



Annex 20

(WP 06 – Del 22)

Case study on an EU-wide introduced VET scheme



Project title:

Professional driving – more than just driving!

Project number:

510074-2010-LLP-DE-LEONARDO-LMP

Grant agreement:

2010-3458

Sub-programme or KA:

Leonardo da Vinci/ DoI



Case Study:
**Directive 2003/59/EC – standardising vocational education and training
for professional drivers in Europe: impact of standardisation
in vocational education and training**
(publication pending)

Deliverable:	No. 22	Version:	Final
WP:	6	Last update:	20 February 2013
Prepared by:	Tanja Bacher, Sigrid Nindl		
With contributions from:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Peter Klingler, DEKRA Albasafe Akademie Kft. (HU)• Claudia Ball, Tanja Buchsdrücker, Benedikt Schimmelpfennig & Malte Stamer, DEKRA Akademie GmbH (DE)• Joanna Buchert & Nils Petermann, ITB (DE)• James Tillyer, FTA (UK)• Catarina Boschi, TkFormazione (IT)• Hans Konings & John van Rijn, VTL (NL)• Pablo Vidal & Amaia San Cristobal Macho, ASIMAG (ES)• Tanja Bacher & Simone Kunz, 3s research laboratory (AT)		
For further information on the project please consult:	www.project-profdrv.eu		
For further information on the paper please contact:	tanja.bacher@3s.co.at		

Zusammenfassung:

Dieser Artikel diskutiert die Auswirkungen eines von der EU eingeführten standardisierten Aus- und Weiterbildungsstandards anhand der Erfahrungen, die mit der Richtlinie 2003/59/EG über die Grundqualifikation und Weiterbildung von BerufskraftfahrerInnen gemacht wurden. Die Richtlinie sollte in erster Linie zur Verbesserung der Straßensicherheit beitragen und einem FahrerInnenmangel, welcher sich in vielen europäischen Ländern zunehmend abzeichnet, entgegenwirken. Die Auswirkungen der Richtlinie wurden im Zuge des ProfDRV Projekts genauer untersucht, diese Fallstudie basiert auf den Projektergebnissen.

Im ersten Teil der Fallstudie werden Instrumente zur Standardisierung/besseren Vergleichbarkeit europäischer (Berufs-)Bildungssysteme in den Mitgliedsstaaten der europäischen Union diskutiert: Zum Einen wird hier auf den generellen Ablauf bei der Entwicklung und Umsetzung von Richtlinien eingegangen und zum Anderen werden relevante Richtlinien und Empfehlungen der Europäischen Kommission in der Berufsbildung reflektiert. Im Rahmen des ProfDRV Projekts wurde die Umsetzung der Richtlinie 2003/59/EG in sieben europäischen Ländern untersucht (Deutschland, Großbritannien, Italien, Niederlande, Österreich, Spanien und Ungarn). Die Projektergebnisse werden im vorliegenden Artikel anhand einer SWOT Analyse analysiert und diskutiert. Aufbauend auf diesen Erkenntnissen werden Schlussfolgerungen und Empfehlungen für die Weiterentwicklung der Richtlinie 2003/59/EG sowie für die Entwicklung neuer Richtlinien, die auf die Einführung EU-weit einheitlicher Aus- und Weiterbildungssysteme abzielen, beschrieben.

Summary:

This Case Study discusses the implications of the introduction of a common European VET standard for the initial qualification and periodic training of professional drivers, considering the experiences acquired from directive 2003/59/EC. The directive aims to improve road safety and should contribute to tackling the issue of professional driver shortages which is common around Europe. The impact of the directive was further investigated in the course of the ProfDRV project, and this case study is based on the results of that initiative.

The case study discusses instruments for standardising educational policies within the member states of the European Union (EU) by reflecting on the development and implementation of directives in the EU in general, and by assessing/evaluating relevant directives and recommendations in the field of VET. In the ProfDRV project the implementation of directive 2003/59/EC has been investigated in 7 European countries (Austria, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Netherlands, Spain and UK). The project findings are analysed and discussed through a SWOT analysis of the results. Conclusions and recommendations for the further development of directive 2003/59/EC, and for the development of new directives that aim to introduce EU-common VET standards, are formulated based on these findings.

Introduction

The road freight and passenger transport sector provides jobs for more than 5 million EU-citizens (Statistical Pocketbook, 2012, p. 24) and since 1976 (Council Directive 76/914/EEC) professional driver training has been considered an official matter of European interest. In the past several decades qualification requirements have increased fundamentally for professional drivers due to changes in work organisation, new technical standards, changing legal regulations, market requirements and work environments, as well as the rapid internationalisation of the transport market. These developments contrast with low levels of professional driver qualification and the absence of a "learning" culture that is characteristic of this occupation over almost all of Europe, and which leads both to an alarming shortage of qualified drivers that possess qualifications required by employers and a negative sector image. As the qualification of professional drivers is considered to be an important factor with regard to road safety and highly relevant for all EU member states DG Energy and Transport introduced directive 2003/59/EC in July 2003, which regulates common basic and continuous training for professional drivers.

The Leonardo da Vinci project *'Professional Driving – more than just driving!: Qualification requirements and vocational training for professional drivers in Europe'* investigated existing vocational training schemes for this occupation in 7 countries (Austria, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Netherlands, Spain and the United Kingdom) from a vocational education and training (VET) and lifelong learning (LLL) perspective. Furthermore, a core job profile has been defined for professional drivers, and European quality standards for initial and periodic VET for drivers that take into account the requirements of the European Qualifications Framework (EQF) have been drafted.

This case study draws conclusions from the project findings and develops recommendations for the further development of directive 2003/59. It also presents recommendations on what should be considered when introducing a common EU VET standard. The first section of the study (*'European Instruments for standardising (vocational) educational policies'*) addresses the development and implementation of directives in the European Union in general, and in relation to directives and recommendations in the field of (vocational) education and training in particular. Furthermore, the embeddedness of such directives and the wider European vocational education policy context is discussed. In the second section the implementation approaches identified in the seven investigated countries are presented and four types of implementation approaches are derived from this examination. The core of the third section builds a SWOT analysis of the implementation of directive 2003/59 in the investigated countries. On the basis of the outcomes of the SWOT analysis in section 4 limits and possibilities of directive 2003/59/EC are discussed. In section 5 general conclusions are drawn on what should be taken into consideration in the development and implementation of other Europe-wide common VET schemes.

(1) European instruments for standardising (vocational) education policies

In the Maastricht Treaty (1992) the European Union codified that *'the Community shall implement vocational training policy which shall support and supplement the action of the member states, while fully respecting the responsibility of the member states for the content and organization of vocational training'* (European Union, 1992). Thus, the Maastricht Treaty codified the subsidiary principle: it encouraged cooperation between the member states, but only in supporting and complementing policy action on national level, *'while further respecting their responsibility for the content of education, the structure of education systems, and their cultural linguistic diversity'* (Huisman & van der Wende, 2004, p. 1). The European Union (EU) has developed several instruments for standardising educational policies within the member states. In the following sub-sections the development and implementation of directives as one of these instruments is addressed, and several directives and recommendations that are designed to standardise educational policies in the EU and make them more comparable are discussed.

