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Preface

This annual report 2018 describes the state of the art of National Access Points in Europe as well as relevant aspects in the area of metadata, level of service, DATEX II and other issues related to the delegated regulations for priority actions A, B, C and E following the ITS Directive 2010/40/EU. A delegated regulation is a legally binding act of the European Union and directly applicable in all member states of the European Union. This report is the result of work carried out as part of the sub-activity 4.6 of the EU EIP project dealing with the topic of "Monitoring and Harmonisation of National Access Points".

The purpose of this report is to share the knowledge and experiences on the implementation of National Access Points, following the delegated regulations 885/2013, 886/2013, 2015/962 and 2017/1926. By sharing the available knowledge and experiences of those Member States (MS) that already have implemented National Access Points, or have started developing plans for implementing National Access Points, other MS 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 State of the art of National Access Points in Europe (chapter 2), as well as a first overview with respect to common features for NAPs (chapter 3), metadata (chapter 4), harmonisation of declaration of compliance (chapter 5), DATEX II (chapter 6), Multimodality (chapter 7), Architecture (chapter 8), Outputs of the EU EIP SA46 activity (chapter 9), Other relevant issues (chapter 10), and Summary and conclusions (chapter 11).

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

Harmonisation

In 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. In 2018 the focus was on completing papers on Metadata harmonization and validation of "Common Features and Level of Service".

Readers who think that they have valuable information that can be used for the Annual NAP report 2018 are kindly requested to send an e-mail to Mr. R. Jorna (r.jorna@mobycon.nl). Especially information on new National Access Points and National Bodies is highly appreciated.
Management Summary

This report describes, for each specific chapter, the works and achievements that took place in 2018, as well as the tasks planned in 2019.

This annual NAP report has two new chapters dedicated to system architecture (chapter 8) and Outputs of the EU EIP SA46 activity (chapter 9).

These are the most important points identified in 2018:

- In 2018 many new National Access Points (NAP) have been realised in Europe. Nevertheless, some EU Member States (MS) still have to establish their first NAP.

- An overview of the NAPs across Europe shows that the NAPs vary in system architecture, organisation, monitoring of data users, accessibility, etc. Thus, there is a need for a more coordinated approach and exchange of ideas and best practices.

- Via the EIP NAP Map (link) one has direct access to all NAP’s in operation.

- 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. In 2018 ACEA declared that OEM’s are prepared to make data available, but are still in deployment mode. In 2019 we shall try to establish some cooperation with the Data Task Force.

- 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; In 2019 EU EIP SA46 will investigate together with stakeholders if such a Uniform Declaration of Compliance can be agreed upon for Delegated Regulations 885/2013 and 2017/1926.

- In total, 22 MS have responded to the 2018 EIP NAP survey, which is an increase of 10 compared to 2016, which was the first time of monitoring the status of implementation of NAPs. From the survey it can be concluded that: 13 MS currently have an operational NAP for truck parking information, 14 MS have an operational NAP for SRTI, 18 MS have a (partly) operational NAP for RTTI and three MS have implemented a NAP for MMTIS.

- On 21 October 2017 the new Delegated Regulation 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. With the adoption of the new Delegated Regulation on the provision of EU-wide multimodal travel information services, “suggesting” the user of NeTEx and SIRI protocols, an important challenge emerged, that is to make all the existing applications compatible with the new orientations.

- On 9 April 2018 the conference “National Access Point as a tool to support the quality of travel” took place in Warsaw, a joint cooperation between the CEF project Crocodile and EU-EIP, ITS Polska, and Rzeczpospolita Polska. The conference was attended by approximately 150 delegates and presented the state of art for NAPs in EU. NAPs were demonstrated and the supporting documents from EU-EIP SA46 was presented.

- A strategic guidance on a suitable Metadata approaches has been provided in form of a “Metadata Guideline”, published by EU EIP SA46 in March 2018. This guideline depicts and discusses alternative Metadata approaches for individual NAP environments, taking into account higher-level considerations for NAP implementations.

- From the feedback and stakeholder engagement on the Common features and Level of Service, the features included in the Support Document appear to be achievable and aligned with current NAP implementations. Several new feature areas were highlighted, in 2019 the validation will continue with these new features explored.

- The NAP survey confirms an increase of the knowledge about DATEX in the national implementations. It remains clear however that the expertise level is quite divided: while there are countries really familiar to DATEX, others are just beginning and could not provide feedback due to the short time since starting the implementation.

- In February 2018 Pedro Barradas (EC DG Mobility and Transport) organised a workshop in Brussels for the operators of NAPs and NBs only. The operators confirmed there is indeed a need to discuss practical issues. This initiative to create a NAP/NB community was continued during the ITS Forum 2018 (link) in Utrecht.
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1. Introduction

This chapter describes the scope and objectives of the EU EIP project and more specifically sub-activity 4.6 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 MS and neighbouring countries, cooperate in order to foster, accelerate, and optimise current and future ITS deployments in Europe in a harmonised way.

EU EIP 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.

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 during 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 EIP 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 organisations such as DATEXII, TISA,
POLIS, ETSI, INSPIRE, Amsterdam Group, C-ITS Platform, TN-ITS, and other potential stakeholders.

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

1.3. Monitoring and Harmonisation of National Access Points (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:

- SPA – Coordinated Metadata Catalogue.

Currently, NAPs are being implemented in various MS, but they vary in approach, data availability (links, metadata, database), assessment of compliance, etc. Sub-activity 4.6 runs a four–year period from 2016 till 2019. 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 MS, 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 MS 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 A, B, C, and E.
- 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 11 MS displayed in Table 1.1 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</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>Department for Transport, 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</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
<pre><code>              | mobilité et l’aménagement (CEREMA)                                           |
</code></pre>
<p>| FI (Participant)| Finnish Transport Agency (FTA)                                          |
| FI (Participant)| Finnish Transport Safety Agency (TRAFL)                                    |
| DK (Participant)| Vejdirektoratet                                                              |
| IT (Participant)| Autovle                                                                     |
| IE (Follower)| Transport Infrastructure Ireland                                             |</p>

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 and other relevant sources (among others, workshops, meetings with experts, literature). In total 22 NAP implementers completed the NAP template. In addition, a separate questionnaire was issued concerning the common features and level of service for NAPs, which resulted in additional feedback of eight completed questionnaires.

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

On 21 October 2017 the new Delegated Regulation on the provision of EU-wide multimodal travel information services was adopted (2017/1926). Due to the importance of this theme, chapter 7 is dedicated to Delegated Regulation MultiModal Travel Information (MMTIS).
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 2018. This deliverable will be updated every year until 2019, 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

For the monitoring of the status of implementation of NAPs in Europe 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, 22 MS have responded to the 2018 survey, which is an increase of 10 compared to 2016, which was the first time of monitoring the status of implementation of NAPs. This does not necessarily mean that the other countries have not implemented a NAP. However, since we did not receive information from these countries, we were not able to
report the status of NAPs in these countries. In the case of Cyprus and Spain we used the
information from the 2017 survey. If MS have established a NAP, but this NAP is not listed
in this report, they can report this to the authors of this report. In the annual report 2019 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 MS.

This chapter presents the results of the 2018 survey. The report will be updated in 2019,
thus providing an annual overview of status of NAPs on a country by country basis.

Annex 1 gives an overview of the 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:**

According to the reports of 2018 80% of all Member States have a NAP or are
actively working on realizing new National Access Points. Nevertheless, quite a few
Member States still have to establish their first National Access Point or data about
their developments is not yet known.

### 2.2. Status of NAP for Safe and Secure Truck Parking

In total, 22 MS 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. Table 2.1 shows the
status of implementation in 2016, 2017, and 2018. In 2016 only four countries had a
(partly) operational NAP, i.e. Belgium, Germany, The Netherlands, and Sweden. Four other
countries had concrete plans to implement a NAP (Austria, Denmark, Poland, and
Portugal). The four remaining countries had no plans (yet). In 2017 this picture has
changed significantly. Nine countries then had an operational NAP, i.e. Austria, Belgium,
Denmark, France, Germany, The Netherlands, Slovenia, Spain, and Sweden. Five other
countries had concrete plans to implement a NAP (Croatia, Greece, Poland, Portugal, and
Romania). The six remaining countries had no plans (yet). In 2018 14 countries have an
operational or work in progress NAP, i.e. Austria, Belgium, Czech Republic, Denmark,
France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, Slovenia, Spain,
and Sweden. Furthermore, six countries have concrete plans to implement a NAP (Croatia,
Estonia, Latvia, Norway, Poland, and Romania). The three remaining countries, Cyprus, Ireland, and Finland have no concrete plans (yet).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Status of implementation 2016</th>
<th>Status of implementation 2017</th>
<th>Status of implementation 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Planned (Q4 2016)</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Partly operational (Flanders only)</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>Planned (Q4 2019)</td>
<td>Planned (Q4 2019)</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>Not operational</td>
<td>Not operational</td>
<td>Not operational*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>Not operational</td>
<td>Operational (by publishing Rest Areas and related static data at EU open data portal)</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Planned (Q4 2016)</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>Planned (Q2 2019)</td>
<td>Planned (Q4 2019)</td>
<td>Planned (Q4 2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Not operational or planned*)</td>
<td>Not operational or planned**)</td>
<td>Not operational or planned**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Planned (Q4 2018)</td>
<td>Implementation ongoing (start Q2 2019)</td>
<td>Implementation ongoing (start Q2 2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>Planned (Q4 2018)</td>
<td>Operational Q1 2019</td>
<td>Operational Q1 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Not operational</td>
<td>Not operational</td>
<td>Not operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>Planned (Q4 2019)</td>
<td>Planning 2020</td>
<td>Planning 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Not operational or planned</td>
<td>Not operational</td>
<td>Planned (by publishing Rest Areas and related static data at EU truck parking portal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Planned (Q3 2018)</td>
<td>Planned (Q4 2018)</td>
<td>Planned (Q4 2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Planned (Q4 2017)</td>
<td>Planned (Q1 2018)</td>
<td>Planned (Q1 2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>Planned (Q4 2018)</td>
<td>Planned (Q4 2019)</td>
<td>Planned (Q4 2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Operational*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>Not operational</td>
<td>Not operational</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*) Based on 2017 survey
** ) Finland has stated to the EC that they don’t have parking places that would fall under the delegated regulation EU 2013/885. (Letter to EC 14.10.2014/ LVM2014-00470)

Table 2.1: Status of implementation NAP for truck parking
From five countries, i.e. Cyprus, Italy, Lithuania, Malta, and Spain, no (updated) information was received. This does not necessarily mean that they have not implemented a NAP for truck parking. Not one country shares a 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 general, the countries with an operational NAP make static truck parking information available, in particular information about the number of parking places. In some countries information about safety and equipment is also accessible. Only in Germany and Denmark dynamic data on the available parking places are added for some regions. In all thirteen countries with an operational NAP the information is available in the NAP.

