

Subj: **RE: Daytime Running Lights - Contract 2002/S 146-115430 effective ness of DRLs**  
Date: 17/11/2003 15:41:53 GMT Standard Time  
From: [John.Berry@cec.eu.int](mailto:John.Berry@cec.eu.int)  
To: [RoyMilnes@aol.com](mailto:RoyMilnes@aol.com)  
*Sent from the Internet ([Details](#))*

Roy

Good question. Its 5 or 6 watts I think, but anyway about 25% of that of normal dipped beams  
John

Subj: **RE: Daytime Running Lights - Contract 2002/S 146-115430 effective ness of DRLs**  
Date: 17/11/2003 13:39:13 GMT Standard Time  
From: [John.Berry@cec.eu.int](mailto:John.Berry@cec.eu.int)  
To: [RoyMilnes@aol.com](mailto:RoyMilnes@aol.com)  
CC: [antonio.fema@chello.be](mailto:antonio.fema@chello.be), [StephenProwerBMF@compuserve.com](mailto:StephenProwerBMF@compuserve.com)  
*Sent from the Internet ([Details](#))*

Roy

Thanks for that. The idea of retrofitting anything to the passenger car may be a rational solution, but politically (at every level) it would be problematic, so much so that MSs would never support the idea. The special, low intensity DRL is a safe bet for policy, but as you rightly say, the requirement to turn on the dipped beams during the day will cause concerns to associations such as yours and to those living in southern countries where the effect is less than for the north (recognised in the report). Also it could 'suffer' from subsidiarity where the Commission is forced to pen a recommendation (as with blood-alcohol levels) leaving MSs to make up their mind, as several have done already.

I will have a better understanding of all things after the 28th November's presentation. The MC people have been invited but you could come too. It's here in Brussels starting at 10 am. Or I could do an open discussion paper that sets out the pros and possible cons and let all respond to it

John

Subj: **RE: Daytime Running Lights - Contract 2002/S 146-115430 effective ness of DRLs**  
Date: 17/11/2003 09:14:28 GMT Standard Time  
From: [John.Berry@cec.eu.int](mailto:John.Berry@cec.eu.int)  
To: [RoyMilnes@aol.com](mailto:RoyMilnes@aol.com)  
*Sent from the Internet ([Details](#))*

Roy

The report has been released in draft form and will be formally presented to the Commission (i.e. me) at the end of the month.

What the study has done is three things. Firstly, it has accounted for all DRL schemes, worldwide. These range from 'total coverage' in several countries, notably Canada where dedicated DRL was required for new cars and the rest switched on their dipped beam. There is coverage of partial schemes where DRL is required on, say rural roads, and voluntary schemes, as in Switzerland. Also, there is coverage of DRL experience when companies and local authorities went to DRL. Attitude surveys have been conducted in those countries and in all EU and accession countries.

Secondly, all statistical evidence on the effect of DRL, in whatever its form, has been assessed and put on a single statistical basis to come to the conclusion that DRL, overall is a good thing. This section, in order to come to a positive cost-benefit in favour of DRL took as its benefits, the ETSC guide to road accident victim costs, and this is assessed by potential reduction in deaths, serious and slight injury. On the cost side is the effect on:

1. cost of installation of a DRL system on new cars (where this is one of the scenario options considered)
2. cost of replacement bulbs
3. cost of pollution (extra CO, HC, NOX, PM)
4. cost of extra fuel used (about 0.5 to 1%)

## 5. cost of CO2 generated

And the benefit to cost come to 2:1 in the most favoured option, which is to turn on the dipped beams on day one.

The third part was an experiment where hundreds of subjects were shown photographs of a car, with or without dipped beams on (representing a car with DRL). In the photograph was either no other person or vehicle, motor-cycle etc or there was. The respondents had a very short period of time to record if there was something else there or not and then several seconds to tick what the something else was. The study concluded that respondents were both quicker in their response and more accurate when the car had its 'DRL' on. This even occurred where there was a motorcycle with its lights on. The presence of DRL on the car seems to sensitise the 'public' to looking for the DRL and then identifying correctly and quickly what else is there. This seems to suggest that the negative efferent of DRL on cars to vulnerable road users, pedestrians and cyclists/motorcyclists alike, may be over stated.

So, what to do next?

Certainly the Commission has not taken any decision on what to do, how could we when the study has yet to be finalised. However, as the only person here who has read the report, I am inclined to the view that dedicated DRL (low energy lamp that has just been approved by the UN-ECE 'GRE') is a good move for new cars. There may be an issue of rear-end collisions so the new lamp should ideally be front showing only (tail lights not showing and hence non confusion with brake lights). Also, there is a case for an automatic override that turns the DRL off and the main lights/dipped beams on when conditions get cloudy. And a switch that switches the DRL off when the ignition is turned off.

The dedicated DRL is of lower intensity to the dipped beam and so it will not mask the motor-cycle headlights (a problem not confirmed by the study).