(1.1) Development and implementation of directives in the European Union

European secondary legislation comprises the binding legal instruments (regulations, directives and decisions) and the non-binding instruments (resolutions and opinions) entrenched in the European Treaty on Functioning of EU States (EUR-Lex¹). In Article 288 of the Treaty, which builds the constitutional basis of the European Union, the EU establishes that *'to exercise the Union's competences, the institutions shall adopt regulations, directives, decisions, recommendations and opinions'* (Official Journal of the European Union C83, p. 171-172). A regulation is generally directly applicable in all member states and binding in its entirety; a directive is binding with regard the result to be achieved in each member state to which it is addressed, but the choice of form and method taken to meet these objectives is the responsibility of national authorities. In contrast, a decision is binding in its entirety, if a decision is addressed to specific member states, its stipulations are specifically applicable to those to which it is addressed, and is binding only to them. Finally, recommendations and opinions have no binding force, and can be seen more as suggestions (ibid.).

In this regard the main aim of directives is to standardise national legislation of member states and to enhance comparability between different legislation. Directives are flexible instruments and member states addressed by directives have sole responsibility for implementing and anchoring the European policy principles defined in a directive in national legislation. When a new directive is developed, typically a draft is prepared by the European Commission following consultation with relevant stakeholders at national and European levels in order to guarantee the practical relevance of the directive. Following the finalisation of a draft directive the Council of Ministers, the Commission, and the European Parliament launch a public consultation period. In this process, the draft directive is published and the general public is invited to discuss the content. This consultation period should last no more than eight weeks commencing from when draft papers are first published (cf. Eurim Briefing No 26, May 1999). Following this public consultation process the directive is, if necessary, reviewed and adapted and is subsequently presented to the Parliament and the Council for approval. If the directive is adopted member states are required to issue national implementation measures and to incorporate the directive into national law to meet a deadline specified in the directive (cf. Europa – Summaries of EU Legislation).

(1.2) Directives and recommendations in (vocational) education policy

Several European directives and recommendations have been passed since the Treaty on Functioning of EU member states was established. Of particular relevance for this study are those directives and recommendations that are designed to standardise and align specific qualifications and/or training programmes within the European Union.

Directive 2003/59/EC on the initial qualification and periodic training of drivers of certain road vehicles for the carriage of goods or passengers provides the European framework for a common minimum level of training for professional drivers. It requires new professional drivers to attain an initial vocational qualification and/or pass a related test and to attend 35 hours of periodic training related to professional driving every five years. Following completion of this initial qualification and periodic training a Certificate of Professional Competence (CPC) is issued. The content and duration of training are defined by the EC directive and at the time of writing the majority of EU countries have transferred this directive into national law in accordance with EU requirements. Before the establishment of directive 2003/59/EC, only in the Netherlands and France were additional training requirements necessary for professional drivers besides the driving licence (Ministry of Transport, Public Health and Water management 2010). Although the aim of the directive is to implement similar initial and periodic training for professional drivers and thus, is an attempt to harmonise (*although preferably called 'convergence'*)² vocational

¹ Cf. http://eur-lex.europa.eu/en/droit_communaire/droit_communaire.htm#1.3 [accessed 05.01.2012].

² As termed by Huisman; van der Wende, 2004, p. 349.

education and training for professional drivers within the European member states, the directive was created under the pretence of enhancing road safety and attracting people to work as professional drivers.

The initial steps of the harmonisation of road transport in Europe were taken in 1976 when the **Council directive 76/916/EEC** on the minimum level of training for road transport drivers was established. In 1985 the European Union issued **Council regulation No 3820/85** on the harmonisation of certain social legislation relating to road transport, including regulation on the minimum age of drivers in the European Union, maximum periods of driving time, as well as requirements on break and resting periods. Furthermore, **directive 91/439/EEC** and successive related EU legal instruments related to driving licences developed the specification of the European Driving License and regulation of driving licenses of all categories within the European Union also contributing to the harmonisation of road transportation in Europe. Directive 2003/59/EC on the initial qualification and periodic training of drivers of certain road vehicles for the carriage of goods or passengers amended Council regulation No 3820/85 and Council directive 91/439/EEC, and repealed directive 76/916/EEC (European Parliament; Council of the European Union, 2005). As mentioned above, the intention behind the development of directive 2003/59 was to establish a minimum standard for driver training in Europe: *'More particularly, the obligation to hold an initial qualification and to undergo periodic training is intended to improve road safety and the safety of the driver, including during operations carried out by the driver while the vehicle is stopped. Furthermore, the modern nature of the profession of drivers should arouse young people's interest in the profession, contributing to the recruitment of new drivers at a time of shortage'* (European Parliament; Council of the European Union, 2003 (5), p.2). Although directives in the freight transport sector may have an impact on reducing the shortage of qualified personnel, it is difficult to assess whether those measures have a positive impact on reducing driver shortages, since directives may also lead to an increase in both demand and supply. Measures for solving the problem of shortage of qualified drivers *'should follow a holistic, coordinated and targeted approach directed at both the demand and supply side, with coherent and coordinated efforts at all levels - European, national, local - involving different actors and stakeholders (social partners, transport and education policy-makers)'* (Directorate General, 2009, p.101).

Directive 2005/36 on the mutual recognition of Professional Qualifications made provisions whereby professionals qualified in one member state can seek professional recognition of their qualifications in another member state for the purpose of practising their profession in that respective state. This directive applies only where the profession in question is regulated in the member state in which the profession is practiced, that is where the practice of the profession is confined to persons who hold specific qualifications or registration/recognition from a specific competent authority or professional body by law, regulation, or administrative procedure (Department of Education and Skills). In June 2011 the European Commission released a Green Paper for the revision of the directive on the Recognition of Professional Qualifications; the formal consultation process led to a proposal for modernising directive 2005/36/EC which was subsequently adopted by the European Commission in December 2011.³

In 2008 the European Parliament issued the recommendation on a **European Qualification Framework (EQF)**. This initiative expresses the conviction that the development and recognition of citizens' knowledge, skills, and competence are crucial for the development of individuals, competitiveness, employment, and social cohesion in the Community. Such development and recognition should facilitate transnational mobility for workers and learners and contribute to meeting the requirements of supply and demand in the European labour market. Access to and participation in lifelong learning for all EU citizens, including disadvantaged groups, and the use of qualifications should therefore be promoted and improved at national and Community levels (European Parliament; Council of the European Union, 2008).

³ Cf. <http://www.efpa.eu/news/proposal-for-modernising-the-professional-qualifications-directive> [accessed 20.06.2012].