Out of all NAPs 62% 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 service criteria related to truck parking infrastructure (e.g. according to the “Truck Parking Label” classification). In almost all operational and planned NAPs data is/will be provided via DATEX II format. A discovery service or metadata is available for five 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 (Austria) leaves it to the data owner, whereas Portugal leaves it to the NAP operator IMT, and Luxembourg offers the data under a Creative Commons Zero licence. Hungary and Romania are currently planning to run a free service but might consider the possibility of selling historical data in a later stage. Generally, the language of the NAP is the national language plus English. However, France, Poland, and Luxembourg have a NAP just in the national language. Additionally, Croatia is planning to introduce their NAP only in their local 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. Additionally, Latvia, Luxembourg, Portugal, and Romania are still yet undecided how their NAP will be monitored.

In 10 countries (out of 13) with an operational NAP, a National Body for assessment of compliance has been nominated. Two other countries are planning to do so. In Austria, Belgium, and 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. Both in the Netherlands and France there are several private organisations who provide data. In most
cases there is not any information available about the number of organisations who use the data from the NAP and if these organisations are either public or private.

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 provides static truck parking information only to the European Access Point and Norway is planning to do the same; these countries have no own NAP for truck parking. All MS are stimulated to provide their truck parking data to the European Portal. So far only a limited number of MS have done so, i.e.: Austria, Belgium, Czech Republic, Denmark, Germany, The Netherlands, Slovenia, Spain, 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, 22 MS 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. Table 2.2 shows the status of implementation in 2016, 2017, and 2018. 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 United Kingdom had concrete
plans to implement a NAP. In Belgium and Cyprus, the NAP for SRTI was not yet operational or planned. In 2017 this picture had changed significantly: 14 countries had 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 a NAP. Table 2.2 below shows the status of implementation also in 2018.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Status of implementation 2016</th>
<th>Status of implementation 2017</th>
<th>Status of implementation 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Planned (Q4 2016)</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>Planned (Q4 2019)</td>
<td>Planned (Q4 2019)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>Not operational or planned</td>
<td>Not operational or planned</td>
<td>Not operational or planned*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>Planned (Q4 2019)</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td></td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Planned (Q4 2018)</td>
<td>Implementation ongoing</td>
<td>(start Q2 2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>Planned (Q4 2018)</td>
<td>Operational Q1 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td></td>
<td>Planned (Q4 2019)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td></td>
<td>Planned (Q2 2019)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Planned (Q3 2018)</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Planned (Q4 2017)</td>
<td>Planned (Q1 2018)</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>Planned (Q4 2018)</td>
<td>Planned (Q4 2019)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td></td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Operational*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*) Based on 2017 survey.

Table 2.2: Status of implementation NAP for safety-related traffic information
From five countries, i.e. Cyprus, Italy, Lithuania, Malta, and Spain, no (updated) information was received. This does not necessarily mean that they have not implemented a NAP for safety-related traffic information. 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 in operation.

The delegated regulation mentions 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. Six countries (Czech Republic, Denmark, 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.

Around one fourth of 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, accordance to data quality frameworks developed in EU EIP sub-activity 4.1, ‘best effort’, validated information, or merely the requirements mentioned in the delegated regulation. France, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Slovakia, and Slovenia have no quality requirements for the data. Germany, Greece, Ireland, and the United Kingdom plan to have quality requirements. In all countries with an operational NAP data is provided via DATEX format, but other formats are also used in some cases, such as data files, xml, RSS, GEO-RSS, and 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 three NAPs (Greece, Hungary, United Kingdom) metadata is foreseen. Luxembourg is planning to exchange data via DATEX and has not yet decided about making metadata available.

The language of the NAP is mostly the national language plus English (Austria, Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, German, Norway, Portugal, Slovenia, and Sweden). Spain has a NAP only in the national language. At the same time France has a NAP which is mainly available in French and some information in English and Spanish. Slovakia offers their

---

NAP in Slovak, English, German, and Hungarian. Furthermore, Denmark and Poland have a NAP only available in English and not in their national language.

Monitoring of the use of the NAP is either planned or already happening for eight NAPs. Five NAPs (France, Denmark, The Netherlands, Norway, Slovakia) will not monitor the use of the NAP. 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:

- Austria: No figures yet about organisation who provide information. One public organisation uses the data at the moment.
- Czech Republic: At the moment one organisation provides information. The NAP does not track how many users have used the data, but there have been more than 200 subscribers.
- Denmark: Two organisations provide information. Approximately 10 organisations (mostly private) use the data at the moment.
- Estonia: One organisation provides information. There is no (not yet) any information available about organisations who use the data from the NAP.
- Finland: One public organisation provides information. Several public and private organisations use the information (actual amount cannot be specified)
- France: 38 road operators/authorities provide information. It is unknown how many organisations use the data from the NAP.
- The Netherlands: two private and one public organisation provides information. Most private service providers use the NAP SRTI in their services.
- Norway: one public organisation (NPRA) provides information. There are 330 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. Yet unknown who use the data of the NAP.
- 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. There are currently six public and six private organisations who use the data.
- Sweden: One public organisation and two private organisations provide information. The number of users of the NAP is unknown.

A large majority of all countries have a National Body for assessment in place, in a few other countries this is not yet the case. Of these countries, eight countries (Austria, Czech
Republic, Denmark, Finland, Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, United Kingdom) already have a procedure in place for the assessment of compliance. Other countries (e.g. Belgium, Estonia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Portugal, Slovenia) 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:**

Although there seems to be an increase in the number of organisations that use the data from the NAP, NAP operators seem to pay little attention to monitoring the use of the NAPs. Thus, it is not clear to what extent delegated regulation 886/2013 has resulted in a wider use of SRTI.

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

In total, 22 MS 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. Table 2.3 shows that already 19 countries have a (partly) operational NAP for RTTI (Austria, Czech Republic, Cyprus, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Luxembourg, The Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, and Sweden). Five other countries (Belgium, Croatia, Latvia, Romania, and the United Kingdom) have concrete plans to implement a NAP. In 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>
<th>Status of Implementation 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Planned (Q4 2016)</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td></td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>Planned (Q4 2019)</td>
<td>Planned (Q4 2019)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>Partly operational</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Operational*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td></td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Planned (Q2 2017)</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Status of implementation 2016</td>
<td>Status of implementation 2017</td>
<td>Status of implementation 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td></td>
<td>Planned (Q4 2018)</td>
<td>Implementation ongoing (start Q2 2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td></td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Q1 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td></td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Operational*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td></td>
<td>Planned (Q4 2021)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td></td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>Planned (Q3 2017)</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td></td>
<td>Planned (Q3 2017)</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td></td>
<td>Planned (Q3 2017)</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td></td>
<td>Planned (Q4 2017)</td>
<td>Planned (Q1 2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td></td>
<td>Planned (Q4 2018)</td>
<td>Planned (Q4 2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td></td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td></td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td></td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Operational*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td></td>
<td>Planned (Q1 2017)</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*) Based on 2017 survey.

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

From five countries, i.e. Cyprus, Italy, Lithuania, Malta, and Spain, no (updated) information was received. This does not necessarily mean that they have not implemented a NAP for safety-related traffic information. 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.
- Belgium: The first version of the NAP will be set up as a simple (open) data portal, with the following data sets:
The real-time road traffic information in DATEXII and OTAP format for the highways in Flanders: traffic flow, incidents, current road works and special events that affect traffic;

- The real-time dynamic speed limit and lane indicator signs data in XML format for the highways in Flanders;
- The real-time variable message sign data for the highways in Flanders in DATEXII format;
- The real-time loop-based traffic data (XML format) for the highways in Flanders: number of vehicles and average speeds, divided in 5 vehicle classes, aggregated per minute;

- Cyprus: Level of Traffic (Speed & Volumes) on primary road network of Cyprus.
- Czech Republic: Both static road data, dynamic road data, and traffic data is available.
- 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.
- Germany: Data are provided by different road authorities, representing the 16 Federal States of Germany. Data coverage is not consistent across these road authorities, as each authority has different data sources. Some federal States provide all required data, while others provide some of them.
- Greece: Data (static, dynamic, traffic) will be provided by NAP according to Regulations.
- Ireland: Vehicle speed, traffic flow, traffic concentration, VMS messages, weather station data, and travel times.
- Luxembourg: The data available focusses on dynamic road status updates. Including: type of road status update, the location of the event, and the period of occurrence of event.
- The Netherlands: real-time traffic data, PT timetable and real-time data, max. speed, charging points, parking register, static road data, TomTom flows & incidents, and road characteristics.
- 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, and VMS messages.
- Slovakia: Both static road data, dynamic road data, and traffic data is available.
• 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, Hungary, Slovenia) state that the information is (or will be) available in the NAP for RTTI. Seven countries (Austria, Cyprus, Ireland, the Netherlands, Luxembourg, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom) state that they provide web-links to the data. Finland, Estonia, Greece, Portugal, Norway, and Romania are planning to offer both options. Slovakia will archive the data in their National Centre of Traffic Information.

