 workshop as the most efficient and effective way to ensure compliance with article 11 of the Delegated Regulation No. 2015/962. The Form will thus contribute to the accessibility,
exchange, re-use and update of road and traffic data for the provision of EU-wide real-time traffic information services.

5.6. Next step

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timescale</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Output</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan – Dec 2018</td>
<td>Setting up harmonised Declaration of Compliance Priority Action E.</td>
<td>Harmonised Declaration of Compliance Priority E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stakeholders to be identified.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1: Next steps for harmonisation of declaration of compliance

Highlight:

Following the Uniform Declaration of Compliance for priority action ‘C’, in 2017 a new Uniform Declaration of Compliance has been agreed upon for priority action ‘B’, which is supported by EU EIP, TISA and the European Commission.

The Uniform Declaration of Compliance for priority action ‘C’ can be downloaded at the following link: [https://www.its-platform.eu/filedepot_download/2216/6242](https://www.its-platform.eu/filedepot_download/2216/6242)
6. DATEX II

6.1. Role of DATEX II in National Access Points

Highlight:

The 2017 NAP survey confirms that all implementations use DATEX II to exchange truck parking information, safety related and dynamic/real time traffic information.

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 a), 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).

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. Specifically, in the monitoring template, countries were asked if they use DATEX II for data exchange or other protocol.

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 partners from 19 European countries. The main conclusion to be highlighted is that all operational NAPs use DATEX II to exchange the information than can be encoded using this standard: truck parking information, safety-related and real time/dynamic traffic information.

6.4. 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 especially the use of DATEX II for RTTI even though harmonized profiles are not yet developed.

Regarding the feedback received in the 2016 survey of the SA4.6, it can be noticed that much more countries have provided feedback and their answers confirm the wide spread usage of DATEX.

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:

Highlight:

A dedicated NAP Session will take place at the upcoming DATEX II User Form, Utrecht, Netherlands, 23 – 24 May 2018.
7. Priority action A – Multimodal Travel Information

The Commission Delegated Regulation on multimodal travel information services has been adopted in October 2017 (No. 2017/1926). Therefore, in this document, this subject should be introduced.

**Highlight:**

*On 21 October 2017 the new Delegated Regulation on the provision of EU-wide multimodal travel information services was adopted (2017/1926).*

7.1. Introducing Delegated Regulation No. 2017/1926

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;

This new type of information, available in National Access Points, introduces very different points of view, in subjects like type of information, actors involved and geographical scope.

The following table shows the main differences between regulated delegations B,C,E and the delegated regulation A concerning multimodal travel information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Real-Time Traffic Information – action (b)</th>
<th>Safety Related Traffic Information – action (c)</th>
<th>Safe and Secure Truck Parking Information – action (e)</th>
<th>Multimodal travel information – action (a)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

EU EIP SA46 Annual NAP report 2017

EU EIP 43/97
<p>| Date delegated regulation applies (including transitional period) | 13 July 2017 | 01 Oct 2015 | 01 Oct 2015 | (a) for the travel and traffic data set out in point 1.1 of Annex I for the comprehensive TEN-T network, by 1 December 2019 at the latest; (b) for the travel and traffic data set out in point 1.2 of Annex I for the comprehensive TEN-T network, by 1 December 2020 at the latest; (c) for the travel and traffic data set out in point 1.3 of Annex I for the comprehensive TEN-T network, by 1 December 2021 the latest; (d) for the travel and traffic data set out in points 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3 of Annex I for the other parts of the Union transport network, by 1 December 2023 at the latest. |
| Motivation | Establishes the specifications necessary to ensure the accessibility, exchange, reuse and update of road and traffic data for the provision of real-time traffic information services | 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 | Establishes the specifications necessary to ensure compatibility, interoperability and continuity for the deployment and operational use of information services for safe and secure parking places for trucks and commercial vehicles | Establishes the necessary specifications in order to ensure that EU-wide multimodal travel information services are accurate and available across borders to ITS users. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographic scope</th>
<th>Comprehensive trans-European road network, incl. motorways not included on this network &amp; nationally identified priority zones</th>
<th>Trans-European road network, MS designated sections of the trans-European road network</th>
<th>Trans-European road network, MS designate areas requiring such a service. MS to define priority zones where dynamic information to be provided</th>
<th>This Regulation applies to the entire transport network of the Union and to all transport modes.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parties mentioned</td>
<td>Road authorities, road operators, digital map producers &amp; real-time traffic information service providers</td>
<td>Public / private road operators &amp; service providers &amp; broadcasters dedicated to traffic information</td>
<td>Public / private parking operators &amp; service provider</td>
<td>Transport authorities, transport operators, infrastructure managers or transport on demand service providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Information on quality to be available from data providers</td>
<td>Minimum level of quality</td>
<td>Truck parking facility operators required to ensure reliability and availability of information</td>
<td>Travel information services shall be based on updates of static and dynamic travel and traffic data. When changes occur, the relevant static and dynamic travel and traffic data listed in Annex I shall be updated by transport authorities, transport operators, infrastructure managers or transport on demand service providers through the national access point in a timely manner. They shall in a timely manner correct any inaccuracies detected by them in their data or signalled to them by any user or end</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
user. Travel and traffic data shall be accessible within a time-frame that ensures the timely provision of the travel information service. They shall be accurate and up to date. Where re-using the static and dynamic travel or traffic data, the source of those data shall be indicated. The date and time of the last update of the static data shall also be indicated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obligatory (or not)</th>
<th>Access point must be implemented but specifications do not oblige road authorities / road operators / service providers to start collecting new data, digitising new data, implementing new TMPs</th>
<th>Applies to all public and private road operators and service providers that detect, collect and/or distribute Safety Related Traffic Information</th>
<th>Access point must be implemented for those areas designated by the MS where traffic and security conditions require the service be implemented. Access point includes static and dynamic data where relevant (i.e. dynamic information to be provided in priority areas defined by MS)</th>
<th>Applies to transport authorities, transport operators, infrastructure managers or transport on demand service providers.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obligation for private parties</td>
<td>Applies to road authorities, road operators, digital map producers and service providers; e.g. service providers shall comply with specific requirements when re-using data such as circulation</td>
<td>Applies to all public and private road operators and service providers that detect, collect and/or distribute Safety Related Traffic Information</td>
<td>Applies to all public or private parking operators and service providers</td>
<td>Applies to transport authorities, transport operators, infrastructure managers or transport on demand service providers. These specifications should not oblige</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominated Body: Yes/No</td>
<td>Access point (repository, registry, web portal), must contain metadata (including information on quality)</td>
<td>Access point (repository, registry, web portal) regrouping individual access points</td>
<td>Access point (referencing all individual single points of access)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - MS required to designate an impartial and independent national body</td>
<td></td>
<td>The access point may take various forms, such as a database, data warehouse, data marketplace, repository, and register, web portal or similar depending on the type of data. Member States should consider regrouping the existing public and private access points in a single point enabling access to all the types of relevant available data that fall within the scope of these specifications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No - MS to assess whether the requirements are complied with by the road authorities, road operators, digital map producers &amp; service providers. MS can request data &amp; quality descriptions from data providers and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - MS required to designate an impartial and independent national body</td>
<td>Yes - MS required to designate an impartial and independent national body</td>
<td>No - In order to make sure that these specifications are correctly implemented, Member States should assess the compliance with the requirements concerning the accessibility, exchange, re-use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To that end the competent authorities should be free to rely on self-declarations of compliance submitted by transport authorities, transport operators, infrastructure managers, transport on demand service providers or travel information service providers, and may randomly check the correctness of these declarations.