With the 2009 recommendation on the establishment of a **European Credit System for Vocational Education and Training (ECVET)** the European Commission attempted to create a system which would encourage vocational mobility of both trainees and professionals (European Parliament; Council of the European Union, 2009).

(1.3) European policies to foster and standardise vocational education and training

All of these directives, regulations, and recommendations reflect the wider political strategy of the European Union to enhance transparency and comparability of VET systems. This is necessary because of the diversity of vocational education and training systems in Europe, which is due to differing national traditions and institutional logics.

The Lisbon Strategy (2000) has had a central role within European education policy and put focus on the development and advancement of high-quality vocational education and training in order for the EU to become the *'most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy in the world, capable of sustainable economic growth with more and better jobs and greater social cohesion'* (cf. Council and EC, 2002). The subsequent Copenhagen declaration (2002) initiated a process of closer cooperation in vocational education and training (VET) in Europe involving governments, social partners, and EU institutions. The social partners in particular were given a crucial role in the development, validation, and recognition of vocational competences and qualifications (ibid.). *'The Copenhagen Process aims at a convergence of VET policies in Europe whilst at the same time respecting the diversity of national systems'* (Cort, 2011, p. 66). The Maastricht communiqué (2004) established action plans at national level to increase investment in VET as well as the flexibility of VET systems to enable them to react more efficiently and quickly to the needs of the labour market. The Helsinki communiqué (2006) confirmed these goals but drew more attention to initial vocational education and training with the aim of reducing youth unemployment rates and ensuring that VET delivers a skills base relevant for working life (Council and EC, 2006). The subsequent Bordeaux Communiqué (2008) proposed four priorities for future action: promoting cooperation in VET at national and European level, enhancing the quality and attractiveness of VET, fostering European cooperation arrangements, and improving the links between VET and the labour market in vocational education and training (Council and EC, 2008). The 2010 Bruges Communiqué stated that national VET systems need to be connected to the wider world in order to remain relevant and competitive, and focused on the implementation and added value of transparency tools (e.g. EQF, ECVET) (Council and EC, 2010). The Europe 2020 strategy was a reaction to the challenges posed by the economic crisis and aims to help foster *'smart, sustainable and inclusive growth'* (EC, 2010). The strategy is comprised of five strategic goals, advanced by seven flagship initiatives. These include the 'Youth on the move' initiative to enhance the performance of education systems and facilitate the entry of young people to the labour market, and the 'Agenda for new skills and jobs' which attempts to increase labour market participation and develop a better match between labour market supply and demand (ibid., 4).⁴

The road freight transport sector represents 45.8% of total EU goods transportation (the remaining transportation of goods is transported through the following means: intra-EU maritime transport: 36.9%; rail: 10.2%; inland waterways: 3.8%; oil pipelines: 3.1%; and intra-EU air transport: 0.1%) (Statistical Pocketbook, 2012, p. 19). The transport industry directly employs more than 10 million people, accounting for 4.5% of total employment and representing 4.6% of Gross Domestic Product (GDP), in the European Union (Eurostat)⁵, and it is clear that better quality training, enhanced mobility, and improving the image of professional drivers are important issues on the European policy agenda. Furthermore, the attempts of directive 2003/59/EC to increase the interest of young people in professional driving are understandable when considering a 2012 Manpower study that ranked professional drivers 7th in a global list of the top ten most difficult positions to fill for employers. The results of this

⁴ Cf. Cedefop, 2013, forthcoming.

⁵ http://ec.europa.eu/transport/strategies/facts-and-figures/all-themes/index_en.htm [accessed 22.11.2012].

study in fact suggested that the problem of shortages of professional drivers is increasing - in the Manpower Talent Shortage Survey of 2010, professional drivers occupied 9th position on the list.

(2) Implementation of directive 2003/59/EC in the investigated countries

As mentioned above directives are very flexible instruments that require member states to achieve a particular result without determining the method of doing so. Therefore, very different approaches have been identified in the investigated countries with regard to the implementation of directive 2003/59/EC. In the course of the ProfDRV project country case studies based on desk research and expert interviews with relevant stakeholders were conducted for Austria, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Netherlands, Spain and the United Kingdom.

In **Austria** directive 2003/59/EC was legally anchored in 2006 with the Federal Law Gazette BGBl I Nr. 153/2006; detailed provisions for implementing Directive 2003/59/EC were issued in 2008 by the Federal Ministry for Transport, Innovation and Technology with the Federal Law Gazette BGBl II Nr. 139/2008. Although the Federal Ministry for Transport is responsible for introducing Directive 2003/59/EC in Austria, the nine provinces are responsible for implementation. Austria has elected to use the test-only option for the initial qualification and all truck drivers who received their license after 9 September 2009 must complete initial qualification. Those drivers with a license issued before 9 September 2009 must participate in 35 hours of periodic training every five years. The three-year apprenticeship training programme in professional driving exists in parallel, and those that pass the final apprenticeship exam obtain the initial qualification for the Certificate of Professional Driving (CPC) (marked with Code 95 in the driving license) alongside their apprenticeship diploma.

Germany implemented the directive into German law with the Professional Driver Qualification Law (BKrFQG) in 2006. The BKrFQG is considered part of traffic and driving license law in Germany and on the regional level is administered by the chambers of commerce in terms of initial qualification / training, and by the ministries of traffic in terms of periodic training. Germany also chose to use the test-only approach, but also offers the option of an accelerated initial qualification consisting of 140 hours training and a test. The formal public apprenticeship scheme for professional driver initial vocational education and training exists in parallel, but those passing through this system obtain the driver CPC as required by the directive alongside their skilled worker certificate.

In **Hungary** two VET schemes existed for professional drivers before the implementation of directive 2003/59/EC. The first scheme was a mandatory initial training programme for professional drivers. The second, the OKJ-education (*'Országos Képzési Jegyzék'*), which is part of Hungary's national qualification framework (NQF) and linked to the Ministry of Education, consists of 600 hours of training (70% theory; 30% practice). The first VET programme was replaced by the CPC, while the OKJ scheme remains but is not linked to the driver CPC and has very few participants. By order of the Ministry of Transport the National Transport Authority (NKH) is responsible for the implementation of the directive in Hungary. Hungary has also opted for the test-only option, although the NKH recommends a training programme of 5 days for the CPC, just as it was handled in the system that was replaced by the CPC. A characteristic of the Hungarian implementation approach is that periodic training includes testing procedures after the 35 hours of training.

The competent authority responsible for implementation of the directive in **Italy** is the Government and its Ministry of Transport. The implementation of the directive led to a new professional certificate in Italy known as the *'Carta di Qualificazione del Conducente'* (CQC)⁶. In terms of national qualification, CQC is now an essential requirement in order to work as a professional driver. Italy has chosen the training and test options with the completion of 140 or 280 hours of training required to receive the initial qualification; the CQC is issued following the completion of training and passing of the test. Before the implementation of the directive Italy had no vocational education and training scheme for professional drivers aside from the national driving license.