For most MS it is yet too early to decide on quality requirements for the data to be made available. While Austria, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Hungary, the Netherlands, Spain, Slovenia, Sweden, and the United Kingdom already have stated that there are/will be some form of quality requirements, e.g. completeness of minimum metadata set according to data quality frameworks developed in EU EIP sub-activity 4.1, 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. Some countries who provide the data without a charge do request additional requirements. For example, France will not charge the use of data but will request registration. Data providers are free to decide if they charge for their data.

The language of the NAP for RTTI is mostly the national language and English. Luxembourg provides the data only in French and France provides the data in particularly in French while some parts are available in English and Spanish. Slovakia provides the data besides the national language and English also in German and Hungarian.

Monitoring of the use of the NAP is planned in most MS 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 three users.
- Finland: One public body is providing data. Several public and private organisations use the data (actual amount cannot be specified).
- France: Apart from Directorate of Roads and concession operators, Michelin Travel Partner also provides data (speed data; location and length of traffic jams). There are not yet organisations known who use the data.
- Greece: Cerith/HIT and Egnatia Odos S.A. will provide data to the NAP. Other data providers will be contacted. Organisations which use the data is unknown.
- Ireland: NAP covers all Irish open data, currently 8,800 datasets, and over 100 publishers. For the datasets relating to the RTTI delegated regulations only Transport Infrastructure Ireland (TII) provide metadata. The use of the data is currently not (yet) known.
- Norway: NPRA and EV Norway provide data. Organisations which use the data is unknown.
- Hungary: When the NAP is accomplished the first step will be that Hungarian Public Road, Alföld Concession Motorway Company and Budapest Public Road provide the data.
- Portugal: All road operators will provide data to the NAP. Who uses the data is (yet) unknown.
- 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. Information on data usage is not available.
- 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 MS have nominated (or will nominate) a National Body comparable to the NAP for SRTI.

Highlight:

In approximately two third of all Members States the implementation of the National Access Point for the provision of EU-wide real-time traffic information services is
operational or starting.
2.5. Status of NAP for Multimodal Travel Information

The delegated regulation on multimodal travel information 2017/1926 has been adopted by the European Commission in 2017. Therefore, this section gives a first glance on how MS are already preparing themselves for this delegated regulation.

Ten countries have already (partly) implemented or are planning to implement a NAP for multimodal travel information, see table 2.4. Ten other countries are in the process of making decisions or have not started yet. The first set of travel and traffic data has to 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>
<th>Status of implementation 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>Planned (Q2 2018)</td>
<td>Planned (Q2 2018)</td>
<td>In progress*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Planned (2020)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Planned (Q3 2018)</td>
<td>Planned (Q1 2018)</td>
<td>(partly) Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(partly) Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Preliminary research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Planned (Q4 2018)</td>
<td></td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Planned (2020)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Planned (Q3 2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Planned (Q4 2019)</td>
<td>Planned (Q4 2019)</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>Planned 2020</td>
<td>Planned (2020)</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Pre-study ongoing</td>
<td>Pre-study ongoing</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*) Based on 2017 survey.

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, Croatian Roads Ltd are responsible and in Cyprus the responsible body will be the Ministry of Transport, Communications and Works. In Denmark the Danish...
Transport, Construction, and Housing Authority will implement the NAP for MMTIS and in Estonia the Road Administration will do the same. In Finland the Finnish Transport Agency will be the responsible body and in Ireland it will be the National Transport Authority. In France the Agency for information, multimodalities and tickets is responsible, in Greece CERTh/HIT will implement the NAP for MMTIS and in Luxembourg it will be the national Traffic Agency. 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 Slovenia and in the United Kingdom. Latvia still needs to decide who will be responsible for the implementation of the NAP for MMTIS. The state of play in Ireland regarding MMTIS is:

- GTFS (already available)
- GTFS Real Time Interface (Planned for Q2 2019)
- SIRI (can be implemented if sought)
- No quality assurance body declared yet for MMTIS data in Ireland
- NeTEx interface development planned for Q3 2019

Most countries have not yet decided about whether or not to nominate a National Body for the assessment of compliance. However, in Austria, Cyprus, Estonia, Finland, France, Slovenia, 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 the Czech Republic it will be handled by the Ministry of Transport.

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, GTFS, and SIRI are mentioned for other modes, INSPIRE for GIS.

The role of the 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:**

Following the delegated regulation, in 2019 the first set of multimodal travel and traffic data should be made available through the NAP by all member states. Currently, only four member states managed to do so, while six other member states have concrete plans to start the implementation.
2.6. The NAP Map - direct access to all NAPs

During the meetings and discussions with different stakeholders in the past years, 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 find out that these search engines will not find the information you are looking for or that the returned results have nothing to do with a National Access Point.

Given these observations, the need for promoting the existence of National Access Points in Europe became evident. This led to the decision to promote the National Access Points via a web service which is user friendly.

Therefore, an interactive EIP NAP map was created and has been posted as a link on the official website of the EU EIP project in the sections of Activity 4.6.

It has been decided that this NAP Map will be hosted on an external server and on the official page there will just be a link. This decision was made after discussions with the administrator of the official page and those who maintain it. The decision was based on the fact that in this way our page will be much easier to maintain and update.

The EIP NAP Map can be accessed from the official EU EIP platform homepage from the link below:
or directly accessing the link:

The purpose of this web page is to disseminate the knowledge on the existence of the NAPs across Europe. This website shows per MS (if available) the National Access Points:

- Safe and Secure Truck Parking Areas (SSTPA)
- Safety Related Traffic Information (SRTI)
- Real-Time Traffic Information (RTTI)
- Multimodal Travel Information Services (MMTIS)

In the left corner you will find the EU EIP logo that shows that this page was created within the platform, but this logo is also a link to the official website.
To the right is the map itself. When the cursor is positioned on one of the countries marked in the light blue colour, the colour will change, the country name will appear, and if you press the mouse button you will be redirected to the page / one of the NAP pages in the country (for example, in the case of France, you will be redirected to the page below where you can access the section you are interested in (see figure 2.3 below).

Figure 2.2: NAP interactive map

Figure 2.3: Examples of NAP pages in France

In this page you will find some useful links and documents:
A list of NAP web address can also be found in Annex 1 of this report:

The table below was completed with the information that the EU EIP project received from every country that responded to our annual NAP survey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Safe and Secure Truck Parking</th>
<th>Safety-Related Traffic Information (SRTI)</th>
<th>Real Time Traffic Information (RTTI)</th>
<th>Multimodal Travel Information Services (MRTIS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Figure 2.4: Example of NAP information at the NAP interactive map website

**Highlight:**

*For promoting NAPs and NAP documents an EIP leaflet is available which can be found in annex 3.*

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

Based on the survey conducted in 2018 it can be concluded that MS are increasingly complying with the delegated regulations 885/2013, 886/2013 and 2015/962. However, there are quite a few countries who have work to do.

With respect to the NAP on truck parking, from the MS that have participated in the survey 13 countries currently have an operational NAP, i.e. Austria, Belgium, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Hungary, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Portugal, Slovenia, Spain, and Sweden. Seven other countries have concrete plans to implement a NAP.
(Croatia, Estonia, Greece, Latvia, Norway, Poland, and Romania). The two remaining countries Cyprus and Finland have no plans (yet). However, this means that at the end of 2018 80% of all MS have a NAP or are actively working on realizing new National Access Points.

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, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Ireland, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, and Sweden. Hungary started its implementation at the end of 2018. Five other countries have concrete plans to implement a NAP (Croatia, Greece, Latvia, Luxembourg, and Romania).

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. Although there seems to be an increase in the number of organisations that use the data from the NAP, NAP operators seem to pay little attention to monitoring the use of NAPs. Thus, it is not clear to what extent delegated regulation 886/2013 has resulted in a wider use of SRTI.

Currently, already 18 countries have a (partly) operational NAP for RTTI (Austria, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, and Sweden). Six other countries (Belgium, Croatia, Greece, Latvia, Romania, and the United Kingdom) have concrete plans to implement a NAP. In Poland the NAP for RTTI is not yet operational or planned. In short, in approximately two third of all Members States the National Access point for the provision of EU-wide real-time traffic information services is operational or starting.

The delegated regulation on MMTIS has been adopted by the European Commission in 2017. Ten countries have already (partly) implemented or are planning to implement a NAP for MMTIS. Ten 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. Currently, only three MS have managed to do so, while six other MS have concrete plans to start the implementation.

**Highlight:**

*From 2016 to 2018 a gradual increase of the number of implemented and/or planned NAPs can be seen. For example, already 18 countries have a (partly) operational NAP for RTTI. However, if we look at the delegated regulation on MMTIS, we notice that only 3 MS have a (partly) operation NAP. So MS still have a lot do to meet the deadline of December 2019.*
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 NAP common features and Level of Service (LoS). These are intended to facilitate effective NAP functioning and make the NAP a straightforward, valuable resource for users. The section below provides a summary of the task, 2018 activities, findings and progress, and the next steps for 2019.

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

3.3. **Progress and achievements**

Following the feature identification and development work, in 2017 the *NAP Common Features and Level of Service – Support Document* was finalised and published online in early 2018.

The document contains 18 features covering the areas of: *Access, Communication, Finding datasets, Update and maintenance, and Dataset information*. It is intended that the features can be applied to NAPs for any of the delegated regulation services.

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.