| Free, reasonable cost, commercial | Service providers are free to arrange commercial agreements for the re-use of relevant data | Where possible, free of charge for all end users | Reasonable as referred to in the Directive on the re-use of public sector information | Use via licence agreements, harmonised set of terms and conditions, quality criteria |

an evidence based declaration of compliance and update of the multimodal travel data by the transport authorities, transport operators, transport on demand service providers and travel information service providers.
| Data definition | Standardised formats, if available, or any other machine readable format for static road data (incl. dynamic location referencing). DATEX II (CEN/TS 16157 and subsequently upgraded versions) format or any machine-readable format fully compatible and interoperable with DATEX II for dynamic status road data and traffic data. | DATEX II (CEN/TS 16157) format or any fully compatible and interoperable with DATEX II machine readable format. | DATEX II (CEN/TS 16157) format or any internationally compatible and interoperable with DATEX II machine readable format. | For what concerns the exchange of static scheduled data (such as public transport, long distance coach and maritime including ferry), the relevant data in the national access point should use the CEN data exchange standard NeTEx CEN/TS 16614 based on the underlying conceptual data reference model Transmodel EN 12896: 2006 and subsequent upgraded versions or any machine-readable format fully compatible by the agreed timeline. For what concerns the exchange of dynamic public transport data, if Member States choose to include dynamic data in the national access point the relevant parts of the CEN public transport data exchange standard SIRI CEN/TS 15531 and subsequent upgraded versions or any machine-readable format fully compatible should be used. Member States may choose to continue using... |
national public transport data standards at the Member State level for national operations but to ensure EU-wide interoperability and the continuity of services, the specified EU standards must be used at the national access point level. Member States may use translation and conversion methods to adhere to the European standardisation requirements. The version of the prescribed standards that is available at the time of date of application should be used. Any relevant updates that widen the scope and include new types of data should be used.

| National vs. European SPA | National or two or more MS can set up a common access point | National | National or international. EC is establishing a EU access point for truck parking (static data) | National, but member States should be allowed to co-operate with one another to set up a common access point covering the available data of the participating Member States. |

Table 7.1: Comparison between delegated regulations B, C, E and A.
7.2. First steps in multimodal travel information

**Highlight:**

Several countries across Europe are taking their first steps in introducing Multimodal Travel Information in their respective National Access Points

Multimodal travel information is being introduced in several countries across Europe, considering the inclusion of the information in the respective NAP. In the next paragraphs we will describe some of the implementations and intentions occurring:

7.2.1. NETHERLANDS

- Currently, via CROW-NDOV all nine Dutch Public Transport companies already make their data available via website [https://ndovloket.nl](https://ndovloket.nl).
- This information is integrated by three integrators and then used by over 500 information service providers.
- The road authorities merely will provide data (RTTI) to the National Traffic Data Warehouse (NDW). The NDW will register to the NAP on MMTIS as one of many data providers.
- CROW-NDOV has a number of interfaces:
  - From PT Operator to NDOV
    - time table, routes, stops, location of vehicle (every minute) and deviation from time table, free text of traffic manager at stops (extreme weather, strikes, etc.), changes in time tables;
  - From NDOV to ‘data users’:
    - Planned time table per stop for number of days, actual departure time per stop (based on position of vehicle)
- BISON is the national systems that maintains the standard interfaces (national standard).
7.2.2. PORTUGAL

- Project under implementation of NAP for ‘A’;
- The objective of the pilot is to support the early implementation of the delegated regulation under Directive 2010/40/EU by Member States, including the public transport authorities, public transport operators and service providers in their territory, for the provision of Union-wide multimodal travel information services which apply to the TEN-T network including urban nodes;
- The project will comprise several phases throughout its development:
  - The phased implementation of the National Access Point (NAP), adapting and extending the NAP accordingly with the shape and form adopted by Portugal;
  - The feasibility of the access and exchange of public and private multimodal travel data and its interoperability, including the conversion and implementation of static scheduled datasets from technical specifications currently in use, into the technical standard of NeTEx;
  - When possible, the exchange of dynamic information from public transport operators to NAP, using the standard protocol SIRI.
  - A multimodal travel information journey planner at national, regional and local levels, in line with EU-Spirit Project, linking services in the corridor Porto - Aveiro - Lisboa using standard interfaces.