⁶ Which is the equivalent of the Certificate of Professional Competence (CPC) as termed in the directive.

In the **Netherlands** compulsory training for road transport drivers was introduced in 1975 in order to improve the skills and quality of drivers. Consequently each driver operating a truck with a total laden weight that exceeds 7.5 tonnes must hold a CPC, a certificate of professional competence. The Ministry of Transport, Public Works and Water Management is responsible for the implementation of the directive. The directive was legally implemented with the *'Regeling Rijbewijzen'* (Driving License regulation) and its stipulations were integrated into the existing system. The Netherlands have chosen the test-only option for the initial qualification which is issued with Code 95 in the driving license.

Spain legally anchored the directive in national law with Royal Decree 1032/2007. The implementation of the directive and its initial qualification has led to the creation of a new certificate - the *'Certificado de Aptitud profesional'* (CAP)⁷, obtained after training and test options with 140 or 280 hours of training. The implementation of the directive has led to considerable changes in vocational education and training for professional drivers in Spain. Firstly, the requirements of the directive led to the development of a training system for drivers that did not exist before the implementation process began. Secondly, the directive led to the introduction of a new technical certificate (medium degree) on driving road transport vehicles which is offered on secondary level (ISCED 3-b) and comprises 2.000 hours of training (Royal Decree 555/2012) in 2012. Whereas the CAP (CPC) is not integrated in the Spanish National Catalogue of Professional Qualifications (CNCP), the new technical certificate introduced in 2012 is part of the national qualification system⁸ (cf. Ministro de Educación, Cultura y Deporte, 18.04.2012).

Before the establishment of directive 2003/59/EC professional drivers in the **United Kingdom** were subject to training during their initial driving test and subsequently at the discretion of employers only. The government Department for Transport has established an official body (JAUPT) responsible for the management and accreditation of periodic training standards. Since initial qualification is obtained through the test-only option in the course of the vocational driving licence test, the DSA (Driving Standards Agency) is responsible for initial qualification. In the UK there is a slight cross-over between periodic training and the National Vocational Qualification, although this is not considered to be ideal.

Four implementation approaches used in the investigated countries can be identified from the results of the country case studies.

- **Integration of the directive into the existing system:** An existing IVET scheme is adapted to meet the requirements of the directive. The best example of this was found in the Netherlands where the driver CPC was integrated in the previously existing VET scheme for professional drivers.
- **Directive opens a new parallel system to the existing VET system:** An IVET scheme for professional drivers existed before implementation of the directive. Implementation of the directive creates a new system, unconnected with the existing system. The best example of this was found in Hungary, where an existing mandatory initial training programme for drivers was replaced by the directive; in addition a second VET scheme exists in parallel with no reference to the CPC.
- **Combination of existing and new systems:** An IVET scheme for professional drivers existed before directive 2003/59/EC. The directive opened a new system, but this new system is partly integrated into the existing system that runs in parallel to the new system. This is the case in Austria and Germany where alongside a driving license a three-year apprenticeship training programme option of qualification exists for professional drivers. In both countries the apprenticeship diploma (skilled-workers-certificate) is

⁷ Which is the equivalent of the Certificate of Professional Competence (CPC) as termed in the directive.

⁸ Currently discussions are ongoing in Spain on the possibility of linking the driver CPC (CAP) with the profile on professional driving in the national qualification Catalogue.

recognised as initial qualification as foreseen in the CPC. The difference between this and the approaches mentioned above is that only the initial qualification for CPC is integrated in the apprenticeship training whereas periodic training runs in parallel to the existing system.

- **Directive leads to the development of a new system:** There is no IVET scheme for professional drivers before the implementation of directive 2003/59. Implementation of the directive is accompanied by the establishment of a new scheme. This is the case in Italy, Spain, and the UK where aside from the driving license no specific education and training programmes existed for drivers before the implementation of the directive, apart from some isolated training courses (e.g. ADR). In comparison to the UK and Italy, which have implemented education and training schemes almost identical to the recommendations of the directive, Spain has taken the directive as a foundation for the development of a new education and training programme on upper secondary level, but which as yet is not linked to the CPC (CAP).

The analysis shows that there are very heterogeneous approaches to implementation of the directive within the investigated countries. Although every country works to the same common European directive, because EU member states are free to determine the way in which the driver CPC is integrated into their national systems there are many commonalities, but even more differences between approaches. Therefore, in the following section strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats of directive 2003/59/EC implementation are presented and discussed.

(3) Directive 2003/59/EC – SWOT analyses of the implementation

Little research has been conducted on the effectiveness of directives in general, and even less on the effectiveness of directive 2003/59/EC in particular.⁹ Consequently, in the ProfDRV project a SWOT analysis – analysing strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats - of directive 2003/59/EC was conducted in order to assess helpful or harmful factors and to derive recommendations for future directives in the field of VET.

The SWOT analysis is a method of systematically analysing a given situation and can assist in the development of informed recommendations (Chen & Brunneski, p. 1). Developed in the 1960's the SWOT method was originally used to analyse business environments, but was developed further and today is applicable also to other contexts. The SWOT analysis aims to identify the strengths and weaknesses and the opportunities and threats of directive 2003/59/EC. The strengths of the directive are attributes that are considered to be helpful while weaknesses are attributes considered harmful. Opportunities refer to factors that can assist the directive in achieving its objective, whereas the threats are factors that hinder the directive in attaining its goals (ibid.).

The first element of the following SWOT analysis is the strengths of the directive and its implementation into the national systems. The primary questions on strengths include: *'What are the advantages of the directive?'* *'What works well?'* *'What are innovative aspects of the directive in the view of relevant stakeholders, policy makers, training providers, and drivers to whom the directive is addressed?'* Secondly, the weaknesses of directive 2003/59/EC are examined, investigating: *'What are the disadvantages of the directive?'* *'What does not work so well?'* *'What are negative effects of the directive?'* The investigation of strengths and weaknesses allows for the assessment of opportunities, which include any favourable condition that could improve directive 2003/59/EC. Issues examined include: *'What are possibilities?'* *'What could be achieved by means of the directive?'* *'What could be results of the directive?'* *'What should be improved in order to achieve the expected outcomes?'* When analysing opportunities it is useful to consider the strengths and assess whether these offer any opportunities. The last element of the SWOT analysis is the identification of threats, including: *'What are obstacles faced?'* *'What is*

⁹ The recently published EC report on the implementation of directive 2003/59/EC relating to the initial qualification and periodic training of drivers must be noted here.

threatening the expected outcomes of the directive? Finally, the fact that what may be perceived as a strength from one perspective may be regarded as a weakness from another, and that a weakness could simultaneously represent an opportunity, must also be considered.

The SWOT analysis is based on the country studies developed in the ProfDRV project and on 70 interviews conducted with relevant experts, representatives of training providers, professional drivers, employers, representatives of social partners, representatives of ministries etc.

