Council of the European Union
General Secretariat

Interinstitutional files:
2025/0097 (COD)

Brussels, 11 September 2025

WK 11092/2025 ADD 7

LIMITE

TRANS
CODEC
ENV
MI

PUBLIC

This is a paper intended for a specific community of recipients. Handling and further distribution are under the sole responsibility of community members.

WORKING DOCUMENT

From:	General Secretariat of the Council
To:	Working Party on Land Transport
N° prev. doc.:	ST 12271 2025 INIT
N° Cion doc.:	ST 8255 2025
Subject:	Proposal for a DIRECTIVE OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL amending Directive 2014/45/EU on periodic roadworthiness tests for motor vehicles and their trailers and Directive 2014/47/EU on the technical roadside inspection of the roadworthiness of commercial vehicles circulating in the Union - Comments from Hungary

Delegations will find attached comments from Hungary on the above-mentioned document.

Comments from Hungary

on the Proposal for a Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Directive 2014/45/EU on periodic roadworthiness tests for motor vehicles and their trailers and Directive 2014/47/EU on the technical roadside inspection of the roadworthiness of commercial vehicles circulating in the Union

Compromise proposal of the Danish Presidency
ST 12271/25

PUBLIC

Hungary maintains its position already submitted (ST 10061/25 ADD12), from which the most important parts are highlighted in the end of this document in point II, and makes the following comments on the first Presidency compromise.

I. Comments on the Presidency compromise ST 12271/25

General comments

- It is essential for the proposals not to maintain but rather **correct the contradictions** between the wording of PTI and VRD Directives. Resolving these inconsistencies and ensuring uniform and consistent terminology is crucial.

The PTI proposal requires the recording of the result of the temporary roadworthiness certificate (using the term "result" instead of the plural "results" used elsewhere) in the national vehicle register. In contrast, the VRD proposal mandates the recording in the vehicle register of data concerning the outcome (using the term "outcome" instead of "result" or "results") of the mandatory periodic roadworthiness test as well as the validity period of the roadworthiness certificate. Meanwhile, the PTI proposal does not use the term "mandatory periodic roadworthiness test" anywhere. Furthermore, the term "outcome" is identified in Annex II, point (7), and the validity period in point (8). The difference in terminology between the VRD and PTI proposals therefore creates the impression that the data to be transmitted after the roadworthiness test and mandatorily recorded in the vehicle register are not identical.

- Hungary notes the absence of provisions regarding the format and data content of the roadworthiness certificate. We would welcome **further harmonisation of the roadworthiness certificate** be it temporary or periodic. We propose further harmonisation of not only of the elements but also of the document itself to facilitate data exchange between Member States and ensure the smooth operation of cross-border road traffic and road vehicle inspections.

Especially with the introduction of the temporary roadworthiness test carried out by a MS other than the MS of registration it would be essential that the roadworthiness certificate would be easily understood by all enforcement authorities across Europe as it is the case for the driving licence and the registration certificate.

1. Directive 2014/45/EU - PTI

Article 3 - Definitions

- **(6a) 'connected vehicle'**: it is not clear how and based on which official documents a vehicle is identified as such; therefore, we consider it necessary to clarify this in the Directive.

- **(12a) 'EU temporary roadworthiness certificate'**: according to the definition, an EU temporary roadworthiness certificate also qualifies as a type of roadworthiness certificate. In contrast, the draft uses both terms together throughout, i.e. instead of simply "roadworthiness certificate," it uses the expression "roadworthiness certificate and EU

temporary roadworthiness certificate," which unnecessarily complicates the regulation. We propose to simplify the regulation by eliminating such redundant complications.

Article 4 - Responsibilities

Paragraph (5): we propose introducing the definition of the term "**trust centres**" in the directive, as this would aid clarity and interpretation.