7.2.3. GERMANY

The German MDM is not yet suitable to provide all the related data. However, some of the related data are already available on other platforms, especially those declared as Open Data. Apart from that, the provision of a public transport data via standardized interfaces is currently being coordinated by DELFI e. V., a group of public transport organizations. The goal is to implement a nationwide system (via a so-called data integration platform - DIP), consolidating timetable information on local, regional and long-distance public transport (by rail and bus).

In summary, there is a rather a data platform-landscape in Germany for MMTIS-related data nowadays, in opposite to one access point, as required by the Delegated Regulation. In order to consolidate the data provision, a „Strategy for a harmonised data provision of the Ministry of Transport“ is being elaborated. The goal of this strategy is to determine how to
further develop the data platform-landscape in Germany, particularly how to provide MMTI-related data in a German NAP.

7.3. Next steps

The table below outlines 2018 actions to be progressed in this subject:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timescale</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Output</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan – Dec</td>
<td>Follow the experiences happening across Europe.</td>
<td>Update of this document and dissemination of the good practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan – Dec</td>
<td>Identify new projects concerning multimodal travel information in NAP</td>
<td>Update of this document and dissemination of the good practices.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 7.2: Next steps for multimodal travel information.*
8. Other relevant issues

8.1. Purpose and scope

In complement to the precedent activities, this activity intends to find other requirements or recommendations not identified in the previous sections.

8.2. Methodology

From the analysis of the updated NAP implementers’ template 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.

This year, a new issue appeared with the publication of the delegated regulation A for multimodal travel information. We considered this question sufficiently important to dedicate it a new chapter (the precedent chapter 7 in this document).

So, in this section we only remember the issues already identified in 2016, which continued to be evaluated across 2017.

8.3. Identified requirements and recommendations

From the analysis of the inputs, follow-up of the new issues identified, and from the discussion of the group the following relevant issues where identified:

8.3.1. 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.

8.3.2. 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.

8.3.3. 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.
8.4. Next steps

The table below outlines 2018 actions to be progressed in this subject:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timescale</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Output</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan – Dec</td>
<td>Monitor how these issues are being addressed across Europe</td>
<td>Update of this document and dissemination of the good practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan – Dec</td>
<td>Identify new issues</td>
<td>Update of this document and dissemination of the good practices.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 8.1: Next steps for other relevant issues.*
9. Summary and conclusions

Current status of NAP implementation

Based on the survey it can be concluded that an increasing number of Member States comply with the delegated regulations 885/2013, 886/2013 and 2015/962, but also that quite a few countries still have to do a lot of work.

With respect to the NAP on truck parking, from the Member States that have participated in the survey eight countries currently have an operational NAP, i.e. Austria, Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, The Netherlands, Slovenia and Sweden. Five other countries have concrete plans to implement an NAP (Croatia, Greece, Poland, Portugal and Romania). The six remaining countries have no plans (yet).

In the case of NAPs for safety-related traffic information currently 13 countries have an operational NAP for SRTI, i.e. Austria, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Ireland, The Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Slovenia and Sweden. Six other countries have concrete plans to implement an NAP.

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

Even though the delegated regulation 2015/962 entered into force in July 2017, already 12 countries have a (partly) operational NAP for RTTI (Austria, Czech Republic, Cyprus, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Ireland, The Netherlands, Norway, Slovenia and Sweden). Five other countries (Croatia, Greece, Portugal, Romania and the UK) have concrete plans to implement an NAP. In Belgium, Hungary and Poland the NAP for RTTI is not yet operational or planned.

For the NAP on multimodal travel information it is still early to make any conclusions. Eight countries have concrete plans for implementing a NAP for multimodal travel information. 12 other countries are in the process of making decisions or have not started yet. The first set of travel and traffic data should be made available through the NAP on 1 December 2019 at the latest.

Common features and Level of Service

The table below lists the aspects ranked as most relevant for defining common features and levels of service for NAPs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Level of Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Functional

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technical</th>
<th>provision of data description / metadata</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></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>
</tbody>
</table>

| Communication   | respond to user questions                |
|                 | provision of technical user support      |
|                 | announcement of service maintenance (with possible effect on availability) |

| Language        | provision of some sections / features (i.e. search, results) in additional languages |

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

It has been previously realized (see EU EIP NAP annual report 2016) that the individual approaches in establishing Metadata structures in individual NAPs vary to a certain extent.

To work towards a further harmonisation of Metadata across the European NAPs, a workshop on Metadata was held by EU EIP Activity 4.6 in Frankfurt/Germany on 8th June 2017, including various stakeholders such as NAP operator and IT experts. It has become evident that a complete Metadata harmonisation across all NAPs would be quite challenging, as individual NAP environments are quite varied regarding system architectures, functionalities and IT / Open Data frameworks. Therefore, some balance has to be found between the harmonisation needs on the one hand, and the consideration of the individual NAP environments in the other hand.