The big question will be what to do with the rest of the car park. Ideally they should turn their dipped beams on. However, before any decision is made there will need to be wide consultation, campaigns/publicity etc. And that is what the report recommends.

So, a thought provoking piece of work and one that, if applied, should save at least 5% of road deaths. Given that the pedestrian protection voluntary agreement included DRL and this was put on ice pending the study, it is reasonable to assume that DRL on new cars is a possibility. For the whole of the EU to turn on to their dipped beams will need a great deal of policy consideration, but the evidence does suggest a strongly positive road safety benefit.

John

Subject: **RE: Contract 2002/S 146-115430 effectiveness of DRLs**  
Date: 23/01/2003 10:23:44 GMT Standard Time  
From: [John.Berry@cec.eu.int](mailto:John.Berry@cec.eu.int)  
To: [RoyMilnes@aol.com](mailto:RoyMilnes@aol.com)  
CC: [StephenProwerBMF@compuserve.com](mailto:StephenProwerBMF@compuserve.com), [tbendixson@onetel.net.uk](mailto:tbendixson@onetel.net.uk), [Richard.Thomas@ctc.org.uk](mailto:Richard.Thomas@ctc.org.uk)  
*Sent from the Internet (Details)*

Roy

Just back in the office and I got the 'files' and will at least browse through them before tomorrow's DRL 'kick-off' meeting. Did we set a date for a meeting?

John

>The study contract has been awarded and the 'kick-off' meeting  
>is next week.  
>After which the study should take about two years to complete.  
>If you have  
>relevent data then may I enquire as to what it is?  
>  
>Thanks  
>

>John Berry

Subj: RE: Contract 2002/S 146-115430 effectiveness of DRLs  
Date: 20/01/2003 11:28:10 GMT Standard Time  
From: John.Berry@cec.eu.int  
To: RoyMilnes@aol.com  
Sent from the Internet ([Details](#))

The study contract has been awarded and the 'kick-off' meeting is next week. After which the study should take about two years to complete. If you have relevant data then may I enquire as to what it is?  
Thanks

John Berry

Subj: RE: Contract 2002/S 146-115430 effectiveness of DRLs  
Date: 20/01/2003 06:31:46 GMT Standard Time  
From: [Rene Bastiaans@cec.eu.int](mailto:Rene.Bastiaans@cec.eu.int)  
To: [RoyMilnes@aol.com](mailto:RoyMilnes@aol.com)  
Sent from the Internet ([Details](#))

Dear Roy,  
I'm afraid that I have changed jobs. I am now working on anti-terrorism and aviation security. The DRL study has been taken over by my colleague John Berry ([john.berry@cec.eu.int](mailto:john.berry@cec.eu.int)). I suggest you to contact him.  
Best regards,  
René Bastiaans

**EUROPEAN COMMISSION  
Office of Neil KINNOCK  
Brussels, 30 March 1999**

**B3/PW/lv D(99) 100186-Cm/0294 Ref. 780/9  
Mr. Roy Milnes**

**Dear Mr. Milnes,**

**Thank you for your letter of 8 March in which I note your concerns about the road safety benefits of DRL. The Commission's position on this issue remains that outlined in my last reply to you made on the 27 January 1999.**

**1 have already explained to you that there are differences of opinion about the statistical significance and magnitude of the DRL effect for road users. Our view is that on balance, research results indicate a positive road safety benefit. Following the SWOV report, national studies in Canada and Hungary have provided convincing evidence about the accident reduction effect of DRL.**

**I can refer you to the various reports produced by Transport Canada, an independent review of the official Canadian assessment by Tofflemire and Whitehead published in the Journal of Safety Research 1997, and also the evaluation of DRL in Hungary by Dr Peter Hollo published in Accident Analysis and Prevention in 1998.**

**The Canadian and Hungarian assessments are particularly relevant for Central Europe, and the Canadian exercise included a cost benefit assessment which indicated a slight net benefit, using their valuations of fatalities and injury. I can also inform you that recently General Motors in the USA have produced a report which suggests that their DRL equipped vehicles in the USA were involved in 5% fewer accidents than non DRL equipped vehicles. We are waiting to receive details of this report.**

**I attach a copy of the DRL specification set out in the Official Journal of the European Communities. I hope this helps.**

**Gert-Jan Koopman  
Member of Cabinet**

Enclosed are five pages of regulations but this may be the most interesting to USA members:-

30/07/97 Official Journal of the European Communities No L 203/163

## 7. INTENSITY OF LIGHT

7.1 The intensity of the light emitted by each lamp shall be not less than 400 cd in the axis of reference.

7.2 Outside the reference axis, in each direction corresponding to the points in the light distribution table reproduced annex 3 to this Regulation, the intensity of the light emitted by each lamp shall be not less than the product of the minimum specified in paragraph 7.1 above by the percentage specified in the said table for the direction in question.

7.3 intensity of the light emitted shall be not more than 800 cd in any direction.

