**RWEG 2 March 2023**

***Item 4. topic 1 – Moderated by Dušan Štofík (SK)***

***Scope of vehicles, frequency of testing, recognition roadworthiness test conducted in another Member State and Roadworthiness Certificate***

***Summary***

**Scope of vehicles**

Including motorcycles and tractors is a political issue in some MSs, and may open up a lot of other issues, though some Member States already have PTIs for these categories in place. Some MSs see little benefit in including motorcycles in PTI, and favour “alternative measures”. Many participants support including O1 and O2 in scope, though O1, in particular, would be more problematic for some MSs because inter alia they are not registered. One MS supports including escooters within the scope.

There may a practical issue in some MSs with tractors reaching PTI stations, and some contributors only favour including tractors capable of higher speeds.

There is an issue with trailers used of transporting boats, as the water can damage the brakes.

**Directive or Regulation?**

Very limited support for a regulation.

**Recognition of roadworthiness test conducted in another MS**

Most contributors were in favour of making this an option for MS, on the basis of bilateral agreements (though one MS would like the option without bilateral agreements). Explicitly providing for it would also provide a clear legal base. However, there was little support for mandatory recognition, and some concerns expressed regarding the possibility of “regulatory shopping”.

**Intervals between PTIs**

Electric vehicles should have the same intervals. If the EU wishes to incentivise the take-up of EVs, then the testing requirements should not be more stringent.

Linking mileage to PTI is far from straightforward, and it may further incentivise fraud. It is generally not favoured.

While PTI intervals vary between Member States, many participants favoured a more frequent PTI for older vehicles.

One participant stated that waiting for 4 years for the first PTI increases the risk of odometer fraud.

Regarding crashed vehicles and other events, most participants feel that PTI is not the best way to assess the state of a vehicle after a crash. Some Member States already have other systems in place for checking a vehicle after a crash. Key issues include the definition of significant damage and exchange of data.

There was limited support for safety recalls becoming a trigger for PTIs, as it was felt that this would place a burden on the citizen.

One contributor suggested more frequent PTI testing for shared mobility vehicles.

**Roadworthiness certificate**

It was generally agreed that digitalisation of roadworthiness certificates has added value, although there is the issue of standardisation. Some MS favour retaining the option of paper based certificates. Some contributors favour direct access to other MS databases. Other issues raised include the language of the certificate

Most contributors who spoke did not favour including OBCFM data in the certificate, did not think it was legally permissible, and saw no added value.