EU EIP Activity 4.6 is further offering a platform to elaborate recommendations for Metadata harmonisation. This includes technical guidance referring to specific Metadata approaches,
as well as a strategic guidance for NAP operators in form of a “Metadata Guideline”. This
guideline depicts and discusses alternative Metadata approaches for individual NAP
environments, taking into account higher-level considerations for NAP implementations. In
particular, the following issues are discussed:

- Summary of existing Metadata standards relevant for NAPs
- Review of current practice of Metadata implementation in individual NAPs
- Discussion of considerations of individual NAP environments in form of a “NAP
  Checklist” with regard to Metadata
- Recommendations to help NAP operators find the right choice on a Metadata approach.

This guideline is envisioned to be published early 2018.

Based on on-going analyses on current NAP practices and feedback from stakeholders on
Metadata, EU EIP Activity 4.6 will continue its efforts towards Metadata harmonization on
the technical and strategic level.

**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 EU EIP Sub-activity (SA) 4.5 (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.

Following the Uniform Declaration of Compliance for priority action ‘C’, in 2017 a new Uniform Declaration of Compliance has been agreed upon for priority action ‘B’, which is supported by EU EIP, TISA and the European Commission.
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.

On 21 October 2017 the new Delegated Regulation on the provision of EU-wide multimodal travel information services was adopted (2017/1926).

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;

Multimodal travel information subject is being introduced in several countries across Europe, considering the inclusion of the information in the respective NAP.

New discussions will arrive next year, considering this new issue, such as the use of the new protocols to exchange this type of information (NeTEX and SIRI), should the NAP for
delegated regulation A, be the same of the NAP for B, C and E, or should be separated NAPs, and other questions to be evaluated in 2018.
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 Commission Delegated Regulations [885/2013](#) (truck parking), [886/2013](#) (SRTI), [2015/962](#) (RTTI) and [2017/1926](#) (MMTIS). Status per December 2017.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country name</th>
<th>National Access Point</th>
<th>Contact National Body</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td><a href="http://www.mobilitaetsdaten.gv.at/">http://www.mobilitaetsdaten.gv.at/</a></td>
<td>AustriaTech – Gesellschaft des Bundes für technologiepolitische Maßnahmen GmbH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td><a href="http://data.its.be/">http://data.its.be/</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(truck parking)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>Planned Q4 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td><a href="http://www.traffic4cyprus.org.cy">www.traffic4cyprus.org.cy</a> (MMTI)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td><a href="http://registr.dopravniinfo.cz/en/">http://registr.dopravniinfo.cz/en/</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td><a href="http://nap.vd.dk/">http://nap.vd.dk/</a></td>
<td>Department for Planning and Environment of the Planning Division of DRD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dynamic road status data &amp; traffic data (Digitraffic): <a href="http://www.digitraffic.fi">www.digitraffic.fi</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical info (Digitraffic): <a href="https://github.com/finnishtransportagency/digitraffic/wiki">https://github.com/finnishtransportagency/digitraffic/wiki</a> RTTI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="https://github.com/finnishtransportagency/mmtis-national-access-point">https://github.com/finnishtransportagency/mmtis-national-access-point</a> MMTIS</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>Greece</td>
<td>Planned Q4 2018</td>
<td>For SRTI, RTTI: National Standards Authority of Ireland (NASI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>Planned Q4 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td><a href="https://data.gov.ie">https://data.gov.ie</a></td>
<td></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></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) <a href="https://ndovloket.nl">https://ndovloket.nl</a> (MMTIS)</td>
<td>RDW, attn. ITS Toezicht IV PO Box 30 000 9640 RA Veendam The Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Planned Q1 2018</td>
<td>IMT Contact details: Av. das Forças Armadas, 40 1649-022 LISBOA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country name</strong></td>
<td><strong>National Access Point</strong></td>
<td><strong>Contact National Body</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Romania          | Planned Q4 2018          | Phone - +351 217 949 000  
imt@imt-ip.pt |
| Slovakia         |                          |                          |
Head of Unit Land Transport Directorate  
Ministry of Infrastructure - SI, Dragomelj 116,  
1230 Domžale, Slovenia |
[http://nap.dgt.es](http://nap.dgt.es) (SRTI, RTTI) |                          |
| Sweden           | [www.trafficdata.se](http://www.trafficdata.se)  
for act c and e | Swedish Transport Agency  
contact details:  
Ingela.Svensson@transportstyrelsen.se |
| United Kingdom   | [https://data.gov.uk/](https://data.gov.uk/) | Inclusion of ITS Directive requirements  
coordinated by Department for Transport – Suku Phull  
Current focus on SRTI and RTTI |

Table A1.1 Overview of NAP contact details
Annex 2: Overview of system architecture NAP

This annex gives an overview of the system architectures of National Access Points in Europe. Status per December 2017.

Figure A2.1 Architecture for Austrian NAP

Authority adapts by replacing its data by a link to the operator’s data

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 Czech NAP
Figure A2.4.1 Architecture for Danish NAP for Truck Parking and Real Time Traffic Information

Figure A2.4.2 Architecture for Danish NAP for Truck Parking and Real Time Traffic Information (Internal Structure)
Figure A2.4.3 Architecture for Danish NAP for Safety Related Traffic Information

Figure A2.5.1 Architecture for Dutch NAP for truck parking
Nadere regels prioriteitsactie C: verkeersveiligheidsinformatie

Wegbeheerder en/of serviceprovider

NDW met rol toegangspunt

MDM met rol toegangspunt

- pull - obv contracten

Verstrekkapp: URL's en metadata

Toegangspunt: ULI's en metadata


Verstrekk per gebeurtenis

Lokatie

Type gebeurtenis

Beschrijving gebeurtenis

Advies voor de weggebruiker

Data van publieke partijen vrij toegankelijk voor hergebruik volgens principes Open Data; toegankelijk via URL's van publieke partijen in toegangspunt

Bij diverse serviceproviders/wegbeheerders zijn databases met één of meer categorieën verkeersveiligheidsgebeurtenissen. Er is geen sprake van een centrale database.