Article 8 - Roadworthiness certificate and EU temporary roadworthiness certificate

Paragraph (1a): the number of EU temporary roadworthiness certificates is not limited, while the proposal introduces the obligation of their recognition. In practice, this means that after the expiry of the six-month validity period, nothing prevents the vehicle owner from submitting the vehicle to a new temporary roadworthiness test and continuing to use it for another six months. This will create an excellent opportunity for vehicle owners seeking to avoid vehicle registration. While recognizing the need to address situations arising from the right to free movement, we support the introduction of the EU temporary roadworthiness certificate, but **we consider it essential to clearly stipulate that only one can be delivered, which must be followed by the periodic roadworthiness test**. For reasons related precisely to registration (and taxation), we do not expect that many Member States will make use of the possibility to recognize periodic roadworthiness tests carried out by another Member State.

2. Directive 2014/47/EU - RSI

We note that already under Directive 2000/30/EC, Member States were required to notify the Member State of registration if serious deficiencies were detected during a road vehicle inspection. This obligation was carried forward, with some refinements, into Directive 2014/47/EU. However, neither directives impose any obligation on the Member State of registration to take action. (To illustrate with a common example, this means that a vehicle with serious, dangerous deficiencies has its registration certificate and license plates confiscated by Austria/Germany, etc., and sent to Hungary, and the vehicle owner can collect them at the government office without having to prove that the deficiencies have been corrected.) The current proposal seeks to introduce an electronic notification procedure in connection with road vehicle inspections (thus imposing significant IT development tasks and costs on Member States) without defining the **minimum action that the Member State of registration should take upon receiving such a notification**. We therefore propose defining these minimum measures, so that the effectiveness of this provision can be demonstrated in relation to the administrative and financial burden incurred.

Article 3 - Definitions

We do not support the mandatory introduction of the "remote sensing" and "plume chasing" testing methods, as it is not possible to accurately measure the pollutant emission and noise emission levels for the vehicle being tested.

Article 4a - Remote sensing

We **do not support the mandatory introduction of the "remote sensing" test method** as proposed, although we consider the devices to be an effective tool for preliminary screening tests related to technical inspections.

The proposal provides for a very substantial mandatory number of checks by means of remote sensing, namely 30% of motor vehicles excluding zero-emission vehicles.
Under the current directive, the mandatory number of checks is determined on the basis of the number of vehicles referred to in points (a), (b) and (c) of Article 2(1), that is, the vehicles

falling within the scope of the directive, whereas the new proposal would determine it on the basis of all motor vehicles registered in the Member State. We recommend that the number of remote-sensing checks likewise be determined solely on the basis of the number of registered vehicles falling within the scope of the directive, in particular given that the measurement efficiency of the technology is not known. Under the current proposal, in Hungary alone, the size of the M1 category would necessitate the performance of 1,300,000 remote-sensing checks per year.

Remote sensing is not suitable for detecting individual non-compliant vehicles. The measurement is highly uncertain, as numerous factors influence the result. At most, it can be used for fleet-level assessments, but the purpose of periodic technical inspections or roadside checks is not this; it is to examine the compliance of individual vehicles. The Commission has not provided any information regarding remote sensing (availability of devices, costs, etc.). There are no limit values for the different components. We do not support leaving it to the Member States to establish these individually. There is neither a method, device, nor limit value for remote noise measurement. Even for exhaust gas measurement, there are many influencing factors that render the measured results unreliable. Although NOx measurement could be appropriate during the technical inspection, it is not practically feasible. Preparing the inspection according to Annex I, point 8.2.3.3 is not feasible in practice. The operation of the NOx-reducing SCR catalyst is temperature-dependent. If it has not reached its minimum operating temperature, it is ineffective. There is no possibility during the technical inspection to determine the temperature of the SCR catalyst. The OBD port does not provide such a temperature value. If a vehicle fails, we cannot unambiguously state that it is faulty; it may simply be that the catalyst was not sufficiently warm. It is not a realistic requirement for the vehicle to "circle" around the test site for five minutes and then be measured within three minutes.

We note that the proposal contains the following: "*They shall record each remote sensing measurement and use the data thus collected to assess real-world pollutant and noise emissions of their vehicle fleet."* It would leave the determination of limit values largely to the Member States: "*Each Member State shall, based on the remote sensing data, establish the emission [level] [threshold] for exhaust and noise for high-emitting vehicles in the relevant categories assessed by the Member State.*" This means that during roadside checks, each Member State would have its own emission limit values based on its remote sensing data. We do not support this; instead, we propose establishing common emission limit values, measurement requirements, and technology standards across the EU.