In the following table the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats identified in the implementation of directive 2003/59/EC in the investigated countries are presented. The strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats are indicated for the macro level (European, national and regional level), meso level (training providers, companies, industries etc.), and micro level (drivers).

(3.1) SWOT Analysis on implementation of directive 2003/59/EC

Strengths

Macro Level

- addressing differences in VET for drivers in EU Member States
- aligning educational policies for drivers within the European Union
- Common minimum education standard for drivers in Europe
- Establishing systematic training for drivers
- Flexible instrument can be adapted to national contexts and integrated into the national VET system

Meso Level

- Consultation processes with national stakeholders during implementation in some countries
- Separation of training and test can improve quality of training providers
- Through directive employers are able to better estimate what a driver is able to do

Micro level

- Minimum training requirements for drivers
- Improved image of drivers
- Increasing number of drivers following training
- Soft skills (communication or interpersonal skills) are also considered alongside technical skills

Weaknesses

Macro level

- Flexibility leads to different implementation approaches (lack of comparability)
- Significant differences in the application of the directive among the countries
- National level: different responsible authorities (national governments, provincial governments)
- Government level: Different responsible authorities (Ministry of Transport or Ministry of Education, or sharing of responsibilities)
- Different training measures within a single country (federalism)
- Existing measures (e.g. apprenticeship, VET programmes for drivers) have not been considered
- Different deadlines for the implementation of the directive in the investigated countries
- Driving licences issued before a certain date have been automatically converted into CPCs without any further training
- CPC is not regarded as qualification and thus cannot be aligned to National and European Qualification Frameworks
- Directive is unable to combat the absence of a learning culture in the sector
- More diversity rather than comparability

Meso level

- Directive often does not meet needs of employers (labour market relevance)
- Not enough participation of relevant stakeholders in developing and implementing the directive
- It is disputed if test-only option does lead to more qualified drivers since there are no training measures required; kind of status-quo with just a test as driving licence
- Periodic training mostly conducted only on a theoretical basis (since not specified in directive)
- No funds for training providers to cover expenses to implement training courses

Micro level

- No funds for trainees to participate in the training measure in most countries
- The CPC does not automatically mean that a driver is executing his job competently
- So far measure has had no impact on geographical mobility of drivers in Europe
- New rules set by the directive are often perceived as an additional burden / hindering obstacle without real benefit for drivers
- Expected driver shortage could increase, because of the entry threshold created by directive

Opportunities

Macro level

- Aligning / making more comparable vocational education and training in Europe
- Increased road safety and safety of the driver
- Better comparability of training for drivers and driver qualifications within Europe
- learning-outcome-approach could enhance transparency, comparability and recognition of knowledge, skills, and competences of drivers
- Mutual recognition of qualifications achieved in another member state
- Linkage of directive with other European instruments (EQF, ECVET)

Meso level

- Through learning outcomes based approach (knowledge, skills and competences) employers could better estimate what a driver is able to do
- Skills needs of the industries could be integrated; considering labour market needs

Micro level

- Minimum adequate training requirements for drivers
- increasing number of qualified drivers
- increasing mobility of newly trained drivers

Threats

Macro level

- Absence of training infrastructure in some countries
- Different costs of training measures in the member states (distortion of competition)
- Different implementation approaches in the member states (character of a directive) and even within one country (federalism)
- Directive in most cases is not integrated into the national VET system which often leads to establishment of parallel systems
- Mutual recognition of parts of periodic training completed in another European country is not regulated in the directive
- Requirements for CPC are lower than VET for drivers in some countries (e.g. skilled-worker-certificate)
- Directive does not follow an educational approach, but rather an administrative approach
- Directive replaced training measures that were effective in some countries (now just requirements of directive)
- Expected training hold-up until the very end of deadlines

Meso level

- Training infrastructure available is in some cases inadequate (e.g. driving schools); quality suffers
- Better qualification for professional drivers, but almost no career opportunities for drivers
- Often well trained drivers have no added value for companies (raises salaries etc.), VET is often not required
- Often employers are not interested in more comparability of the qualification of professional drivers, because drivers are not supposed to work abroad (with exception of cross-border traffic)
- Participation in other VET schemes (e.g. apprenticeship) could decrease, because CPC is easier and faster to acquire
- Employers agree that the CPC is just a limited measure against driver shortage

Micro level

- In some countries drivers are responsible for acquiring the CPC (costs and time), not employers, could lead to a decrease in drivers
- Directive has not yet had effects on enhanced geographical mobility of professional drivers
- Drivers are not interested in more comparability of their professional standards (nor in working abroad)
- Measure is often perceived by drivers as not having any impact on their actual abilities

The SWOT analysis identifies a number of strengths and demonstrates several positive aspects of directive 2003/59/EC. This applies on the micro (*improved image and qualification level of drivers*) and the macro level (*standardisation of educational policies for drivers, set-up of a minimum qualification standard for drivers all over Europe*). The flexible character of a directive offers *room for interpretation and could facilitate a smooth transposition into the national VET systems*. However, the research also shows that the *nature of a directive leads to the development of further differing systems in Europe (and even within a single country)*. In some countries *parallel tracks in the existing VET systems* have been opened whereas in other countries the directive has led to the *creation of an entirely new system*. This fosters the perception that it is not possible to enhance comparability and transparency of the driver qualification amongst Europe and improve mutual recognition of driver qualifications through the implementation of the directive.

The *consultation of relevant stakeholders*, including drivers and employers, in some countries as part of the implementation process can be considered a strength of the directive. However, the analysis also shows that the majority of stakeholders believe that they were unable to participate in the development and implementation of the directive in an efficient manner. The weaknesses are two-sided: they relate to the *character of a directive* and to the *content of the directive* in particular (options for initial qualification, no guidelines for how to conduct trainings, etc.).

One principal opportunity of the directive is that *it could contribute to increasing comparability, transferability and mutual recognition* of driver qualifications by establishing minimum training requirements for driver training in Europe. This could be achieved through the use of an output- rather than an input-oriented approach. If learning outcome based descriptions of the knowledge, skills, and competence of drivers that have completed the CPC were the criteria universally used throughout the EU to indicate the abilities of professional drivers, it would be far easier to link the directive to other European Instruments i.e. EQF and ECVET.

When implemented appropriately the directive could *provide drivers with the knowledge, skills, and competences* necessary to work as a professional driver and could *facilitate the process of standardising vocational education and training* requirements for professional drivers in Europe. Whether this goal can be achieved by the means of the directive is very much dependent upon the *quality of the implementation process*, e.g. if and how the directive was integrated into existing VET schemes. Stakeholders consulted on the directive are sceptical and generally doubt that it is an adequate instrument that can achieve the expected outcomes. Often the directive is perceived as an *additional burden* for drivers and some interviewees even stated that the *directive does not have any impact on the quality and competences of the driver*. Furthermore, in countries which have chosen the *test-only option*, the criticism can be levelled that the *initial qualification is not accompanied by training* and therefore, driver training effectively maintains a status quo, but with an additional test.