The final section of the document contains a checklist for implementers to complete. This is used to feedback if the features are implemented in NAPs and provide additional comments to the SA 4.6 group. The checklist is shown in Figure 3.1.
Figure 3.1: NAP implementer checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The NAP is available over the internet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. NAP can be navigated easily and is design compliant with web design standards / accessibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. NAP is provided in the national language and commonly used language(s) of the MS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. NAP follows EU data protection and industry data security standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. NAP requires data publishers to register to add their data / metadata</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. NAP provides help for data publishers to register, add data / metadata</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. NAP provides Terms &amp; Conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. NAP is promoted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. NAP provides means for data consumers to contact NAP provider / dataset owner for assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finding datasets</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. NAP provides appropriate discovery services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Datasets can be searched for using a metadata catalogue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The NAP provides machine readable metadata</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Update and maintenance</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. The NAP service is maintained</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. The NAP content and metadata is maintained and makes best effort is made to keep content up-to-date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. NAP monitoring &amp; evaluation is undertaken</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dataset information</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16. NAP provides clear descriptions of each dataset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. NAP provides dataset documentation (or links) where required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. NAP datasets classified according to standard / controlled vocabularies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3.1. NAP COMMON FEATURES AND LEVEL OF SERVICE - VALIDATION

As noted in previous annual reports, in many countries NAPs are still in their infancy. In 2018, rather than undertake a formal validation exercise the group promoted and shared their work; encouraging implementers to complete the features checklist, share feedback and experiences.

The checklist was completed for both existing and planned NAPs, and from the responses it appears it was generally simple to understand and complete. The feedback does not cover all European NAPs but can be summarised as follows:
1. Implemented features
   - No features were rejected as being unacceptable or unachievable
   - All *required* features were commonly implemented across the MS NAPs
   - Machine readable metadata is not currently a feature supported by all NAPs (this is not a required feature in the document)
   - In some MS there are different features in each NAP (for STRI, RTTI, and Truck Parking), this could possibly be attributed to the timings of the NAP implementations and links to legacy services
   - On NAP content and metadata maintenance, and ensuring up-to-date metadata – the scope of responsibility (or remit) of the NAP implementer varies, and in some cases this aspect is the task of the data publisher
   - On NAP monitoring and evaluation - monitoring is a more common feature than evaluation

2. Additional features to be considered
   - Data consumers are required to register, and the NAP uses web access control
   - NAP datasets are searchable via a map interface

3.4. Challenges

To date, feedback has not been received from all MS with active NAPs, to help improve the Support Document additional feedback will be requested in 2019. As more NAPs become operational, greater experience in operating and using NAPs will be gathered.

Also, the numbers and disciplines of NAP data consumers is limited, over time this will increase and features to benefit data consumers will be explored.

**Highlight:**
- *The features included in the Support Document appear to be achievable and aligned to NAP implementations*
- *The validation should continue with new features explored*
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) in Figure 4.1.

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” (2015) as a proposal for a harmonised set of Metadata,
- evaluation of Metadata approaches in the MS 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.

A major milestone was a dedicated workshop on Metadata in Frankfurt/Germany on 8th June 2017, where NAP stakeholders exchanged their perspectives and gave important aspects for further Metadata harmonisation among European NAPs.

A conclusion was 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. However, some strategic guidance on a suitable Metadata approaches, considering individual NAP environments, seemed to be required.

This strategic guidance has been provided in form of a “Metadata Guideline”, published by EU EIP Activity 4.6 in March 2018. 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.

Document link: https://www.its-platform.eu/filedepot_download/1701/5355
EU EIP 4.6 Activity is now promoting this Guideline to be used for individual NAP implementations.

4.3. Next steps

The Metadata work so far has been focused on “car-oriented” data and NAPs, addressing the Delegated Regulations 885/2013, 886/2013, and 2015/962.

A current challenge is to find a Metadata harmonisation regarding data and NAPs addressing the Delegated Regulation 2017/1926, i.e. dealing with Multi-Modal Traveller Information Services (MMTIS).

The goal is to find a consensus for the Metadata approach to be adopted by European NAPs for MMTIS. As many of these NAPs are still in the preparation phase, it is important to find a harmonisation approach as early as possible, which can be considered in the current preparations.

In particular, the existing “Coordinated Metadata Catalogue” needs to be extended towards the data types defined in the Delegated Regulation 2017/1926.

The initiators of the “Coordinated Metadata Catalogue” (NL, AT, and DE) are working on a proposal for such an extension. The work plan for this is as follows:

- End of 2018: First discussions between NL/AT/DE
- Start of 2019: Provision of a “first coordinated draft”
- Spring of 2019: Review process by every EU NAP stakeholder
- Early summer of 2019: Provision of a final version; presentation at an EU EIP workshop

It is expected there are some challenges when working in this, due to many new data domains and data formats, e.g. regarding public transport and geospatial information. During the process, stakeholders from different MMTIS data domains, which have not been involved with EU EIP so far, have to be consulted in order to consider their specific Metadata aspects. For example, potential overlaps or inconsistencies between the “Catalogue” and other, existing metadata definitions (e.g. INSPIRE) have to be identified.

Another challenge is to consolidate the definitions for the specific Metadata field “Data Types”. This field describes the category of a dataset within a NAP. In the current “Catalogue”, there are 58 possible data types. They are composed by data types mentioned by the Delegated Regulations 885/2013, 886/2013, and 2015/962.

If the data types mentioned by Delegated Regulation 2017/1926 were added, the number of possible data types would raise to 106, which is obviously not handy for NAP users.
During the current work for the “Catalogue”, a feasible and agreed solution on this is sought.

**Highlight:**
- The “Coordinated Metadata Catalogue” is an important milestone towards harmonisation of Metadata descriptions in European NAPs.
- To address strategical considerations in individual NAP environments, an additional “Metadata Guideline” is provided.
- To support the on-going efforts to establish or expand NAPs for multi-model data and services, the “Coordinated Metadata Catalogue” is currently under revision.
5. Harmonisation of the Declaration of compliance

The Delegated Regulations 885/2013, 886/2013, 2015/962, and 2017/1926 request MS to manage National Access Points and to carry out an assessment of compliance with these delegated regulations.

Without a harmonised approach, road authorities, road operators, digital map producers, service providers, truck parking operators, public transport companies, etc. 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 actors (road authorities, road operators, digital map producers, service providers, parking operators, public transport companies, etc.) that operate within their territory that might submit their own declarations of compliance in different languages and in a variety of formats.

Through a joint effort of EU EIP and TISA in 2016 and 2017 Uniform Declarations of Compliance Forms have been developed for Delegated Regulation (EU) No. 886/2013 and No. 2015/962.

- The Uniform Declaration of Compliance for Delegated Regulation 886/2013 with three documents (introductory letter, uniform declaration of compliance, explanatory note) can be downloaded [HERE](#).
- The Uniform Declaration of Compliance for Delegated Regulation 2015/962 with four documents (introductory letter, two uniform declarations of compliance, explanatory note) can be downloaded [HERE](#).

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 if it needs to be modified.

The stakeholders recommend that this Uniform Declaration of Compliance Form will be used from now on by all relevant actors across Europe as the only form for declaration of compliance.

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.
The Uniform Declaration of Compliance Form is supported by TISA, the EU EIP project, and the European Commission (DG MOVE).

For the Delegated Regulations 885/2013 (truck parking) and 2017/1926 (multimodal travel information services) a uniform Declaration of Compliance is not yet existing. EU EIP sub-activity 4.6 in 2019 will investigate together with stakeholders if such a Uniform Declaration of Compliance can be agreed upon for Delegated Regulations 885/2013 and 2017/1926.

**Highlight:**

*In 2016 and 2017 Uniform Declarations of Compliance for priority action ‘C’ and priority action ‘B’ were published. In 2019 we will investigate together with stakeholders if Uniform Declarations of Compliance can be agreed upon for priority actions ‘A’ and ‘E’.*
6. DATEX II

6.1. Role of DATEX II in National Access Points

Highlight:

The NAP survey confirms an increase of the knowledge about DATEX in the national implementations. It remains clear however that the expertise level is quite divided: while there are countries really familiar to DATEX, others are just beginning and could not provide feedback due to the short time since starting the implementation.

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, common and harmonized minimum 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)

- **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)
o DATEX II organisation⁵ is working on a DATEX II reference profile that is considered to contain all events that are known as “SRTI-flagged” in the EU

- **action b) – Delegated regulation EU 962/2015 – Real-Time Traffic Information**
  o 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).

There are also some other initiatives to promote and support the use of DATEX for NAPs:
- 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.
- As reported by the national NAP body, the NAP in Greece will also make available to data providers an online tool that will assist them in providing their datasets in a DATEX II compliant format.

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 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 DATEX II model and to disseminate information to the DATEX II organisation. SA4.5 acts 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

⁵ https://www.datex2.eu/index.php/datex2/about
The survey organized this year by SA4.6 gave a good picture on how DATEX is used by NAPs and it confirms an increase of the knowledge about DATEX in the national implementations. It remains clear however that the expertise level is quite divided: while there are countries really familiar to DATEX, others are just beginning and could not provide feedback due to the short time since starting the implementation.

6.3. Feedback from the monitoring templates

Regarding the NAPs for truck parking, out of 17 replies, 13 are providing data using DATEX in line with the common Parking Publications profiles. The others are using their own formats (e.g. xls files), however they are all planning to adopt DATEX.

Most of those using DATEX did not mention any technical difficulties with it. Only one issue which could be considered very problematic was mentioned by Denmark: version 2.3 “cannot be used for validation of DATEX II XML messages with Level-B extensions which extend objects that are already extended in version 2.3.”. However, the issue is submitted to DATEX II Support which shows that NAP implementers are aware of the support provided by DATEX organisation.

Other issues mentioned regarding DATEX in NAPs for truck parking are:

- Czech Republic: numbering scheme needs to be developed (how to identify Rest Area objects from facilities, exits to parking spaces)
- Hungary: location referencing not working properly due to the lack of necessary OpenLR updates

At least two reports suggest that future developments will be to provide dynamic parking information. This is included in the DATEX standard but is not available or not used yet.