Annex I of the PTI Directive and Annex II of RSI Directive

- The proposal would allow checking brake performance using a wheel play detector, which is a device for checking wheel play. This is not suitable for assessing brake performance. At most, a plate brake tester is appropriate. We propose amending the text accordingly.

- Regarding Annexes I and III of PTI Directive, we note that access to on-board diagnostic (OBD) information of vehicles is subject to strict conditions and accreditation requirements. Service centres and testing stations require separate accreditation for this access, which the majority of currently operating testing stations in our country are unable to fully comply with.

We consider it necessary to clearly clarify whether the testing station license issued by the national authority also authorizes the inspector to access OBD information, and if not, how and

on what basis the inspector is granted such authorization. Furthermore, it is essential to clarify what happens if a given testing station cannot access the OBD system data due to technical or authorization reasons.
In this respect, we see the need to develop transitional or alternative solutions to ensure that technical inspections uniformly comply with the relevant EU and national legislation. Our country regards the resolution of these issues as important to guarantee uniform and lawful data access during technical inspections.

II. General views on other parts of the proposal, not yet amended

1. **We do not support the introduction of annual periodic inspections for M1 and N1 categories older than 10 years**.
2. **We do not support the annual tests for exhaust emissions of N1 category vehicles**.

Justification: *Both proposals would significantly increase the financial and administrative burden on the owners of these vehicles, primarily impacting those with lower income and considerably increases the administrative duties and obligations of the relevant authorities. In return, road safety and the protection of the environment would improve only to a relatively small extent.*

According to vehicle fleet statistics in Hungary, nearly 80% of M1 category vehicles are older than 10 years, which corresponds to roughly 3.3 million cars, meaning that the number of periodic inspections would double. Implementing this in practice would require an enormous expansion of capacity. The Commission justifies the introduction of annual inspections by citing an expected improvement in accident data. However, no data specific to vehicles over 10 years old is provided—only accident statistics for the overall fleet. Thus, this justification should be regarded as an assumption rather than substantiated evidence. Hungarian accident statistics show that accidents caused by technical failure are negligible, and furthermore, the data does not indicate a significant increase in accidents caused by technical defects in vehicles over 10 years old.

3. **We do not support the mandatory introduction of "remote sensing" and "plume chasing" testing methods** as proposed, while recognising these instruments as effective tools for pre-screening in connection with roadside technical inspections.

Justification: ***These testing methods cannot reliably guarantee accurate results for pollutant emissions or noise levels of the individual vehicle tested.***

In Hungary, instruments and testing technologies based on remote sensing for pollutant emission measurement are generally not used. An instrument is in use for pre-screening checks, but no instrument or testing technology is currently available for noise measurement.
Hungary already uses remote sensing methods for pollutant emission measurement, but only for pre-screening purposes. The NOx emission limit values planned to be introduced exist only in the context of type approval procedures. For roadside inspections, there is no legal limit value applicable to roadside measurements which, if exceeded, would substantiate a presumption of improper functioning, tampering, or failure of a vehicle's AdBlue system, making an infringement provable and thereby justifying mandatory technical inspection or the imposition of a fine on the vehicle owner.

PUBLIC

In our view, such measurements would only generate an administratively unmanageable or difficult-to-manage "suspicion" concerning individual vehicles. Consequently, in order to ensure effective enforcement, more accurate measurements would later be required. This complex and uncertain measurement-based regulatory procedure appears to us to deliver fewer environmental benefits than the considerable resources (financial, human, material, and administrative) it would demand. Therefore, we consider these instruments suitable only for pre-screening purposes.

We also note that remote sensing measurements are highly uncertain, with results influenced by numerous factors. At most, they may provide insights into fleet-level characteristics, but the aim of periodic inspections or roadside checks is not to draw conclusions about the fleet as a whole, but rather to verify the compliance of individual vehicles.

PUBLIC