

Title: The Vehicle Drivers (Certificates of Professional Competence) Regulations 2007 PIR No: DfTPIR004 Original IA/RPC No: n/a Lead department or agency: Driver and Vehicle Standards Agency (DVSA) Other departments or agencies: DOE NI Contact for enquiries: lis.flaherty@dvs.gov.uk	Post Implementation Review
	Date: 20/7/16
	Type of regulation: EU
	Type of review: Statutory
	Date measure came into force: 27/3/07
	Recommendation: Keep
RPC Opinion: Green	

1. What were the policy objectives of the measure?

The primary objectives of the Directive were to improve road safety and driver safety; improve the professionalism and the quality of service offered by professional drivers; and to contribute towards lessening driver shortages. The Directive did not state when impacts were expected to materialise but it seems reasonable to assume that they should by now be starting to show some influence. This is because a key part of the regulation was a requirement for all drivers with 'grandfather' rights (those who already held the entitlement to drive a category C/D licence at the time the Regulations were introduced, without the requirement to complete the initial qualification) to complete periodic training – these drivers should by now have all done this.

2. What evidence has informed the PIR?

The PIR has considered a wide range of secondary data and outputs from various stakeholder engagement activities. Both the Directive itself and the CPC Regulations have previously been subject to ex-post evaluations commissioned by the European Commission and DVSA respectively.

The main research questions for the PIR were determined by a review of the PIR template in the Cross-Government Evaluation Group guidance (unpublished) and by the development of a Directive logic map.

3. To what extent have the policy objectives been achieved?

Safety outcomes have improved but they have occurred for a number of modes unaffected by the regulations. This coupled with the fact that safety outcomes are affected by many other factors means that it is not possible to say whether the regulations have improved road safety.

Regarding the other objectives, the absence of reliable evidence means it is also not possible to confidently state whether the regulations have increased training or boosted skill levels, or if CPC has encouraged new entrants to the industry by boosting wages and improving perceptions of the industry. For these objectives, as with safety, there are many other factors that play a role so identifying the impact of the CPC is challenging.

However, the PIR evidence base clearly demonstrates that drivers are undertaking continuous professional training; this should increase their skill levels, which should in turn contribute to fulfilling the objectives of the Directive.

Sign-off For Post Implementation Review: Chief economist/Head of Analysis and Minister

I have read the PIR and I am satisfied that it represents a fair and proportionate assessment of the impact of the measure.

Signed: Giles Doy

Date: 20.7.16.

Further Information Sheet

Please provide additional evidence in subsequent sheets, as required.

4. What were the original assumptions?

The original impact assessment (IA) assumed that the costs of the regulation would stem from the additional training requirements placed on drivers. The benefits were assumed to potentially derive from safety improvements as well as reductions in fuel consumption and insurance premia as a result of drivers being more highly skilled. It was assumed that the regulations would boost competition across the EU through harmonisation of skills and knowledge. The IA, conducted in 2007, did not attempt to produce quantified estimates of the net present value of the regulation.

5. Were there any unintended consequences?

Whilst the Directive is clearly aimed at professional drivers, some of the wording in the Articles seems to capture occasional and incidental drivers as well. This is leading many Member States, including the UK, to seek clarification from the Commission and is one of the reasons why the Commission is currently reviewing the Directive.

There is also a perception among some stakeholders that the CPC has contributed toward older drivers leaving the industry when faced with a requirement to complete periodic training, and a possibility that the requirement to take continual training may have contributed to the reduction in the number of existing licence holders taking vocational tests to upgrade their licence.

6. Has the evidence identified any opportunities for reducing the burden on business?

The main conclusion of the PIR is that Government intervention is still required as the objectives of the regulation remain valid and therefore the PIR recommendation is that the regulations remain.

The UK Government will continue to work with the EU in order to seek greater clarification on the exemptions, which may present opportunities to reduce burden on businesses in the future.

7. For EU measures, how does the UK's implementation compare with that in other EU member states in terms of costs to business?

The UK took the least burdensome options in implementing the Directive, which afforded drivers and businesses the greatest flexibility. The UK Government did this in order to keep the cost to business as low as possible. The pre-existing licence acquisition test itself made up 80% of the content of what the Directive was proposing for the CPC; including the existing UK tests avoided significant duplication of effort and cost for the drivers and for businesses. In addition to selecting the least burdensome options, it is also the case that many of the options chosen were supported by UK stakeholders.

The PIR evidence base sets out the approach to implementation taken by other Member States and did not identify any opportunities to change the UK approach in order to lower costs to businesses.