Figure A2.5.2 Architecture for Dutch NAP for Safety Related Traffic Information

Figure A2.6 Architecture for German NAP
Figure A2.7 Architecture for Finnish NAP for Safety-Related Traffic Information

Figure A2.8 Architecture for Greek NAP
Planned National Access Point Norway

One Common National Access Point for all Transport Data

**National Point of Access for Transport Data (NAP)**

- Metadata and Discovery Service
- Additional service: Smart Integration of Data

Figure A2.9 Architecture for Norwegian NAP (planned)

Figure A2.10: Architecture for Polish NAP
Figure A2.11 Architecture for Swedish NAP

Figure A2.12 Architecture for UK’s NAP
Annex 3: NAP Quality of Service questionnaire

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 Jorne (r.jorne@mobyczn.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></th>
<th>Least</th>
<th>Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mark 1-5</td>
<td>with a x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Functional

1.1. provision of data description / metadata (manual input by data provider, other...)

1.2. data exchange
- refers to where data exchange take place i.e. at the portal, per link to externals, machine to machine with SPA

1.3. access to logging data

1.4. request user registration (i.e. gain general access to SPA / specific functionalities)

1.5. payments - user transaction / payment logging and processing

1.6. subscription services offered by SPA

1.7. special user features
- for example if the SPA offers user personalisation - save preferences, create
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments / observations on section above:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 2. Technical

| 2.1. performance - monitoring and collection of performance related statistics (availability, down time → consequences for other systems) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2.2. capacity / scalability |  |
| 2.3. KPIs |  |
| 2.4. method of delivery of results (push / pull - API / web download / data portal) |  |
| 2.5. hosting (data consumption, speed requirements) |  |
| 2.6. security features |  |
| 2.7. level(s) of access to SPA |  |
| 2.8. back-up / recovery system |  |
| 2.9. platform the SPA is based on (i.e. open source: CKAN [http://ckan.org/](http://ckan.org/), or commercial) |  |
| 2.10. service management and organisation |  |
| 2.11. service maintenance |  |

### 3. Layout & design (the usability / user friendliness)

| 3.1. design of SPA landing page - any similar features across Member States SPAs for pages relating to priority action areas | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3.2. provide users with 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 |  |

### 4. Communication

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

### 5. Monitoring

| 5.1. usage / requests analytics & reporting (standard or custom) - downloads, page views, keyword analysis etc. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
### Comments / observations on section above:

#### 6. Language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1. 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. single / multiple languages usable for searching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3. 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>

#### Comments / observations on section above:

#### 7. Additional services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.1. access to archived data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2. 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. monitoring of data quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Comments / observations on section above:

### Additional feedback / comments:

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>,

in relation to the Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) No. 886/2013 of 15 May 2013 supplementing Directive 2010/40/EU (ITS Directive) and the articles published therein, that ________________________________ <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.
1. The road network as described in the appendix.
2. will make this information available based on its role as Data Supplier or Information Service Provider.
3. 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;
4. 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);
5. 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);
6. 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;
7. 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;
8. will cooperate with _____________________________<name of designated National Body> to conduct assessment of compliance as described in Article 9;
9. will ensure that this Declaration is up to date and valid;
10. will immediately send an amended Declaration to the designated National Body after any change in the service provision;

---

2 In case of a different road network, please clarify this road network for each applicable category of safety message in an appendix.
3 One organisation may fulfil both roles. If you tick both boxes, this declaration should also cover both roles.
4 Availability via the National Access Point only applies to Data Suppliers.
5 This paragraph only applies to Data Suppliers.
6 This paragraph only applies to Information Service Providers.
7 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 1 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.

⁴ TISA, Terms and Definitions for the Traffic and Travel Information Value Chain, EO12013, 2012, available for download at http://tisa.org/newsroom/supplementar/
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 1: 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 compliance (if different). They must register with the NAP and make available the SRTI data.

---

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.
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.

Annex 5: Uniform Declaration of Compliance ITS Action B (two types) + Explanatory document

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

Declaration of Compliance, ITS Action B – Real-Time Traffic Information – Form for road authorities and road operators –

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 number1 ______________ <number>,

in relation to the Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) No. 2015/962 of 18 December 2014 supplementing Directive 2010/40/EU (ITS Directive) and the articles published therein, that ______________________________________________ <trading name> in accordance with the Regulation mentioned above:

1. Are providing, or starting from ______________________ <dd/mm/yyyy> will provide real-time traffic information in specific data categories as defined in the Annex of the Delegated Regulation (EU) No. 2015/962 as indicated below, namely2:  
   ☐ Static road data  
   ☐ Dynamic road status data  
   ☐ Traffic data;

2. according to Article 1, will make this information available for:  
   ☐ all sections of the road network as designated by the Member State  
   ☐ a subsection of this road network3;

1 If the entity has a number.  
2 Cross what is applicable.  
3 In case of a different road network, it is understood that the Member State may request a further clarification of this road network for each applicable data category.
3. is providing this information based on its role as:
   - road authority
   - road operator;

