Council of the European Union
General Secretariat

PUBLIC

Interinstitutional files:
2025/0096 (COD)

Brussels, 16 October 2025

WK 13198/2025 ADD 1

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 12452/2/25 REV 2 + ADD 1 + ADD 2
N° Cion doc.:	ST 8259/25 + ADD 1 - 4
Subject:	Proposal for a Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council on the registration documents for vehicles and vehicle registration data recorded in national vehicle registers and repealing Council Directive 1999/37/EC - Revised Presidency compromise - Comments from the Netherlands

Delegations will find, attached, comments from **the Netherlands** on the above-mentioned subject.

PUBLIC

VRD DIRECTIVE - INPUT NL FOLLOWING WP 9 OCTOBER 2025

The Netherlands is happy with many of the changes proposed by the Presidency and believe the proposal is going in the right direction. We particularly welcome the changes related to the legal owner in that the definition has been removed and it has been made optional again.

We still have a few remaining comments/points:

- Inconsistencies between the Vehicle Registration Directive and ELV Regulation text (Council general approach) when it comes to owner/holder
- NL is of the opinion that as a precondition for taking actions on open recalls (e.g. in PTI) OEMs should be obliged to provide information on recalls and all affected VINs.
- NL believes that the word 'inspection' in Article 9(3) on mutual recognition should be changed to 'assessment'

Vehicle Registration Directive (VRD)

Inconsistences owner/holder in ELV and RWP

As mentioned, the Netherlands very much welcomes that the owner has been made optional again in the VRD. We do believe that for consistency purposes, the definition of the vehicle owner in the ELV Regulation (Council General Approach) needs to be changed.

The current formulation[1] refers to the owner or holder '*of the vehicle'*. In the Netherlands, the holder of the vehicle is not a legally established definition, as it is the holder 'of the registration certificate' that is recorded.

The NL (together with France and Germany) is currently proposing some changes to this definition in the ELV-negotiations[2].

This might be a point for the Council Legal Service.

Obligation for OEMs to provide information on recalls and VINs

NL can support the optional nature of checking recalls in PTI (Annex I of the PTI/RSI Directive). NL would consider a proposal for mandatory rejection

[1] "'vehicle owner' means any natural or legal person holding the ownership right of a vehicle [...] or the holder of the [...] vehicle if the owner can not be identified;"

[2] Vehicle owner: means any natural or legal person holding the ownership right of a vehicle or, if the owner cannot be identified, the holder of the vehicle registration certificate or the holder of the vehicle.

Formatted: English (United States)

Formatted: English (United States)

PUBLIC

(based on recalls) to be disproportionate and unfeasible under the current circumstances. Furthermore, NL considers this measure to be partly effective given that most recalls occur for relatively new vehicles before the first PTI is performed (so before four years).

NL would furthermore propose that – as a precondition – OEMs are obliged to provide information on recalls and all affected VINs.

Drafting suggestion for Article 6 (data recorded in vehicle registers):

(h) data regarding vehicles, systems, components, separate technical units, parts and equipment that are not in conformity or that present a serious risk as provided by manufacturers, importers and/or distributors as provided for in Article 14, 17 and 19 of Regulation (EU) 2018/858.

- **Article 9 (3) (mutual recognition)**

The notion of “inspections” is connected to PTI. PTI is not the correct instrument prior to re-registration, this should be carried out by the approval authority, hence our suggestion to replace ”inspections” by “assessments”.