(4) Limits and possibilities of directive 2003/59/EC

The SWOT analysis has shown that the directive possesses several strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats; that there could be additional strengths and opportunities as well as weaknesses and threats that were not identified in the SWOT analysis must also be taken into consideration. In this section, limits and possibilities of directive 2003/59/EC for enhancing the comparability of VET for drivers in Europe are discussed based on the result of the SWOT analysis.

(4.1) Common minimum educational standard for drivers in Europe

Directives are important instruments in the attempt to standardise different policies within the European Union; with directive 2003/59/EC a step was taken towards the establishment of a common minimum educational standard for drivers which could enhance the comparability and mutual recognition of training for professional

drivers in Europe. The introduction of a compulsory VET programme for professional drivers through directive 2003/59/EC represents the best form of action for improved comparability and transparency in driver's VET. However, because countries are free to decide on the way in which CPC is implemented into their national systems, the directive has led to many commonalities, but many more differences between the countries in the approaches taken in this regard. The major similarities concern those factors directly regulated by directive 2003/59/EC, such as the content to be addressed in initial qualification and defined in annex 1 of the directive, or the duration of training. But beyond this regulated framework approaches to implementation of directive 2003/59/EC differ greatly. Major differences can be noted in relation to the handling of periodic training. The Netherlands and UK, for example, allow a high degree of flexibility in the choice of topics (in the UK almost 2,500 and in the Netherlands approximately 200 training courses are currently approved), whereas in other investigated countries there is strong regulation of the topics to be covered through the definition of a fixed set of topics within given timeframes. Further differences can be found in the requirements on training providers and trainers, on the assurance of training quality, and on the way assessment is implemented. Although all implementation approaches comply with the provisions of the directive, different specifications lead to major differences in implementation and, consequently, in the actual results of training. This in turn causes the directive to have little impact on improving the comparability of professional driver training in Europe. Furthermore, organisation of training and the didactical approaches applied within training vary widely.¹⁰

The flexibility and space for diversity offered by directive 2003/59/EC regarding implementation at national level is considered to be a strength of the directive, as it allows the members states to embed the directive into national law based on their national legislation, vocational education and training systems and overall national circumstances. Unfortunately, only a limited number of member states have made use of this flexibility in order to embed and inter-relate the driver CPC into / with their formal vocational education and training systems. In a number of cases parallel tracks have been created that have no or only very limited connections with the formal national VET systems. A recently published report on the implementation of directive 2003/59 concluded that the directive *'has contributed to ensuring a common level of training for professional drivers in the European Union'* (COM(2012) 358 final, 12.7.2012). However, the information collected in the present study on the different national implementation approaches and systems indicates that the assumption that the directive has led to a common minimum level for the abilities of professional drivers throughout Europe cannot be confirmed. This is primarily due to the differences identified in the implementation of training in terms of training programmes and methods applied (as also stated by EC report COM(2012) 358), as well as in the applied assessment / testing procedures. This diversity is generally beneficial, but the assumption that it leads to a common minimum level of the ability of professional drivers is misleading.

Some of the interviewed experts even expressed doubts that the directive has any impact on the actual abilities of drivers. Furthermore, a number of the experts consulted argued that an EU regulation would have been a more effective instrument to meet the demands of the sector. The assumption that standardised vocational education and training will automatically lead to better road safety, better comparability of driver qualifications, and therefore increased mobility cannot be sustained by the research results. Moreover, stakeholder consultations revealed the tendency for drivers to be no more mobile now in terms of their profession than they were before the implementation of the directive. In some countries however, for example in Austria, third country drivers are already an important resource required to maintain road freight transport. The general lack of a "learning culture" that is characteristic of the branch both for drivers and employers, and a dearth of career opportunities are obstacles that cannot be solved by the measures specified in the directive.

¹⁰ See also deliverable 21 "Synthesis of project results" available at www.project-profdrv.eu.

(4.2) Missing learning outcomes approach

In annex 1 of directive 2003/59/EC the minimum qualification and training requirements are defined through a list of subjects. This is an input rather than output oriented approach and does not include a learning outcome based description of knowledge, skills, and competences to be achieved through the training, nor does it support the recognition of learning outcomes achieved at the workplace. In contrast to the applied input approach, learning outcome descriptions would allow for real comparability between the abilities of professional drivers following the completion of training schemes to obtain the driver CPC. Thus, one of the main recommendations of the ProfDRV project is that a review and adaptation of annex 1 of directive 2003/59/EC should be undertaken, and that current subjects should be complemented by the learning outcomes to be achieved, thereby establishing a common learning outcomes based minimum standard for the qualification of professional drivers in Europe. This approach would foster the best conditions for developing a common basic qualification level of professional drivers in Europe.

(4.3) Improving comparability and transparency by applying European and National Qualification Frameworks

Another advantage of adopting such a learning outcome based approach is that it would then be possible to align the CPC to NQFs and the EQF. Currently this is not possible as there are no standards defined in terms of learning outcomes (knowledge, skills and competences). Furthermore, none of the driver CPC initial qualifications that are exclusively based on the European directive are considered to be formal VET certificates and consequently are not incorporated in the framework of the respective National Qualifications Frameworks.¹¹ The fact that in many countries the driver CPC is not embedded in the formal national vocational education and training systems, and instead exists in parallel must be considered as a missed opportunity to increase the reputation of professional driving. Professional driving is still perceived as inferior in terms of prestige and career opportunities to other skilled professions (e.g. mechatronic, hairdresser, electrician or clerk) with formalised and recognised vocational education and training programmes. Only for the UK evidence was found on considering the integration of the driver CPC into the national VET system and proposing that the qualification should be allocated level 2 of the English Qualifications Framework (Skills for Logistics, 2009). This is the equivalent of level 3 of the EQF. EC directive 2003/59 includes a reference to Council decision 85/368/EEC that intended to make VET qualifications comparable among the EU member states. This Council decision has been superseded by the adoption of the recommendation on the establishment of the European Qualifications Framework for lifelong learning (1065/2008/EC, 2008/C 111/01). From the inception of directive 2003/59/EC therefore, it was anticipated that it would be linked to an instrument which aims to make qualifications more comparable across Europe (see annex 1 of 2003/59/EC). Another important consideration in this context is that EQF / NQF levels may also be used as a wage indicator. Therefore, it is possible that in those countries where an IVET scheme for drivers has been in place for some time (e.g. apprenticeships in Austria and Germany), wages might be lower for holders of the CPC than for those who have passed through the existing VET scheme. Although it is still too early to draw conclusions on this point, it has to be considered a potential effect of the directive.