4. will conform to the requirements as stipulated in Article 3, sub 4, concerning the provision of metadata;

5. will conform to the requirements as stipulated in Article 4 concerning the provision of static road data and concerning the correction of errors without delay;

6. will conform to the requirements as stipulated in Article 5 concerning the provision of dynamic road status data;

7. will conform to the requirements as stipulated in Article 6 concerning the provision of traffic data;

8. will conform to the requirements as stipulated in Article 7 concerning a regular updating of all data and the timely correction of any inaccuracies;

9. will conform to the requirements as stipulated in Article 8 concerning the timely updating of static road data;

10. will conform to the requirements as stipulated in Article 9 concerning the timely updating of dynamic road status data;

11. will conform to the requirements as stipulated in Article 10 concerning the updating of traffic data as soon as possible after a change in the status of the traffic data;

12. will cooperate with the Member State, such that the Member State is able to conduct its assessment of compliance as described in Article 11;

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

14. In case of any change that necessitates an update of this Declaration, will timely provide an amended Declaration to the designated contact point of the Member State;

15. will, on explicit request of the Member State, and for the sole purposes of the Member State to conduct its assessment of compliance as described in Article 11, provide the following documents:

---

4 One organisation may fulfil multiple roles. If you tick multiple boxes, this Declaration should also cover the multiple roles.

5 The Member State may request a description of the data provided, and evidence of compliance with Articles 3 to 10 as applicable.

6 In time for (i.e. synchronised with the start of) a Member State’s assessment process. Recommended submission deadline for an amended Declaration is March 31st yearly.
• A description of the data provided as well as the information on the quality thereof and the conditions of re-use of these data as supplement to paragraph 1 of this Declaration;
• Overview of the road network for which data pertaining to the Delegated Regulation 2015/962 are provided as supplement to paragraph 2 of this Declaration;
• Evidence to support conformance with Articles 3 to 10 as applicable, showing that data are provided and updated as required.

Optional
☐ Other: ____________________________________________
☐ ________________________________________________
☐ ________________________________________________
☐ ________________________________________________
☐ ________________________________________________

The information in this form is provided for the sole purposes of the Member State to conduct its assessment of compliance as described in Article 11 of the Delegated Regulation No. 2015/962. None of the data provided in this form may be published without the prior express written consent of my organisation.

Signed ___________________________ <date>
<signature>

Please send this Declaration with appendices to:
<Name and address of designated contact point of the Member State>

7 Further information may be provided with this Declaration, including possibly those listed in paragraph 15 (in advance of a request).
Declaration of Compliance, ITS Action B – Real-Time Traffic Information
– Form for digital map producers and service providers –

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>,

in relation to the Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) No. 2015/962 of 18 December 2014 supplementing Directive 2010/40/EU (ITS Directive) and the articles published therein, that ____________________________<trading name> in accordance with the Regulation mentioned above:

1. are using, or starting from ____________________________<dd/mm/yyyy> will use, real-time traffic information as provided by road authorities and road operators, according to any data type(s) of the specific data categories as defined in the Annex of the Delegated Regulation (EU) No. 2015/962 namely ,¹:
   □ Static road data
   □ Dynamic road status data
   □ Traffic data²
   in accordance with the requirements for updating as defined in general in Article 7 and per data category in Article 8 (Static road data), Article 9 (dynamic road status data), and article 10 (traffic data);

2. according to Article 1, will use provided information in its services or products, which are available for:
   □ all sections of the road network as designated by the Member State
   □ a subsection of this road network³

3. is using this information as provided by road authorities and road operators, based on its role as ⁴
   □ digital map producer
   □ service provider

¹ Cross what is applicable.
² Only applicable for service providers
³ In case of a different road network, it is understood that the Member State may request a further clarification of this road network for each applicable data category.
⁴ One organisation may fulfil multiple roles. If you tick multiple boxes, this Declaration should also cover the multiple roles.
4. if using static road data, will collaborate with the applicable road authorities and/or road operators to report any inaccuracies without delay, as described in article 4;

5. when acting in the role of service provider, will take into account as far as possible (as described in article 4 for static road data and article 5 for dynamic road status data respectively):
   • When using static road data\(^5\), traffic circulation plans developed by the competent authorities
   • When using dynamic road status data\(^6\), any temporary traffic management measures taken by the competent authorities

6. will cooperate with the Member State, such that the Member State is able to conduct its assessment of compliance as described in Article 117;

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

8. In case of any change that necessitates an update of this Declaration, will timely\(^8\) provide an amended Declaration to the designated contact point of the Member State,

9. will, on explicit request of the Member State, and for the sole purposes of the Member State to conduct its assessment of compliance as described in Article 11, provide the following documents:
   • Overview of road network for which data pertaining to the Delegated Regulation No. 2015/962 is used as supplement to paragraph 2 of this Declaration;
   • A description of the digital map, or real-time traffic information services provided;
   • Evidence to support conformance with Article 7, and Article 8, 9, 10 as applicable, showing that pertinent data updates are processed in a timely manner in order to make the information accessible to end-users without delay;
   • The conditions of re-use of these data, if applicable;

Optional\(^9\)

\[\begin{array}{c}
\square \text{Other: ____________________________________________} \\
\square \text{______________________________________________________} \\
\square \text{______________________________________________________}
\end{array}\]

---

\(^5\) Static road data usage as indicated in paragraph 1 of this Declaration.
\(^6\) Dynamic road status data usage as indicated in paragraph 1 of this Declaration.
\(^7\) The Member State may request a description of the services provided, and evidence of compliance with Article 7, and Article 8, 9, 10 as applicable.
\(^8\) In time for (i.e. synchronised with the start of) a Member State’s assessment process. Recommended submission deadline for an amended Declaration is March 31\(^{st}\) yearly.
\(^9\) Further information may be provided with this Declaration, including possibly those listed in paragraph 9 (in advance of a request).
The information in this form is provided for the sole purposes of the Member State to conduct its assessment of compliance as described in Article 11 of the Delegated Regulation No. 2015/962. None of the data provided in this form may be published without the prior express written consent of my organisation.