Regarding the NAPs for SRTI, out of 21 replies, all use DATEX and four of them also use other formats (e.g. xml). No technical difficulties were reported except for Denmark, which mentioned the same issue as for the NAP for truck parking.

Regarding the NAPs for RTTI, out of 21 replies, all use DATEX for some data types and most of them also use other formats (e.g. xml, JSON). The regular use of other data types is to be expected as not all information required by RTTI regulation can be provided in DATEX standard.

No major technical difficulties were reported except for Denmark, which mentioned the same issue as for the NAP for truck parking.
Other issues mentioned regarding DATEX in NAPs for RTTI are:

- The Netherlands: harmonisation of geo-referencing
- Hungary: location referencing not working properly due to the lack of necessary OpenLR updates

Regarding the NAPs for MMTIS, out of 15 replies, only two use DATEX while most of them use other formats (e.g. xml, JSON, NeTEx). This is to be expected as few datatypes required by MMTIS regulation can be provided in DATEX standard. No major technical difficulties were reported.

The following general issues were identified regarding DATEX for all types of NAPs:

- implementers are looking forward to the new version 3.0 (or the new Light alternative) expecting it to be simpler / less complicated
- Surprisingly, no report mentions lack of standard profiles as a problem. Most likely custom profiles were defined with data suppliers and users. This conclusion is supported at least by the report from Germany which mentions regarding RTTI NAP that “Depending on the data type, specific DATEX II profiles are applied”. This situation could lead to incompatibility between NAPs from different countries.

### 6.4. Update on DATEX organisation

The current major focus of the group is on developing the new version of the standard. Also, they are aiming to provide more support to the users and one of the actions in this respect is the redesign of the website to make it friendlier and more informative.

The latest major event of the group was the DATEX User Forum on 23 – 24 May 2018 in Utrecht. The main issues from the Forum relevant to the DATEX activity are:

- during the event the new standard 3.0 and its benefits were presented
- participants discussed about experiences in using DATEX
- a major conclusion was that a minimum DATEX profile is needed for each delegated regulation to ensure that everyone has the same basis to cooperate

### 6.5. Conclusions

This activity is focused on identifying the needs and experiences of NAP implementers with respect to using DATEX II for data exchange. This year the activity maintained a close cooperation with Activity 4.5 and DATEX organisation by, for example, having experts from ITS Romania participating at the meetings of 4.5 and at the DATEX Forum.
The survey organized this year by SA4.6 gave a good picture on how DATEX is used by NAPs. The feedback was interesting and provided relevant information on the status of implementation and existing issues.

Overall, only one major technical issue was reported, however it is submitted to DATEX support which suggests the positive conclusion that implementers are aware of the help they can receive from the DATEX organisation.

The clearest situation regarding DATEX implementation is for truck parking NAPs, mostly because common EU DATEX profiles are available. For the other types of NAPs, the implementations are more complex. This is partly due to the fact that DATEX cannot be used for all data types and partly because common minimum profiles are not available. This need for common profiles is confirmed by DATEX organisation and can also be concluded based on the report from Germany where, in the case of RTTI NAP, it mentions that “a DATEX II has been created for the data type <<road works>>, which is recommended to be used by all Federal States as data suppliers…… Discussions and trainings with the Federal States are on-going, with the goals of consistent usage of the DATEX II profile.”

Regarding the preparation of the annual surveys, several conclusions can be made.

The report from Austria suggested to make it clearer what kind of data exchange the DATEX question refers to. This is a valid point and should be addressed in the next year. Also, in response to this suggestion, further discussions with Austrian contacts clarified the issue in the sense that the Austrian NAP, except for truck parking data, is a weblinks based implementation. So, it does contain nor provide any data, it just offers metadata. However, the metadata is delivered in DATEX format. This suggests another useful change for the next survey: to add a question asking whether the metadata is provided in DATEX and/or other standards.

One final conclusion is that the questions about DATEX are too open. Therefore, it would be useful to add 2-3 guided questions, for example: how many profiles, if all the data in the Regulation are covered, actual DATEX version etc.
7. Delegated Regulation 2017/1926 – Multimodal Travel Information

The Delegated Regulation 2017/1926 on multimodal travel information services has been adopted in 2017. Along the past years, a large number of applications concerning multimodal travel information were developed and put in place. Several journey planners appeared considering different modes of transport, responding to the needs of end users, making available a large amount of travelling data in multiple formats.

With the adoption of the new Delegated Regulation 2017/1926 on the provision of EU-wide multimodal travel information services, “suggesting” the user of NeTE\textsuperscript{x} and SIRI protocols, an important challenge emerged, that is to make all the existing applications compatible with the new orientations, concerning the supply of NAPs according to these protocols.

In this chapter we will describe some implementations and experiences related with Delegated Regulation 2017/1926

**Highlight:**

*With the adoption of the new Delegated Regulation 2017/1926 on the provision of EU-wide multimodal travel information services, “suggesting” the user of NeTE\textsuperscript{x} and SIRI protocols, an important challenge emerged, that is to make all the existing applications compatible with the new orientations, concerning the supply of NAPs according to these protocols.*

7.1. Introducing Delegated Regulation 2017/1926

From a road operator perspective, Delegated Regulation 2017/1926 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, streets, and stops should be considered;
- How to integrate all this 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 Delegated Regulations 886/2013, 885/2013, 2015/962, and the Delegated Regulation 2017/1926 concerning multimodal travel information services:

- Delegated Regulation 2017/1926 applies to the entire transport network and not only to the trans-European road network;
- Delegated Regulation 2017/1926 applies to all transport modes and not only to road transport;
- With Delegated Regulation 2017/1926, new stakeholders appear such as transport authorities, transport operators, infrastructure managers, or transport on demand service providers;
- New protocols, others than DATEXII, should be used for data exchange (NeTEx, SIRI, TAP-TSI);
- No nominated body is required for Delegated Regulation 2017/1926;

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 and are also adapting their existing Open Journey Planner (OJP) to this new reality._

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. **Project How2Go in Portugal**

- The objective of the project is to support the early implementation of the delegated regulation under Directive 2010/40/EU by MS, 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.

7.2.2. MAPPING ACCESSIBLE TRANSPORT FOR PERSONS WITH REDUCED MOBILITY

The overall aim of the project is the development of technical solutions and recommendations to provide travel information through digital means specifically catered to persons-of-reduced-mobility (PRMs) and will comprise several phases:

- Compile an inventory of Digital Transport Information Systems (DTIS) relevant for PRM;
- Survey PRMs on their requirements and preferences with respect to the functions and interface of DTIS;
- Identify legal, technological, and practical barriers that obstruct the fulfilment of these PRM traveller requirements in DTIS;
- Identify the best practices and gaps based on the existing DTIS inventory and traveller expectation survey;
- Propose a draft of the mapping solution demo that will be used in the pilot studies (second phase of the project).

Three implementations of a pilot will occur in the NL/DE border pilot, a national UK pilot and a last mile Lisbon pilot.
The pilot will essentially consist of implementing an interactive web map application (web portal) designed with RWD (Responsive Web Design). The web portal will allow users to consult information available about the stops in the region of each one of the pilots (railway stations, airports, ports, bus terminals, etc.) and to plan multimodal travel journeys, considering not only the general information, but specially the available services oriented to people with reduced mobility (PRM).

In this pilot, we are mainly dealing with static information, such as schedules, services provided to PRM by the operators, fares, etc. Once developed, the information available on the pilot, will be interlinked with the National Access Points (NAPs) of Directive 2010/40/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council with regard to the provision of EU-wide multimodal travel information services. The consortium will feed the NAP with the relevant NetEx profile that includes the PRM information available.

7.2.3. EU-SPRIT COOPERATION

EU-Spirit is an internet-based, cross-border travel information service for customers of public transport. It is based on existing local, regional, and national travel information systems which are interlinked via technical interfaces.

The EU-Spirit service provides door-to-door travel information for customers who do not only travel within one region. The service provides the calculation of an itinerary between stops, addresses, or points of interest in different European regions. The information service includes any carrier of local public transport and long-distance rail and flight services as well as additional services like map service and fare information. The information of the EU-Spirit service providers is for free and is provided via the customer's local information system in his mother tongue.

Up to now, providers from Denmark, France, Germany, Luxembourg, Poland, and Sweden offer the EU-Spirit service.

During 2018, this group (EU EIP SA4.6) had an interesting cooperation with EU-Spirit resulting in participation in two meetings this year.

The first meeting was held in Berlin in May where we addressed the issues and problems that EU-Spirit faces in their OJP building task. A vision of a possible architecture of a NAP extension to Priority Action A was presented:
In October 2018, in Stockholm, a second joint meeting happened where, once again, EU-Spirit group showed their commitment with the new delegated regulation. Some actions are being put in place, concerning the convergence of the existing applications with the new orientations, for example the implementation of translators of the most common standards used to exchange this type of data to NeTEX and SIRI.

https://eu-spirit.eu/

7.2.4. GERMANY

The German Ministry of Transport and Digital Infrastructure is following two parallel activities to address the obligations from the Delegated Regulation 2017/1926:

1. A National Access Point (NAP) is required in accordance to Delegated Regulation 2017/1926. Currently, a detailed concept including operational and organisational aspects for such a NAP is being elaborated. A major pre-requisite is to build upon existing data platforms (such as the existing German NAP for Delegated Regulations 886/2013, 885/2013 and 2015/962) and to integrate them into one, overarching data platform, covering all available data sources in the domain of the Ministry. Results of this concept are expected for summer 2019. Based on the results, a first operational realisation of a German NAP for Delegated Regulation 2017/1926 is planned for the end of 2019.

