Council of the European Union
General Secretariat

PUBLIC

**Interinstitutional files:**
**2025/0097 (COD)**

**Brussels, 15 October 2025**

**WK 13196/2025 ADD 5**

**LIMITE**

**TRANS**
**CODEC**
**ENV**
**MI**

*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 12271/3/25 REV 3 |
| N° Cion doc.: | ST 8255/25 + ADD 1 |
| 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<br>- Further revised presidency compromise<br>= Comments from Finland |

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

MINISTRY OF TRANSPORT AND COMMUNICATIONS

PUBLIC

# Written Comments on the revised 4th compromise text of PTI and RSI Directives (12271/3/25 REV 3) from Finland

We thank the Presidency for providing the compromise text. Please find below our brief comments on it. We will not repeat all our previous comments in this document.

## PTI Directive, Article 2, Regarding PTI for motorcycles

We fully support the amendments made by the Presidency regarding the PTI for T-category vehicles and PTI for motorcycles. We thank the Presidency for taking our comments into consideration.

In response to the discussion held in the Working Party on Road Transport on the 9th of October, we wish to emphasize that we fully acknowledge the risks faced by motorcyclists and do not intend to downplay their significance in any way.

Finland has a strong foundation in traffic safety governance, supported by comprehensive accident investigation systems and a national strategy aligned with Vision Zero principles. Finland was the recipient of the 2024 European Transport Safety Council prize for outstanding progress in road safety. One of the reasons was that all accidents leading to fatalities are investigated.

According to our accident investigation board data, excessive speed and substance use are the most significant risk factors behind motorcycle crashes. These issues cannot be addressed through vehicle inspections. We are currently renewing our National Traffic Safety Strategy. As part of the renewing of the strategy, an assessment will be made of what specific measures can be taken to reduce motorcycle accidents. We understand that our job is not yet done.

By aligning motorcycle safety efforts with the Safe System framework, Finland can make measurable progress toward its zero-fatality vision—without imposing disproportionate regulatory burdens on riders. In line with the Safe System approach, we aim to identify interventions that prevent the most serious injuries and fatalities while being the most cost-effective. Making a concrete list of alternative road safety measures for two- or three-wheel vehicles would not be an issue after the renewal of our Road Safety Strategy.

## PTI Directive, article 3, Definitions, point (12)

We do not fully support the amendment in the definition of ‘roadworthiness certificate’ where a reference would be made to Article 8(2) meaning a QR- or barcode on a paper certificate. We see that Member States should not be obligated to further develop paper documents as we are developing digital first solutions.

## PTI Directive, article 4(5), Responsibilities,

We support the wording “…in a format…” and also the amendments regarding centralized data centers in article 4(5).

**Ministry of Transport and Communications** | PO Box 31, FI-00023, Government, Finland | lvm.fi/en | tel. +358 295 16001

PUBLIC

## PTI Directive, Article 5, Date and frequency of testing

We can support the changes made by the Presidency in article 5.

## PTI Directive, Article 8(1a), Roadworthiness certificate and EU temporary roadworthiness certificate

In our view it's positive that there is a fixed time, but instead of the 10 days, we would prefer a wording where the data in transferred at the latest before the beginning of the next business day. This would be aligned with Article 16(1)(b) meaning the use of data exchange between Member States.

## PTI Directive, Article 9(4), Follow-up of deficiencies

We do not understand, why there should be penalties in PTI Directive. It would not be possible to issue penalties in PTI as inspectors do not have the legal authority to issue penalties. However, we see that this rule would be ok in RSI Directive's Article 14. The sufficient and correct sanction would be the rejection of PTI in a PTI.