Signed _______________________________<date>

<signature>

Please send this Declaration (with appendices as applicable) to:
<Name and address of designated contact point of the Member State>
Explanatory terms and definitions for Uniform Declaration of Compliance – Action B

Introduction

This document provides clarification on the interpretation of some of the terms in the COMMISSION DELEGATED REGULATION (EU) No. 2015/962 (Priority Action B) which supplements the European ITS Directive 2010/40/EU.

In addition, it provides clarification on the obligations placed by the Delegated Regulation on the relevant entities, supported with clarification of the intent behind some of the Articles in the Delegated Regulation No. 2015/962.

Definitions of Road Authorities; Road Operators; (real-time traffic information) Service Providers and Digital Map Producers

The COMMISSION DELEGATED REGULATION (EU) No. 2015/962 (Priority Action B), which supplements the European ITS Directive 2010/40/EU, involves four kinds of entities: two representing the public domain (Road Authorities and Road Operators) and two representing the private sector (Real-Time Traffic Information Service Providers and Digital Map Producers).

Road Authorities and Road Operators

Although Road Authorities and Road Operators could be private and operating on behalf of public bodies, these entities are to be understood as belonging to the public sector within the provisions described in Delegated Regulation No. 2015/962 (Priority Action B). They are responsible for the control and management of the roads belonging to the Trans-European network as well as that of motorways and ‘priority zones’ (interurban/urban busy roads), when these have been identified as such voluntarily, by the national authorities. Those entities may collect and hold real time traffic information, which in the Delegated Regulation means information derived from static road data, dynamic road status data and traffic data or some of these three categories of data.

According to Art. 2 Definitions in the Delegated Regulation No. 2015/962 a ‘road authority’ means “any public authority responsible for the planning, control or management of roads falling within its territorial competence” while a ‘road operator’ means “any public or private entity that is responsible for the maintenance and management of the road”.

Service Providers and Digital Map Producers

Although nothing prevents a public entity to be a (real-time traffic information) Service Provider, (real-time information) Service Providers and Digital Map Producers are perceived within the provisions of this Delegated Regulation as being private entities. They are the entities that collect and hold static road data, dynamic road status data and traffic data or some of these three categories of data, with the aim to create services and products for commercial use. They may use and re-use data provided by Road Authorities and Road Operators in combination with that data which they themselves collect and by fusion or other process
maintain a commercial business with customers on real-time traffic information service provision and digital map services (including location referencing).

According to Art. 2 *Definitions* in the Delegated Regulation No. 2015/962 a ‘Service Provider’ means “any public or private provider of a real-time traffic information service, excluding a mere conveyer of information, to users and end users”. The exclusion specified in this definition aims at excluding information radio (or other) broadcasters from the obligations under this Regulation.

The Delegated Regulation No. 2015/962 does not provide a definition for “Digital Map Producer”. In the context of these Declarations of Conformance, a “Digital Map Producer” is understood as “an entity that collects and holds static road data, with the aim to create products and services for commercial use”.

**An entity may fulfil more roles**

In Europe, any of the four entities (Road Authorities, Road Operators, Service Providers and Digital Map Producers) may fulfill one or more of these roles.

**Obligations of Road Authorities and Road Operators**

Road Authorities and Road Operators are obliged to make accessible for use and re-use the **static road data** they collect and update (according to the specifications set in Art.8: informing on the type of static road data, the location of the condition concerned by the update; the type of update; the description of the update, the date of update; date and time of occurrence and quality) in a standardized format to any digital map producer or Service Provider within the Union.

The corresponding metadata (including information on the quality) shall also be made accessible for use and re-use to interested Digital Map Producers and Service Providers. In addition, Road Authorities and Road Operators shall comply with Art. 3.4 in ensuring that they provide the appropriate metadata in cooperation with Digital Map Producers and Service Providers so that users can discover and use the datasets via the National Access Points.

Inaccuracies related to static road data have to be corrected without delay by the Road Authorities and Road Operators.

With regard to **dynamic road status data and traffic data**, Road Authorities and Road Operators are obliged to make accessible for use and re-use the dynamic road status data and traffic data they collect and update (according to the specifications set in Art.9 and 10: informing on the type of dynamic road status data, the location of the condition/event concerned by the update; the period of occurrence of the event; the quality of the data update) in DATEX II format while also ensuring that the updates are timely and where known and possible, these updates should be provided in advance.

---

10 ‘any’ means on a non-discriminatory basis.
The corresponding metadata (including information on the quality) shall also be made accessible for exchange and re-use by any\textsuperscript{11} Service Provider within the Union.

The timely provision of the dynamic road status data and traffic data and the corresponding metadata has to be done by the Road Authorities and Road Operators in good time so that it ensures the timely provision of the real-time traffic information service and through the national access point.

Road Authorities and Road Operators are (according to Art. 11) obliged to submit a Declaration of Compliance to the responsible national authorities and they may additionally be requested by Member States authorities to provide the following documents as part of their Declaration of Compliance:

a. A description of the static road data, dynamic road status data and traffic data they provide as well as the information on the quality and the conditions of re-use of these data;

b. An evidence based declaration of compliance with the requirements set out in Arts. 3-10 of the Delegated Regulation

\textbf{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).