7.4 In the case of a lamp containing more than one light source the lamp shall comply with the minimum intensity required when any one light source has failed and when all light sources are illuminated the maximum intensity all not be exceeded.

OJ No L 171, 30. 6. 1997, p. 2S.

Mr Roy Milnes

Dear Mr Milnes,

Mr Kinnock has asked me to thank you for your letter about your doubts on the safety benefits of daytime running lights (DRL).

Since you last wrote raising the issue of headlight glare from the use of DRL, the Commission has consulted with experts from Member States to assess the implications of the SWOV report and to consider how the DRL issue should be taken forward.

In very broad terms, the main point arising from this consultation is that most Member States conclude that road users as a whole benefit from DRL, and a minority conclude that the only significant safety benefit from DRL is when they are activated in poor daylight conditions. There are also differences of opinion about the significance of the overall safety effects of DRL; but this is largely an academic debate and the balance of the evidence is that DRL are beneficial from a casualty reduction point of view. This was confirmed in an exercise in which Member States were asked to evaluate a range of safety measures as a contribution towards the Commission's prioritisation of road safety measures for its road safety programme. I have to tell you that DRL were considered to be a fairly significant measure as they were placed in the top third of all safety measures.

Of course, we accept that there are concerns by some Member States, and groups such as yours, about the safety benefits for vulnerable road users and the implications of additional fuel consumption for the environment. This is complicated by the fact that there are different technical solutions for the adoption of DRL, each of which have different implications for user and social cost. We will need to address these issues before we can decide how to proceed.

Within the Community, Directive 97/28/EC allows for the fitting of DRL to vehicles, although it also allows for their prohibition by Member States. It is unlikely that DRL would be banned in the Community because their technical specification is internationally agreed according to the LJV ECE regulation 87 (set out in 76/758/EEC), which is adopted in the type approval framework directive (97/30/EC). This agreement specifies the intensity of light for DRL and consequently the internationally accepted level of glare from such lights. Unless this level is modified by international agreement there would be no alteration to the specification for DRL.

You raise the issue of glare from DRL already fitted to some car models sold in the UK car market. The manufacturers of these cars necessarily have to comply with the type approval framework which includes a specification for DRL, so I would be very surprised if DRL were being fitted illegally.

It can be argued that the increased conspicuity of motorised vehicles should benefit vulnerable road user safety by increasing their time interval for detecting and avoiding approaching vehicles. But on the other hand, there is a possibility that lit vehicles could mask adjacent vulnerable road users and make them undetectable to approaching vehicles. The net benefit for vulnerable road users depends upon the interaction of these two influences. So far, the balance of the evidence we have seen supports the view that vulnerable road users benefit from DRL, but we accept that there are divergent views on this issue.

In your letter you raise the specific issue of the problem which glaring DRL may cause for drivers suffering from visual fatigue. This is a debatable point, and the potential problem of 'glare' is anyway addressed in the technical specifications which set a maximum light intensity of 800 candelas. The problem of glare is more likely to arise from mis-use of existing lighting systems or incorrect alignment of headlights. The former is a driver behavioural problem, the latter an operational problem which should be detected in vehicle testing procedures.

I should also mention that medical eye experts recently consulted about the medical requirements for the issuing of driving licences within the EU, unanimously agreed that DRL would significantly improve vehicle conspicuity for both vulnerable road users and drivers with impaired vision. An ageing population and the probability that proportionately more people will be using the roads with impaired eyesight reinforces this view.

Gert-Jan Koopman  
Member of Cabinet

**EUROPEAN COMMISSION**

Office of NEIL KINNOCK Member of Cabinet

Brussels,

D(98) 1546/98

12<sup>th</sup> June 1998

Mr Roy Milnes

Dear Mr Milnes,

Mr Kinnock has asked me to thank you for your letter of 14 April on the use of Day Time Running Lights (DRTL).

The Commission is indeed carrying out a detailed review of the research available in this area. For your information, I enclose a copy of the study carried out by the SWOV on the subject. In particular, I would like to draw your attention to the graph on page 4 which illustrates the effectiveness of DRTL according to latitude, as well as to the table on page 148 which indicates the number of accidents and human lives which might be saved.

As already indicated to you by the DETR, discussions are still ongoing in order to fully assess the advantages and disadvantages of such a measure. Some of the concerns you express are in fact being considered, in particular the environmental consequences as well as the impact on vulnerable road users.

However, at this stage, it is impossible to anticipate what the results will be. I would like to add that, even if the study should recommend the introduction of DRTL, the European Commission will not be proposing it as a measure to be taken at the EU level, since this is a matter that falls under Member States' competence.

Gert Jan Koopman

Rue de la Loi 200, **B-1049** BruxellesNVetstraat 200, B-1049 Brussel - Belgium - Office: BREY 09/161

Telephone: direct line (+32-2)299.33.81, switchboard 299.1 1.1 1. Fax: 296.07.49

Telex: COMEU B 21877. Telegraphic address: COMEUR Brussels.