**Therefore, we suggest a new drafting:**

"

4. ~~In the case of~~ **tTampering** or manipulation of the vehicle's emission control system, high-voltage system, **including battery management system,** silencer, or safety-related systems~~, such tampering or manipulation~~ shall be considered as major or dangerous **deficiencies.** ~~deficiency, and shall be punishable by effective, proportionate, dissuasive and non-discriminatory penalties.~~

"

## PTI Directive, Article 16, Exchange of data between Member States' authorities

**Question:** We would like to make sure that the wording in article 16 refers to the data of certificates and not the certificates themselves? Especially regarding the EU temporary roadworthiness certificates in Article 16. It looks like some of our previous comments that were already considered, have been deleted. What is the reason for this?

## PTI Annex I, point 3

We support the Commission's proposal in PTI Annex I point 3. We see that the text "-the valid software version including the integrity feature;" should not be deleted from the introduction part. We think that it should be possible to check the integrity of the vehicle after the vehicle has been taken into use, for example in connection to tampering or recalls. Enabling such procedures would require that the necessary data be made available by the vehicle manufacturer to the relevant actors.

PUBLIC

## PTI Annex, item 0.3, recall

The proposed new item 0.3 would lead to an immediate suspension of the vehicle and prevent the vehicle to be used on the road. We are not convinced that it is always necessary. However, in principle we can support the amendment, but there should be middle (major) classification for the fault also.

In Finland we have a system in place where a failure to comply with a recall finally leads to a failed roadworthiness inspection decision. The owners/holders are informed by the manufacturer's representatives about recalls multiple times beforehand, but for many reasons some fail to comply or do not get the information. Only after many attempts to inform the owner/holder of the vehicle a signal is added into the vehicle's registry information. This signal is then visible when the vehicle enters a PTI.

## Annexes: 8.2.3.3. NOX measurement, Vehicle preparation:

We thank the Presidency for efforts to resolve the outstanding issues related to NOx testing, particularly under cold climate conditions. However, we have serious concerns about the feasibility of implementing the proposed compromise. It is essential that any new tests are based on a solid technical, legal, and operational foundation. The current compromise would mean that, in many parts of Finland, NOx testing could not be carried out for several days—or even months—each year.

In reflection to the discussions held in the Council's WP on the 9th of October, we think that the current compromise would create a loophole and would be unequal to citizens as the content of a PTI would vary between seasons.

Therefore, we see that mandatory NOx tests in PTI should not be included in the next compromise text. We can support optional NOx testing in PTI. As an alternative, a review clause with an appropriate timeline could be considered. Comprehensive testing under freezing conditions and operational studies must be completed before NOx testing can be implemented.

We can support NOx testing in the RSI Directive.

PUBLIC

## RSI Directive, Article 2

We thank the Presidency for the proposal regarding N1-vehicles in new article 2(1a). We see that the amendment is taking the article into the right direction.

## RSI Directive, Article 4a

In general, we support the changes made regarding remote sensing.

## RSI Directive, Article 5

**Comment:** We want to repeat our position that we continue to oppose national targets or quotas, as we believe they would shift focus toward initial RSIs at the expense of more detailed inspections, that promote road safety better than initial inspections.

We have concerns regarding the process for roadside inspections (RSI), which in our understanding requires an initial RSI before a more detailed inspection can be conducted. We believe that inspectors (the police in Finland) should have the discretion to carry out a detailed roadside inspection immediately, without first performing an initial RSI, and that all such detailed inspections should count more heavily toward any RSI targets. However, we continue to oppose national targets or quotas, as we believe they would shift focus toward initial RSIs at the expense of more thorough inspections, that promote road safety better than initial inspections.

## RSI Directive, Article 14

Please see our comments regarding PTI Directive, Article 9(4) above.

**We suggest a new drafting in RSI Directive:**

“

4. ~~In the case of~~ **tTampering** or manipulation of the vehicle’s emission control system, high-voltage system, **including battery management system,** silencer, or safety-related systems~~, such tampering or manipulation~~ shall be considered as major or dangerous **deficiencies.** ~~deficiency,~~ and shall be punishable by effective, proportionate, dissuasive and non-discriminatory penalties.

“

## RSI Article 18a

The same question as in PTI Article 16.