2. Besides the NAP implementation, a major issue is the harmonisation of the provided data, allowing data users to obtain data from different sources in a “one-stop approach”. This is mainly because many data types by the Delegated Regulation touch on the responsibilities of many stakeholders in Germany. For example, public transport data are provided via standardized interfaces from DELFI e. V., a group of...
public transport organisations. To find a feasible solution for the upcoming NAP, the individual positions and requirements by those stakeholders are examined via an extensive consultation process. During this process, existing data assets, usage of data formats and platforms, and the attitude and obstacles when providing such data via the upcoming NAP are analysed and discussed.

7.2.5. **Norway**

**Entur AS** and The Norwegian Railway Directorate is currently implementing the NeTEx standard for all national public transport in Norway. The goal of this initiative is to fully incorporate NeTEx for all data exchange of public transport information across Norway and collect all public transport data in one national database. Additionally, a NeTEx/IFOPT compliant national database for Stop Places and Points-of-Interest is established, serving as the master data source for all fixed objects including equipment and facilities used for public transport and planning thereof. In a similar fashion, real-time feeds are exchanged using SIRI interfaces and collected in a national real-time proxy.

All Norwegian public transport data will be open to the public, both as a journey planner API and as open data in Transmodel based formats (NeTEx/SIRI). In addition, Entur AS has launched a national journey planner, based on these data. This service is available both as a website and smartphone apps. The first version of the backend platform and journey planner was launched in November 2017, with services covering nationwide journey planning for all modes of public transport as well and basic ticketing for railways and the greater Oslo region.

As of May 2018, 18 of the ~25 major providers of public transport data exchange their data in NeTEx, and it is expected that all major providers will exchange their data in NeTEx by the end of 2018. In addition, Entur integrates 25 sources of real-time data over the SIRI interface, covering the majority of regions in Norway.

7.2.6. **Open Mobility Data in the Nordics (ODIN)**

The ODIN working group consists of several organisations concerned with open data from the public transport sector in the Nordics. The aim of the working group is two-fold: First, the working group seeks to establish the Nordics as a living lab for new innovative mobility services. The second objective for ODIN is to implement the Delegated Regulation 2017/1926 in such a way that all countries are both compliant with the Regulation and increases the attractiveness of the Nordic mobility market. The working group cooperates around five themes:

- Datasets and Services Licenses and Terms
Standards and Formats

Leveraging EU Regulations

Shared Technology and Open Source

Outreach and Developer Experience

In 2019, ODIN will focus on the creation of a common Nordic NeTEx profile, closer cooperation with OpenStreetMap, developer communication, and engagement in the OpenTripPlanner and Open Journey Planner communities.

ODIN consists of Entur A/S, Helsinki Region Transport (HSL), Research Institutes of Sweden (RISE), SFMCOM, Samtrafiken AB, The Danish Transport, Construction and Housing Authority, The Finnish Transport Infrastructure Agency (Väylä), and the Swedish Transport Administration.

7.2.7. Joint forces for Open Traffic Data

An industry-wide initiative was formed in Sweden in 2016 and the project -- Joint forces for Open Traffic Data - was funded in June 2016. The goal of the project was to craft shared national strategic objectives, a common vision, for open traffic data focusing on public transport actors. Also, the project should develop an action plan with necessary tasks to implement the strategic objectives. The work with national strategic objectives resulted in five areas with industry-anchored solutions: datasets and services, licensing and terms, IT architecture, organisation, and financing. At the same time the Delegated Regulation 2017/1926, Multimodal Transport Information Services (MMTIS) was enforced by the European Commission in May 2017. The regulation contains rules regarding collection of traffic data and to make it available through a National Access Point (NAP). These two circumstances resulted in a Swedish implementing project which started in March 2018.

The project contains of three major parts:

1. New formats for import of data which allows to collect more data as well as real-time public transport data

2. A new national database for validation, conversion, and general processing of public transport data

3. New formats for Export of data (NeTEx, Siri, GTFS, GTFS-R, Noptis)

4. A new interface for Trafiklab.se with new interactive solutions for developers

The project involves all actors in the public transport industry and will continue over a period of four years (2018-2022).
7.2.8. Status implementation of MMTIS in the Netherlands

Since 2015 a national database for public transport information is in operation, the so-called NDOV. [https://ndovloket.nl](https://ndovloket.nl).

NDOV is a cooperation of 15 (regional) authorities responsible for public transport. The goal is to improve the quality of information relevant for travellers.

All licensed public transport organisations have to provide its static and dynamic data to the database for free. This NDOV database is accessible for service providers after registration.

Regarding the Delegated Regulation MMTIS the NDOV is not covering all transport modes. The Dutch ministry is in the decision-making process for the assignment or the installation of a national access point for MMTIS before end of 2019, as well as for a national assessment body to meet all specifications.

A number of public transport apps (route planners) and service providers are available in the Netherlands and offering end user services for integrated trip information, including rail, light rail, taxis, and often road traffic information from various sources. Many of those services are free of charge for the end users and provide real time pre-trip and on trip information, basically covering the whole of the country. Examples of apps are Google Maps, 9292, NS Reisplanner Xtra (train). Also, a number of local or city-specific transportation apps are available e.g. Metro Tram Amsterdam.
8. Using architecture to achieve next level harmonisation of National Access Points

To support harmonisation of NAPs in Europe it is of value to promote and explain the concept of architecture. A good start of setting up a NAP starts with defining the architecture needed.

What is architecture?⁷

An Intelligent Transport System (ITS) Architecture is a set of high-level views that enable plans to be made for integrating ITS applications and services. It normally covers technical aspects, plus the related organisational, legal, and business issues.

Using an architecture helps to ensure that the resulting ITS deployment:

- can be planned in a logical manner;
- integrates successfully with other systems;
- meets the desired performance levels;
- has the desired behaviour;
- is easy to manage;
- is easy to maintain;
- is easy to extend;
- satisfies the expectations of the users.

FRAME NEXT is a project that extends the European ITS Framework Architecture, now normally known as the FRAME Architecture, with the activities of the different member states in Europe, within the priority areas of the ITS directive (Directive 2010/40/EU) and with the methodologies and tools that make a modern ITS architecture attractive and appealing for its.

FRAME NEXT goals are to:

- create a Common Pan-European ITS Architecture
- extend and enhance the existing FRAME Architecture users.

⁷ Source: Frame next
EU EIP NAP-activity consulted Frame Next. The aim of the FRAME NEXT is to support the EU-wide harmonization of six priority areas, by extending the existing FRAME architecture with a number of blueprint architectures. These blueprints will define the minimal architecture that should be implemented in each member state.

From an architectural point of view, it is a fact that the various NAPs currently in operation at first sight seem to be providing their services using quite different technical solutions. An overview of architectural schemes can be found in Annex 2.

To achieve a next level of harmonisation in NAPs, the first priority area tackled in FRAME NEXT consisted of developing a first European blueprint ITS architecture for NAPs. Therefore, FRAME NEXT studied details of three NAPs in operation, from the Netherlands, Germany, and Austria. It appears that all three NAPs name roles differently but have approximately the same meaning/purpose, see figure 8.1.
In architectural terms these three different NAP schemes can be described as seen in Figure 8.1: Comparison of the set-up in three NAPs and Figure 8.2: Description of the three different NAP schemes in architectural terms.
The conclusion of this work resulted in a preliminary list of NAP roles:

**ITS-role declaration**

1. NAP Organisational operator
2. NAP Technical operator
3. Content provider
4. NAP Content manager
5. NAP Content publisher
6. Content consumer
7. NAP user support
8. NAP Content procurer (optional)
9. NAP Knowledge provider (optional)

A draft of the final NAP architectural blue print is seen in Figure 8.3. This is however not the final NAP architectural blue print of a NAP as some issues still have to be solved.
This FRAME NEXT study was presented during the ITS Forum 2018 (for proceedings check www.itsforum2018.eu). FRAME NEXT is working on a final document.
9. Outputs of the EU EIP SA46 activity

EU EIP is monitoring the progress of NAPs in Europe and providing support actions to accelerate, improve and harmonise NAP implementations, among others:

**EU EIP ANNUAL REPORT 2018 (this report)**
Giving an overview of the state of the art of National Access Points in Europe. Including a list of web links of NAPs in operation.
Contact: Louis Hendriks louis.hendriks@rws.nl

**NAP COMMON FEATURES & LEVEL OF SERVICE**
Support Document describing features to encourage good practice, help make NAP services available to a wide audience, facilitate data sharing & promote dataset discovery.
Contains 18 features covering: access, communication, finding datasets, maintaining and updating the NAP & dataset information.
Contact: Jacqueline Barr jbarr@ibigroup.com

**METADATA GUIDELINE**
Giving advice how to apply metadata in existing and future NAPs. Assisting organisations responsible for NAPs and NAP users with interest in Metadata usage within NAPs.
Contact: Peter Lubrich lubrich@bast.de

**SELF DECLARATION FORMS**
"Model forms" to fulfil the self-declarations, as stipulated by the Delegated Regulations. Reducing the administrative burden for NAP operators, National Bodies dealing with assessments, data suppliers, and Service Providers.
Available for ‘real-time traffic information’ and ‘safety related traffic information’.
Contact: Louis Hendriks louis.hendriks@rws.nl

**EUROPEAN NAP MAP**
EU EIP website showing a map with MS of Europe linking NAPs in operation.

**NAP LEAFLET**
For promoting NAPs and EIP NAP documents a leaflet was published (annex 3)
10. Other relevant issues

10.1. Purpose and scope

In complement to the precedent chapter, this chapter intends to describe other relevant requirements, developments and/or recommendations not identified in the previous sections.

10.2. Topics of interest

10.2.1. UK study of NAP implementation

In June 2018 the UK Department for Transport (DfT) commissioned the Transport Systems Catapult (TSC) to undertake a high-level review of the status of the National Access Point (NAP). This review will help support the outline business case of a UK open data directory.