\textbf{Obligations of real-time traffic information Service Providers and Digital Map Producers}

Digital Map Producers and real-time traffic information Service Providers using static road data are obliged to collaborate with Road Authorities and Road Operators in order to ensure that any inaccuracies related to static road data are signaled without delay to the Road Authorities and Road Operators from which the data originates.

Digital Map Producers and Service Providers are obliged to process the updates in their static road data as these are sent by the Road Authorities and Road Operators in a timely manner in order to make the information accessible to end users without delay. Service Providers are obliged to do the same with regards to dynamic road status data and traffic data.

With regards to traffic management, Service Providers using static road data or dynamic road status data provided by Road Authorities and Road Operators shall take into account as far as possible any traffic circulation plans or temporary traffic management measures developed/taken by the competent authorities.

For the purpose of optimising traffic management, Road Authorities or Road Operators may request Service Providers to provide the traffic data they collect and update. Such data has to be provided in DATEX II or a fully DATEXII compatible format through the National Access Point. It shall be accompanied by the corresponding metadata including information on the quality. This is expected to be an exceptional request from the Road Authorities.

\textsuperscript{11} ‘any’ means on a non-discriminatory basis.
and/or Road Operators. When such a request takes place, Service Providers have to abide. Nonetheless, there is no obligation imposed to Service Providers by the Delegated Regulation to provide this traffic data free of charge. As explained in the Appendix, which clarifies Article 6 of the Delegated Regulation, Art. 6 does not oblige Service Providers to share this data for free with the Road Authorities and Road Operators.

Note: A detailed analysis on the intent of Article 6 is provided on the following two pages.

Service Providers and Digital Map Producers are (according to Art. 11) obliged to submit a Declaration of Compliance to the responsible national authorities and they may additionally be requested by Member States authorities to provide the following documents as part of their Declaration of Compliance:

a. A description of the real time traffic information services or digital map they provide as well as the information on the quality and the conditions of re-use of the covered data;

b. An evidence based declaration of compliance with the requirements set out in Arts. 3-10 of the Delegated Regulation

It should be noted that Service Providers who collect their own traffic data, and who don’t make use of data collected and updated by Road Authorities and/or Road Operators, are not obliged to submit a Declaration of Compliance, unless they are specifically requested to provide traffic data by Road Operators and/or Road Authorities for the purpose of traffic management under Article 6(3) of the Delegated Regulation No. 2015/962.

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).

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

It is strongly recommended for organisations responsible 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.
Priority Action B: Clarification for Article 6 and its Intent

Introduction

This section aims to clarify the intent of Article 6 of the COMMISSION DELEGATED REGULATION (EU) No. 2015/962 (Priority Action B) which supplements the European ITS Directive 2010/40/EU.

Article 6

Article 6 of the COMMISSION DELEGATED REGULATION (EU) No. 2015/962 (Priority Action B) which supplements the European ITS Directive 2010/40/EU, concerns the provision, accessibility, exchange and re-use of traffic data.

Two previous articles, Articles 4 and 5, request Road Authorities and Road Operators to provide the static road data (art. 4) and dynamic road status data (art. 5) they collect and update in an interoperable manner and on a non-discriminatory basis. Both these articles state that Service Providers, when using such static or dynamic road status data, “shall take into account, as far as possible, any temporary traffic management measures taken by the competent authorities” (Art. 4(3) and Art. 5(3)).

Art. 6(3) makes a more specific request with regards to traffic data and Service Providers on the possibility that Road Authorities and Road Operators “may request Service Providers to provide the traffic data they collect and update pursuant to Article 10…through the access point referred to in Article 3 and accompanied by the corresponding metadata including information on the quality thereof”.

The fact that Art. 6(3) uses the term ‘may’ and not ‘shall’ (as ‘shall’ is clearly used in the other articles of this law) is indicative of the exceptionality of the case it aims to describe. Road authorities and Road Operators are expected to make such a request to the Service Providers on exceptional cases only, and not on a regular basis.

This exceptionality, stated in Art. 6(3), is also enhanced by the justification provided, should this request be made to Service Providers: for “the purpose of optimising traffic management”. On the contrary, Articles 4 and 5 mention traffic management and the fact that Service Providers should take into account “as far as possible, any temporary traffic management measures (Art. 5(3)) or any traffic circulation plans (Art. 4(3)) taken by the competent authorities”, and they do not seek to impose alignment on information given to the road users. The intention of Arts 4 and 5 is to enhance and nurture the cooperation of Service Providers and Road Authorities in ensuring the update of their information.

Art. 6(3) takes a more advanced view on this by stating that on exceptional cases such as the optimisation of the traffic management is, Service Providers will have to provide traffic data to the Road Authorities and Road Operators so that these can optimise their traffic management.

Art. 6(3) does not oblige Service Providers to share this data for free with the Road Authorities and Road Operators, neither does it entitle Road Authorities and Road Operators to distribute
this data to other parties. This intention of Art. 6 is supported throughout the Delegated Regulation and more specifically, points 5 and 17 of the Preamble to the Delegated Regulation. Point 17 for example, clearly states that there is no obligation on Service Providers to share their data with other Service Providers and that they are free to conclude commercial agreements with other Service Providers for the use of the static and dynamic road status data as well as traffic data. Point 19 similarly states that the specific terms and conditions applicable for the use or re-use of such data for optimisation of traffic management by public authorities to improve traffic management as well as infrastructure management and maintenance “should be left to the parties concerned”.