(5) Conclusions and Outlook

Wider conclusions on the effectiveness of directives for implementing EU-wide common VET standards can be drawn from the ProfDRV results and the outcomes of the SWOT analysis. The results reveal serious doubts about the ability of a directive to achieve EU-wide common VET standards due to the heterogeneity of implementation approaches which it allows EU member states to apply, and a consequent lack of comparability. This variety of approaches is due to the different vocational education and training traditions of EU member states, and also can

¹¹ The Dutch driver CPC that has been merged with the previously existing VET scheme is allocated to level 2 on the Dutch Qualification Framework (NLQF). However, the existing minimum CPC that complies with the minimum requirements of the directive is not considered in the NLQF.

be attributed to the very different strategies used to incorporate European directives into national law and national structures. From a vocational education and training perspective the following recommendations can be made in order to improve the outcomes of directives aiming to establish an EU-wide common VET standard for specific professions, and to guarantee that greater comparability and transferability of qualifications can be reached by means of a directive.

(5.1) Involvement of national stakeholders in the development and implementation of directives

In developing and implementing other directives that attempt to implement EU-wide common VET schemes for specific professions, national specificities should be taken into account, and national stakeholders (VET experts, VET providers, representatives of ministries, members of the target group etc.) should be consulted in order to ensure that the directive can be effectively transposed into national contexts. For example, if countries do not possess adequate training facilities to conduct the training as prescribed by the directive, national analysis and stakeholder consultation would make this evident from the very beginning and appropriate measures could be taken during implementation to overcome this issue. Furthermore, this would engender a more participatory approach rather than a top-down approach administered by the European Union. Although national experts are occasionally involved in the development of directives, the respective target group is rarely consulted, which can lead to the rejection of the directive by the target group and the perception that the directive is an irrelevant additional burden imposed by the European Union. Therefore, the specific needs of European member states and of the target group (e.g. understood through conducting qualification needs analysis, feasibility studies, etc.) should be better integrated and accounted for when developing and implementing directives in the field of VET.

(5.2) Embedding directives in VET into the different national VET systems

As mentioned above, directives allow member states a degree of flexibility in the embedding of EU directives into national law, based on their respective national legislation, vocational education and training systems, and overall national environment. Directives therefore attempt to standardise rather than harmonise national VET systems. This potentially provides real added value as the effective incorporation of directives could ensure a high level of quality through the application of existing and widely recognised VET structures and facilities which are available in most European countries. This would help to facilitate lifelong learning amongst workers through the creation of bridges to other VET tracks in the formal VET system. Unfortunately, the investigation of directive 2003/59/EC revealed that only a limited number of member states made use of this flexibility in order to embed and relate the directive into / with their formal vocational education and training systems. In a number of cases parallel tracks have been opened because the implementation of the directive has no or only marginal connection to the formal national VET system. Another consequence of the lack of incorporation of the directive into national VET systems, as is demonstrated by the investigation of directive 2003/59/EC, is that the directive is not considered to be included in National Qualifications Frameworks as a formal VET qualification. Therefore, an educational rather than an administrative approach should be applied. Directive 2003/59/EC, for example, was implemented under the guise of enhancing road safety and the safety of drivers as well as to attract young people for the job as drivers. Hence, the directive is not regarded as vocational education measure which would clearly demand the involvement of national ministries of education, but instead as a transport initiative, meaning that in most cases ministries of transport are responsible for the implementation of a fundamentally VET related directive. This approach is certainly questionable when purpose of the directive is to establish minimum EU-wide qualification standards. Therefore, future VET directives should indicate that member states should follow established national procedures for the creation of new qualifications / educational standards in the implementation of the directive. For example, if national educational legislation requires the involvement of social partners in the definition of new qualifications and educational standards, the same procedures should also be applied when implementing directives in vocational education and training. Furthermore, this would help to ensure that VET standards implemented through directives are relevant to the labour market (e.g. through social dialogue).

(5.3) Application of the learning outcomes based approach and reference to EQF

The main aim of a learning outcomes based approach is to make qualifications more comparable and transparent by describing the outcomes of learning associated with a certain qualification / certificate. The ways in which learning takes place (input parameters) vary greatly in the EU due to different traditions in European VET systems, but also due to formal, non- and informal learning elements within individual learning pathways. These different methods of learning therefore cannot be compared, but descriptions of the outcomes of learning are comparable independently from the methods through which they have been achieved. The EQF recognises that *“Europe’s education systems are so diverse that comparisons based on inputs, say length of study, are impracticable”* (The European Qualifications Framework for Lifelong Learning – leaflet, p.4). Therefore, when developing new directives in VET the EQF approach should be applied, and the minimum standard defined in the directive should be described in terms of ‘knowledge’, ‘skills’ and ‘competences’. This would facilitate the process of making European qualifications / certificates more comparable. Furthermore, this would assist member states in the process of referencing the qualification requirements defined in a directive to their National Qualification Frameworks (NQF), and subsequently to the EQF. Thus, applying the learning outcomes based approach recommended by the EQF would help to establish the comparability and transparency between training programmes available in EU member states that is one of the primary goals of the Copenhagen process. Therefore, when other directives are issued in the field of VET training requirements should be described in terms of outputs rather than inputs. Hence, directives should be connected with existing transparency instruments to provide real added value in the establishment of the European dimension of vocational education and training including the mutual recognition of qualifications and competences as initiated by the Copenhagen process.

(5.4) Development of quality standards to guarantee a common level of quality

Quality considerations in an education context may not be limited to the delivery of relevant and appropriate content or to the suitability of training facilities. One may argue that the implementation of the learning outcomes approach as recommended above should be sufficient to overcome most of the obstacles and challenges encountered in this study. But experiences of the implementation of the European Qualifications Framework¹² demonstrate that the application of the learning outcomes approach on profiles alone is insufficient for comparability of qualifications/ certificates and for ensuring that VET programmes have a sustainable impact on meeting labour markets requirements. The definition of quality standards in order to ensure a common level of quality of vocational education and training in the area subject to the directive could be used as a foundation to meet the qualification requirements of the labour market. Furthermore, quality standards could also facilitate the implementation of common or comparable assessment procedures, which would allow conclusions to be drawn on the efficiency of the measures defined in the directive through an assessment of the extent to which learning outcomes have been achieved. Moreover, the validation and recognition of knowledge, skills and competences acquired via non formal and informal ways could also be advanced through this process.

¹² See (among others) the results of the EQF Predict (www.project-predict.eu or www.eqf-support.eu) and NQF-SQF (www.project-nqf-sqf.eu) project on this topic.