The objectives of the review are to:

- Present a detailed status update of the progress the UK has made in support of an outline business case
- UK NAP Gap analysis in terms of: compatibility, inter-operability and continuity for the deployment and operational. Informing a UK National requirement capture supporting the outline business case
- Advise on any identified compliance issues with the delegated regulation requirements for NAP – such as licensing, permissions of usage etc. and relative design implications
- Advise expansion of NAP’s capabilities in the wider sense, requirements and roadmap to lead in the field, future aspirational innovation potential EU event attendance for the purposes of gaining a detailed understanding on the approach being taken by other MS, inversely projecting UK activity and interest levels to the EU
- Develop an outline business case to allow the DfT to enact follow on activity as required

In August 2018 the DfT and TSC carried out extensive UK stakeholder interviews and a survey exercise to capture their thoughts and desirable NAP features. The initial scope is limited to providing a detailed focus on road-based transport.

The scoping study project completed in December 2018 and the DfT is considering options on how to best proceed with the development of a UK NAP.
10.2.2. Updating the Working Programme in relation to the actions under Article 6(3) of the Directive 2010/40/EU

Since the entry into force of Directive 2010/40/EU (the ITS Directive) in August 2010, the Commission has implemented the first Working Programme 1, which, in addition to the creation of the European ITS Advisory Group and the adoption of reporting guidelines, focused mainly on the adoption of specifications for the priority actions under the Directive.

Decision (EU) 2017/2380 extended to 27 August 2022 the Commission’s power to adopt delegated acts, as referred to in Article 7 of the Directive, without changing the Directive’s scope or objectives. It also requires the Commission to update by 10 January 2019 the Working Programme in relation to other actions in the four priority areas listed in Annex I to the Directive.

On 11 December 2018 the European Commission published the Annex to the COMMISSION DECISION, updating the Working Programme related to the actions under Article 6(3) of Directive 2010/40/EU.

In this Annex the EC proposes six activities, three of which are relevant with respect to the implementation and operation of National Access Points:

1. **Revision of current specifications for EU-wide real-time traffic information services**

   Description: this activity will consider, for specific data types, the possible geographical extension of the current specifications for EU-wide real-time traffic information services (Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2015/962) and possible additional data types, in particular relevant data types at urban level (priority area I of the ITS Directive).

   The objective is to extend the geographical scope so as possibly to cover the whole road transport network, at least for some data types to be determined, and to look at possible new data types such as urban vehicle access restrictions, also taking into account the activities referred to in sections Recharging/refuelling points’ and ‘Access to vehicle data for road operation purpose’ below.

   The mapping exercise with MS experts will take into account the recommendations of the C-ITS platform, in particular those relating to enhanced traffic management.

   The Commission plans to launch a supporting study in 2019 intended to cover activities described in this section and sections Recharging/refuelling points’ and ‘Access to vehicle data for road operation purpose’ below.

   **Timeline:** 2019–2020
2. **Recharging/refuelling points**

Description: this activity will look into the accessibility of static and dynamic information (including pricing information) on the whole territory of the Union (priority area I of the ITS Directive).

In order to complement the current provisions of Commission Delegated Regulations (EU) 2015/9628 and 2017/19269, this activity will address the need for information on publicly accessible recharging/refuelling points (not only stations) and pricing information on the whole road network, and the roles of the various parties involved. Work has already started in 2018 with the launch of a Connecting Europe Facility (CEF) Programme Support Action on data collection related to recharging/refuelling points for alternative fuels.

This activity is related to the activity described in section 3.2 on the possible revision of Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2015/962.

Timeline: 2018–2020

3. **Access to vehicle data for road operation purposes**

Description: as announced in the Communication on An EU strategy for mobility of the future, this activity will consider the need for specifications on access to vehicle data for the needs of public authorities, road operators and any other parties in charge of road operations, in particular for traffic management purposes (priority area I of the ITS Directive).

The objective is to work on the data needs and the roles of parties in the business-to-government context, taking into account current commercial activities. In line with the Communication, this activity does not cover business-to-business contexts.

This activity is related to the activity described in section 3.2 on the possible revision of Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2015/962.

Timeline: 2018–2019

For the proposed activities 1 and 2 it means especially that the geographical scope of the Delegated Regulations might be enlarged, meaning that the NAPs might describe data for a much larger part of the road network, including urban roads. Activity 3 means that more vehicle data might become available through the NAPs, at least where the vehicle data could be relevant for traffic safety purposes and possibly for traffic management purpose as well. A European Data Taskforce has been established to discuss the issue of making vehicle data more widely available and implement solutions on a voluntary basis. A future expert group on CCAM may take them on board for pan-European implementation.
11. Summary and conclusions

Current status of NAP implementation

From the survey it can be concluded that:

- 13 member states currently have an operational NAP for truck parking information.
- 14 member states have an operational NAP for SRTI.
- 18 member states have a (partly) operational NAP for RTTI.
- 3 member states have implemented a NAP for MMTIS.

The NAPs vary in system architecture, organisation, monitoring of data users, accessibility, etc. Thus, there is a need for a more coordinated approach and exchange of ideas and best practices.

Common features and Level of Service

From the feedback and stakeholder engagement on the Common features and Level of Service, the features included in the Support Document appear to be achievable and aligned with current NAP implementations. Several new feature areas were highlighted, in 2019 the validation will continue with these new features explored.

Metadata

The on-going efforts to harmonize the Metadata usage across European NAPs include strategic and technical guidance by EIP Sub-Activity (SA) 4.6. Strategic guidance is given in the recently published “Metadata Guideline”. Technical guidance is given in form of the “Coordinated Metadata Catalogue”. This “Catalogue” has already shown some value for many NAPs operating in the domain of road traffic. However, with the new Delegated Regulation for multi-modal traveller information services (MMTIS), there is a need to update and expand this “Catalogue”. SA4.6. and other NAP experts are currently working on such an update. A challenge here is to include many additional travel modes and data types covered by this Delegated Regulation. After a continuing discussion and final approval, a new “Catalogue” version is expected for early summer 2019.

Harmonisation of NAP – requirements with respect to DATEX II

This year the activity maintained a close cooperation with SA 4.5 and DATEX organisation by, for example, having experts from ITS Romania participating at the meetings of 4.5 and at the DATEX Forum.
The survey organized this year by SA 4.6 gave a good picture on how DATEX is used by NAPs. The feedback was interesting and provided relevant information on the status of implementation and existing issues.

The NAP survey confirms an increase of the knowledge about DATEX in the national implementations. It remains clear however that the expertise level is quite divided: while there are countries really familiar to DATEX, others are just beginning and could not provide feedback due to the short time since starting the implementation.

Overall, only one major technical issue was reported, however it is submitted to DATEX support which suggests the positive conclusion that implementers are aware of the help they can receive from the DATEX organisation.

The clearest situation regarding DATEX implementation is for truck parking NAPs, mostly because common EU DATEX profiles are available. For the other types of NAPs, the implementations are more complex. This is partly due to the fact that DATEX cannot be used for all data types and partly because common minimum profiles are not available.

Regarding the preparation of the annual surveys, several conclusions can be made.

The report from Austria suggested to make it clearer what kind of data exchange the DATEX question refers to. This is a valid point and should be addressed in the next year.

Another useful change for the next survey is to add a question asking whether the metadata is provided in DATEX and/or other standards.

One final conclusion is that the questions about DATEX are too open. Therefore, it would be useful to add 2-3 guided questions, for example: how many profiles, if all the data in the Regulation are covered, actual DATEX version etc.

Harmonized declaration of compliance

Through a joint effort of EU EIP and TISA in 2016 and 2017 Uniform Declarations of Compliance Forms have been developed for Delegated Regulation No. 886/2013 (SRTI) and No. 2015/962 (RTTI). For the Delegated Regulations 885/2013 (truck parking) and 2017/1926 (multimodal travel information services) a uniform Declaration of Compliance is not yet existing. In 2019 EU EIP sub-activity 4.6 will investigate together with stakeholders if such a Uniform Declaration of Compliance can be agreed upon for Delegated Regulations 885/2013 and 2017/1926.

Other aspects

In complement to the precedent chapter, this chapter intends to describe other relevant requirements, developments, and/or recommendations not identified in the previous sections. In this year’s report we have chosen to describe two interesting topics that are summarized below.
- **UK study of NAP implementation.**

In June 2018 the UK Department for Transport commissioned the Transport Systems Catapult (TSC) to undertake a high-level review of the status of the National Access Point (NAP). This review includes five different objectives that will help support the outline business case of a UK open data directory.

- **Updating the Working Programme in relation to the actions under Article 6(3) of the Directive 2010/40EU**

EC proposes six activities, three of which are relevant with respect to the implementation and operation of National Access Points:

1. **Revision of current specifications for EU-wide real-time traffic information services**

   This activity will consider, for specific data types, the possible geographical extension of the current specifications for EU-wide real-time traffic information services.

2. **Recharging/refuelling points**

   This activity will look into the accessibility of static and dynamic information (including pricing information) on the whole territory of the Union (priority area I of the ITS Directive).

3. **Access to vehicle data for road operation purposes**

   This activity will consider the need for specifications on access to vehicle data for the needs of organisations in charge of road operations, in particular for traffic management purposes.
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 2018.

