

## **SUMMARY OF RESPONSES - HARMONISED REGISTRATION CERTIFICATE CONSULTATION**

Over 500 consultation documents were issued to interested parties. A copy of the consultation document also appeared on the DVLA Website. 36 responses were received, although many of these were from trade organisations responding on behalf of their members.

The consultation sought views on the inclusion, or otherwise, of voluntary items referred to in the Directive (1999/37/EC). It also posed a number of more general questions –

- Do you agree that impact on business should be kept to a minimum and that it is not necessary to include all voluntary information on the new certificate?

Of those that replied 97.2% agreed, whilst 2.8% disagreed.

- Which voluntary item(s) of vehicle data (not currently shown on the V5) should be shown on the harmonised certificate?

Of the 500 or so consultees contacted, 16 of the 36 replies included suggestions for additional voluntary items of data to be included on the harmonised certificate. The main suggestions raised, plus the percentage of consultees who expressed a preference against the number of consultation documents issued were –

Ownership information	1.8%
Financial interest	0.6%
Vehicle mass	1.2%
Emissions data	0.8%
Sound levels	0.6%

Although the above figures did not provide much weight for inclusion of any of the items, the motor industry were supportive of the inclusion of “environmental” data. This would be useful when vehicles had to cross borders in Europe and may also be of benefit for any future government initiatives on the use of environmental friendly vehicles.

- Do you agree that the vehicle keeper should continue to be shown on the new document?

100% of those that responded were in favour.

- Do you think that in the longer term DVLA should record owners or note financial interest in vehicles?

Of those that replied 88.9% were in favour, whilst 11.1% were opposed.

- What additional security features should be included to make it more difficult for documents to be used fraudulently?

Of the 36 replies received, 11 consultees offered suggestions for additional security features. They were broken down as follows –

Hologram	1.6%
Mandatory mileage	0.2%
Metal strands	0.4%
Photograph of keeper	0.4%

- Do you agree with Government that there is a continuing need for a tight system of registration covering “on hire” certificates when the registration certificate is unavailable?

Of those that replied 97.2% agreed, whilst 2.8% were opposed.

The following organisations responded to the consultation:-

1. AA
2. ABI
3. ACPOS
4. AEA
5. American Car Imports
6. BMF
7. British Association of Removers
8. BVRLA
9. Confederation of Passenger Transport UK
10. Criminal Justice Division/Lord Chancellors Department
11. Durham Constabulary
12. Experian
13. Federation of Small Business
14. Home Office/Property and Road Crime Reduction Unit
15. International Powered Access Federation
16. Justice Department/Scottish Executive Police Division
17. MI Institute
18. N C Consulting
19. Office of Fair Trading Regulatory Review Team
20. Pentagram Motorsports
21. Police Federation of England and Wales
22. Prof. Iwan Davies
23. RAC
24. Richard Hardie (Member of the public)
25. RMIF
26. Road Haulage Association
27. Road Rescue Recovery
28. Scottish Traffic Area
29. Staffordshire Police
30. Strathclyde Police
31. The National Assembly for Wales (Transport Directorate)

32. Transport Research Foundation
33. Volvo Trucks Ltd
34. VSE 2
35. VSE 4