List of references:

- Bruneski, Paul; Chen, Eva. SWOT Analysis. Strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats. Online: <http://web.viu.ca/tri/SWOT%20Analysis.pdf> [accessed 11.02.2013].
- Cedefop, forthcoming. *Cooperation between education and training and the labour market in renewing VET*. Ongoing Cedefop Study.
- Cort, Pia (2011). *Taking the Copenhagen Process apart. Critical readings of European vocational education and training policy*. Phd Dissertation at the Danish school of education, Aarhus University. Online: http://pure.au.dk/portal/files/43939819/Taking_the_Copenhagen_Process_Apart_Pia_Cort.pdf [13.02.2013].
- Department of Education and Skills: *Mutual Recognition of Professional Qualifications*. Online: <http://www.education.ie/home/home.jsp?category=17216&ecategory=28966&language=EN> [accessed 18.11.2011].
- Directorate-General for Internal Policies. Policy Department B: Structural and Cohesion Policies (2009). *Shortage of qualified personnel in road freight transport*. p. 101. Online: <http://www.trt.it/english/Schede-progetti/European-parliament/Shortage.pdf> [accessed 27.01.2012].
- The European Qualifications Framework for Lifelong Learning – leaflet, p.4.
- Eurim Briefing: *EU Consultation Practices and Principles*. No 26, May 1999.
- European Commission (2012). *Report from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of Regions on the implementation of Directive 2003/59/EC relating to the initial qualification and periodic training of drivers of certain road vehicles for the carriage of goods or passengers*. Online: http://ec.europa.eu/transport/road_safety/pdf/professional_drivers/report_on_periodic_training_of_professional_drivers_en.pdf [accessed 20.11.2012].
- European Parliament; Council of the European Union (2008). *Recommendation of the European Parliament and of the Council on the establishment of the European Qualifications Framework for lifelong learning*. Online: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2008:111:0001:0007:EN:PDF> [accessed 14.11.2011].
- European Parliament; Council of the European Union (2009). *Recommendation of the European Parliament and of the Council on the establishment of a European Credit System for Vocational Education and Training (ECVET)*. Online: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2009:155:0011:0018:EN:PDF> [accessed 18.11.2011].
- European Parliament; Council of the European Union (2005). *Directive 2005/36/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council on the Recognition of Professional Qualifications*. Online: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2005:255:0022:0142:en:PDF> [accessed 18.11.2011].
- European Parliament; Council of the European Union (2003). *Directive 2003/59/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council on the initial and periodic training of drivers of certain road vehicles for the carriage of goods or passengers*. Online: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:32003L0059:EN:HTML> [accessed 18.11.2011].
- Council of the European Union; European Commission (2002). *The Copenhagen Declaration*. http://ec.europa.eu/education/news/ip/docs/maastricht_com_en.pdf [accessed 14.11.2012].
- Council of the European Union; European Commission (2004). *The Maastricht Communiqué*. http://ec.europa.eu/education/news/ip/docs/maastricht_com_en.pdf [accessed 14.11.2012].
- Council of the European Union; European Commission (2006). *Helsinki Communiqué*. http://ec.europa.eu/education/policies/2010/doc/helsinkicom_en.pdf [accessed 14.11.2012].
- Council of the European Union; European Commission (2008). *Bordeaux Communiqué on enhanced cooperation in vocational education and training*. http://ec.europa.eu/education/lifelong-learning-policy/doc/bordeaux_en.pdf [accessed 14.11.2012].
- Council of the European Union; European Commission (2010). *The Bruges Communiqué on enhanced European cooperation in vocational education and training*. http://www.cedefop.europa.eu/EN/Files/bruges_en.pdf [accessed 14.11.2012].
- European Union. *Treaty on European Union (Consolidated Version), Treaty of Maastricht*. 7 February 1992, Official Journal of the European Communities C 325/5; 24 December 2002, available at: <http://www.unhcr.org/refworld/docid/3ae6b39218.html> [accessed 22 November 2012].
- Eurojargon. Online: http://europa.eu/abc/eurojargon/index_en.htm [accessed 27.01.2012].
- Europa – Summaries of EU Legislations: Directives. Online: http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/institutional_affairs/decisionmaking_process/114527_en.htm [accessed 14.11.2011].
- European Trade Union Confederation (ETUC). *The European Union's Lisbon Strategy*. Online: <http://www.etuc.org/a/652> [accessed

04.01.2012].

Huisman, J.; van der Wende, M. (2004). *The EU and Bologna: are supra- and international initiatives threatening domestic agendas?* European Journal of Education, 2004, Vol. 39, No. 39.

Manpower (2010). *Talent shortage survey results 2010*. Online: <http://www.manpowergroup.com/research/research.cfm?choosyear=2010&categoryid=2> [accessed 04.01.2012].

Manpower (2012). *Talent shortage survey results 2012*. Online: <http://www.manpowergroup.com/research/research.cfm?choosyear=2012&categoryid=2> [accessed 20.06.2012].

Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deporte (2012). Boletín oficial del estado. Miércoles 18 de abril de 2012, no. 93, 2012. Online: <http://www.boe.es/boe/dias/2012/04/18/pdfs/BOE-S-2012-93.pdf> [accessed 23.11.2012].

Ministry of Transport, Public Works and Water Management in the Netherlands (2010): *Evaluation Report of the Directive 2003/59*.

Mitraszewska, Izabella/Nowacki, Gabriel/ Kaminski, Tomasz (2008). *Professional Drivers' Labour Market in Poland according to directive 2003/59. Paper presented on the 8th International Conference "Reliability and Statistics in transportation and communication – 2008*. Online: http://www.tsi.lv/Research/Conference/RelStat_08/Proceedings/27.pdf [accessed 18.11.2011].

Official Journal of the European Union C83 (2010). *Information and Notices*. Volume 53, 30 March 2010, Part 6, Title I, Chapter 2, p. 171. Online: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2010:083:FULL:EN:PDF> [accessed 14.11.2011].

Pelz, W. (2004). *SWOT Analyse – Geschichte und Tipps zur Anwendung*. Online: <http://wpez.de/ress/swot.pdf> [accessed 23.11.2012].

Romanian Association for international Road Transport: *International Road Freight Transport*. Online: http://crib.mae.ro/upload/docs/6095_artri_art_sec.pdf [accessed 04.01.2011].

RSA (2007). *Consultation – Driver Certificate of Professional Competence*. Online: http://www.rsa.ie/Documents/Road%20Safety/Consultations/CPC_Consultation.pdf [accessed 14.11.2011].

Statistical Pocketbook (2012). EU Transport in figures. Online: <http://ec.europa.eu/transport/facts-fundings/statistics/doc/2012/pocketbook2012.pdf> [accessed 06.02.2013].

Online resources:

<http://www.efpa.eu/news/proposal-for-modernising-the-professional-qualifications-directive> [accessed 20.06.2012].

http://eur-lex.europa.eu/en/droit_communaire/droit_communaire.htm#1.3 [accessed 05.01.2012].

http://ec.europa.eu/education/lifelong-learning-policy/eqf_en.htm [accessed 05.01.2012].

http://ec.europa.eu/transport/facts-fundings/statistics/pocketbook-2011_en.htm [accessed 22.11.2012]

http://ec.europa.eu/transport/strategies/facts-and-figures/all-themes/index_en.htm [accessed 22.11.2012].

http://www.mindtools.com/pages/article/newTMC_05.htm [accessed 05.01.2012]

For further information on the project please consult:

www.project-profdrv.eu

For further information on the paper please contact:

tanja.bacher@3s.co.at