<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> (truck parking, SRTI, MMTIS)</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> (truck parking)</td>
<td>ITS Belgium Peter van de Perre, <a href="mailto:pv@its.be">pv@its.be</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>N/A (truck parking, SRTI) N/A (RTTI, MMTIS)</td>
<td>Croatian roads Ltd, Croatian Motorways Ltd, Rijeka-Zagreb Motorway PLC, Bina Istra PLC and Zagreb-Macelj Motorway Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>N/A (truck parking, SRTI) N/A (RTTI, MMTIS)</td>
<td>Croatian roads Ltd, Croatian Motorways Ltd, Rijeka-Zagreb Motorway PLC, Bina Istra PLC and Zagreb-Macelj Motorway Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td><a href="http://www.traffic4cyprus.org.cy">www.traffic4cyprus.org.cy</a> (MMTIS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td><a href="http://www.opendata.fi">www.opendata.fi</a> (truck parking) <a href="http://digitrack.liikennevirasto.fi/en/">http://digitrack.liikennevirasto.fi/en/</a> (SRTI) Static road data (Digiroad):</td>
<td>Finnish Transport Agency Contact details: Matti Pesu, <a href="mailto:matti.pesu@fta.fi">matti.pesu@fta.fi</a></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>Dynamic road status data &amp; traffic data (Digitraffic): <a href="http://www.digitraffic.fi">www.digitraffic.fi</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="https://github.com/finnishtransportagency/digitraffic/wiki">https://github.com/finnishtransportagency/digitraffic/wiki</a> (RTTI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.finap.fi">www.finap.fi</a> (MMTIS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.bison-fute.gouv.fr/action-e.html">http://www.bison-fute.gouv.fr/action-e.html</a> (truck parking)</td>
<td>Bast (Federal Highway Research Institute)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="https://transport.data.gouv.fr/#about">https://transport.data.gouv.fr/#about</a></td>
<td>51427 Bergisch Gladbach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="https://service.mdm-portal.de/">https://service.mdm-portal.de/</a> (truck parking, SRTI, RTTI)</td>
<td>BASI (Federal Highway Research Institute)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nationale Stelle für Verkehrsdaten</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brüderstraße 53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51427 Bergisch Gladbach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tel. +49 2204 43- 5506, <a href="mailto:nast@bast.de">nast@bast.de</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Q3_2018 (truck parking, SRTI, RTTI, MMTIS)</td>
<td>Centre for Research and Technology Hellas – Hellenic Institute of Transport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contact details: Dr. Evangelos Mitsakis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Q1 2019 (truck parking, SRTI, RTTI)</td>
<td>Hungarian Public Road Non-profit PLC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contact details: <a href="mailto:zubriczky.levente@kozut.hu">zubriczky.levente@kozut.hu</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="https://data.gov.ie">https://data.gov.ie</a></td>
<td>For SRTI, RTTI: National Standards Authority of Ireland (NASI)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuanian Road Administration <a href="mailto:Ira@ira.lt">Ira@ira.lt</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phone +370 5 232 9600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Basanavičiaus g. 36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT-03109 Vilnius, Lithuania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.trafficinfo.lt">http://www.trafficinfo.lt</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country name</td>
<td>National Access Point</td>
<td>Contact National Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td><a href="https://data.public.lu/fr/datasets/aires-de-destination-sur-les-autoroutes">Link</a> (truck parking) <a href="https://data.public.lu/fr/datasets/cita-donnees-trafic-en-datexii">Link</a> (RTTI) <a href="https://data.public.lu">Link</a> (MMTIS)</td>
<td>Administration des Ponts et Chaussées</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td><a href="https://nt.ndw.nu/#/parking-overview">Link</a> (truck parking) <a href="https://nt.ndw.nu/#/traffic-overview">Link</a> (SRTI) <a href="https://nt.ndw.nu">Link</a> (RTTI) <a href="https://ndovloket.nl">Link</a> (MMTIS)</td>
<td>RDW, attn. ITS Toezicht IV PO Box 30 000 9640 RA Veendam The Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td><a href="http://data.europa.eu/euodp/en/data/dataset/etpa">Link</a> (truck parking) <a href="https://nt.ndw.nu/#/parking-overview">Link</a> (SRTI) <a href="https://nt.ndw.nu">Link</a> (RTTI) <a href="https://ndovloket.nl">Link</a> (MMTIS)</td>
<td>For SRTI: Norwegian Road Supervisory Authority (RSA) Contact details: <a href="mailto:post@vegtisynet.com">post@vegtisynet.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td><a href="http://data.europa.eu/euodp/en/data/dataset/etpa">Link</a> (truck parking, not operational) <a href="http://www.data.norge.no">Link</a> and <a href="http://www.vegvesen.no">Link</a> (SRTI, RTTI, MMTIS)</td>
<td>General Directorate for National Roads and Motorways (GDDKiA) – Krzysztof Modelewski: <a href="mailto:kmodelew.ski@gddkia.gov.pl">kmodelew.ski@gddkia.gov.pl</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>N/A (truck parking, STRI)</td>
<td>ROMANIAN NATIONAL COMPANY FOR ROAD INFRASTRUCTURE ADMINISTRATION Contact details: 38 Dinicu Golescu Blvd. Sector 1, Bucharest, Romania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>N/A (truck parking, STRI)</td>
<td>National Traffic Management Centre; Dean Herenda, Head of Unit Land Transport Directorate Ministry of Infrastructure - SI, Dragomelj 116, 1230 Domžale, Slovenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>N/A (truck parking) <a href="www.odoprave.info">Link</a> (STRI, RTTI)</td>
<td>ROMANIAN NATIONAL COMPANY FOR ROAD INFRASTRUCTURE ADMINISTRATION Contact details: 38 Dinicu Golescu Blvd. Sector 1, Bucharest, Romania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td><a href="http://data.europa.eu/euodp/en/data/dataset/etpa">Link</a> - truck parking (via EU portal) <a href="https://www.promet.si/portal/en/etd.aspx">Link</a> (STRI RTTI)</td>
<td>National Traffic Management Centre; Dean Herenda, Head of Unit Land Transport Directorate Ministry of Infrastructure - SI, Dragomelj 116, 1230 Domžale, Slovenia</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>Sweden</td>
<td><a href="http://www.trafficdata.se">www.trafficdata.se</a> (truck parking, SRTI, MMTIS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td><a href="https://data.gov.uk/">https://data.gov.uk/</a> (truck parking, SRTI, MMTIS)</td>
<td>Inclusion of ITS Directive requirements coordinated by Department for Transport – Suku Phull Current focus on SRTI and RTTI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

This annex gives an overview of the system architectures of National Access Points in Europe. Status per December 2018.

Figure A2.1 Architecture for Austrian NAP

Figure A2.2.1 Architecture for Belgian NAP for truck parking (current)
Figure A2.2.2 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
Bij diverse serviceproviders/weggebruikers zijn databases met een of meer categorieën verkeersveiligheidsgebeurtenissen. Er is geen sprake van een centrale database.
Figure A2.7 Architecture for Finnish NAP for Safety-Related Traffic Information

Figure A2.8.1 Architecture for France NAP for Safety-Related Traffic Information
Architecture for public road operators

Figure A2.8.2 Architecture for France NAP for Safety-Related Traffic Information

Figure A2.9 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 A2.10 Architecture for Norwegian NAP

Figure A2.11: Architecture for Polish NAP
Figure A2.12: Architecture for Slovakian NAP for Safety-Related Traffic Information

Figure A2.13: Architecture for Swedish NAP
Figure A2.14 Architecture for UK’s NAP
Annex 3: EIP leaflet for promoting NAPs and NAP documents

**NATIONAL ACCESS POINTS - EXCHANGE OF ROAD TRAFFIC DATA**

**WHAT IS A NATIONAL ACCESS POINT?**
A National Access Point (NAP) is a digital interface installed by a EU Member State to make traffic and mobility data accessible for a wide range of data users. NAPs can take the form of a repository, registry, web portal or similar.

NAPs are part of the ITS Action Plan and Directive of the European Commission. Each EU Member State is stipulated to install NAPs to address obligations from the corresponding EC Delegated Regulations.

**WHAT ARE THE BENEFITS OF NATIONAL ACCESS POINTS?**
- Facilitating access, easy exchange and reuse of transport related data.
- Bringing together suppliers, users and refiners of traffic and mobility data.
- Supporting the provision of EU-wide interoperable travel and traffic services to end users.

**HOW DO I ACCESS NATIONAL ACCESS POINTS?**
Check out an interactive map of operating NAPs across Europe, including web links.

**WHERE DO I FIND ADDITIONAL INFORMATION?**
Learn more about the NAP approach of the ITS Action Plan of the European Commission, including downloadable versions of the ITS Directive and the corresponding Delegated Regulations.

---

EUEP Activity: Monitoring & Harmonisation of National Access Points
Activity Lead: Louis Hendrik [louis.hendrik@tw.r.t]

---

*Co-financed by the Connecting Europe Facility of the European Union*
EU EIP is monitoring the progress of NAPs in Europe and providing support actions to accelerate, improve and harmonise NAP implementations, among others:

**EU EIP ANNUAL REPORT 2017 ON NAPs**
- Giving an overview of the state of the art of National Access Points in Europe.
- Including a list of web links of NAPs in operation.
  
  Contact: Louis Hendriks louis.hendriks@eurecat

**NAP COMMON FEATURES & LEVEL OF SERVICE**
- Support Document describing features to encourage good practice, help make NAP services available to a wider audience, facilitate data sharing & promote dataset discovery.
- Contains 18 features covering access, communication, finding datasets, maintaining and updating the NAP & dataset information.
  
  Contact: Jacqueline Barre jacq@eurecat.com

**METADATA GUIDELINE**
- Giving advice on how to apply metadata in existing and future NAPs.
- Assisting organisations responsible for NAPs and NAP users interested in metadata usage within NAPs.
  
  Contact: Peter Lubrich lubrich@eurecat.de

**SELF DECLARATION FORMS**
- "Model forms" to fulfill the self-declarations, as stipulated by the Delegated Regulations.
- Reducing the administrative burden for NAP operators. National Bodies dealing with assessments, data suppliers and Service Providers.
- Available for "real-time traffic information" and "safety-related traffic information".
  
  Contact: Louis Hendriks louis.hendriks@eurecat