

## **Inventory of gaps NAPCORE 2022**

The goal of H2 is to identify topics that are not (yet) covered by scope of NAPCORE and its yearly working programs. Gaps can come from internal sources or external sources:

- Examples of internal sources are WG1-WG5 outputs and CAT meetings.
- Examples of external sources are EU policy papers, EU website, Mobility Data Space concepts and documents, Revised ITS Directive and Delegated Regulations, Sustainable and Smart Mobility Strategy 2020, European Data Strategy, H2020/ CEF funded projects, other Platforms (CCAM, C-Roads, MaaS Alliance, ...), etc.

### **Identification of gaps**

According to the Grant Agreement and Workplan 2022 in this first year only internal gaps have been identified. Gaps arising from outside the project are not considered in 2022.

In total 25 gaps have been identified through a process of contacting the various WG leaders and participation in the CAT meetings. Each gap was described using the following entries:

- Identified gap
- What is at stake?
- Relevance for NAPCORE
- Stakeholders
- Urgency.

In the next step the gaps were scored on a series of so-called 'gap criteria', e.g. number of NAPs impacted, relevance for EU regulations, potential for improving added value of NAPs, complexity of the required action, etc.

In the end ten gaps were ranked as most relevant, and these gaps are shown in the tables below. For each of the gaps additional criteria were added in order to structure/categorize the gaps. These criteria included among others the type of gap, EU/national level, stakeholders impacted, reason for change, coverage in workplan and timing of action needed.

### **Recommendations for further action**

For each of the ten gaps a recommendation for further action was formulated (to be taken up within NAPCORE or elsewhere). These recommendations will then be discussed in the SCOM, where a decision will be taken on the follow-up of these recommendations.

From the ten gaps ranked as most relevant four gaps have been highlighted as gaps that are critical. These are presented in table 1. Five other gaps have been identified as hindering/disturbing the work processes. These are presented in table 2. One gap is from another category (see table 3), not critical, not hindering the process, but could be a serious risk for the reliability of the NAPs, and thus their use. For this moment (2022) it seems not necessary to formulate an action, but it is recommended to keep it on the list for reconsidering in 2023.

**Table 1: critical gaps**

Identified gap	What is at stake?	Relevance for NAPCORE	Stakeholders
Lack of structural, strategic public/private consultation	In order to come to large scale deployment of ITS services as foreseen in the ITS Directive, it is important that public and private parties align on relevant topics, like definitions and quality criteria. Right now there is no EU strategic public/private 'table' to discuss on that.	NAPCORE wants to advice in new Delegated Regulations from a NAP perspective. Service providers should also have a say in new DR's. Furthermore both NAPCORE and the future "DUPLO" forum can benefit from a EU strategic public/private discussion table.	All partners concerned.
Lack of definitions	Delegated Regulations are sometimes weak in defining requirements in relation to Compliance Assessment.	Compliance Assessment Forms need clear guidance to achieve objectives. Phrases such as 'in a timely manner', 'non-discriminatory measures', etc. should be clarified	All partners concerned
Limited data availability for several data categories	Without appropriate data the information services described within the Delegated Regulations supplementing the ITS Directive will not be implemented.	Unclear because NAPCORE is not per se meant to support data collection. However, it can provide support through indirect means.	Data consumers (negatively impacted), policy makers such as DG-MOVE (can play a role for solving this issue).
Lack of sense of urgency to start to implement the revised RTTI DR	The revised RTTI DR will lead to a lot of work for all the member states.	If we don't align on the implementation of the revised RTTI DR, we might miss the opportunities that the DR gives.	All NC partners

**Table 2: gaps hindering/disturbing the work processes**

Identified gap	What is at stake?	Relevance for NAPCORE	Stakeholders
Unsolved aspects related to the European Access Point (EAP) concept	Many questions regarding the EAP remain unsolved, such as: -What is its main goal? - Who will/would manage it? - How would it work (types of EAP)?	With the view to develop a useful and feasible platform/service, it is crucial to solve these issues	Data consumers
Missing Best Practices on Assessment Compliance	Lack of infrastructure/implementation/responsibilities leads to few flagship cases.	Few role models are available and thus little imagination on how to best achieve the implementation of measures.	All WG5 partners concerned
We hardly know if and who is using the data in the NAPs	A lot of money is invested in NAPs, but what is the (societal) benefit of these investments?	To know the users of NAPs is very relevant for providing training and courses to users, and to be able to make a cost – benefit analysis.	NAP operators, data providers. Note: if a NAP is only repository, you can only know the users of the link, not if they actually use the data.
Lack of DATEX II reference profiles for STTP	DATEX II already has several reference profiles for RTTI, MMTIS and SRTI. Nevertheless, there are still no specific reference profiles for SSTP, although there is a recommended service profile named “Intelligent and secure truck parking”	The reference profile is a subset of the standard, and contains the necessary information for a specific use case. If there are no profiles for the use cases from SSTP, then the use of DATEX II in SSTP categories might be jeopardized.	All entities that depend on availability of SSTP data (both data providers and consumers, NAP operators)
Metadata requirements are not fulfilled by some of the NAP operators	There are many aspects to be improved regarding NAPs' Metadata. A list containing Requirements for Metadata was elaborated by sWG 4.4, and it is being used by WG2 in Milestone 2.7.	Enhancing Metadata is fundamental in order to provide interoperability, accessibility e re-usability of data from NAPs	NAP operators, data providers, data users

**Table 3: other gaps**

Identified gap	What is at stake?	Relevance for NAPCORE	Stakeholders
Cyber security: Improve resilience of NAPs (for example: no storage of data on non-EU servers) and lack of standardised approach in case of cyber-attack (emergency plan)	Difference between NAP as data warehouse or NAP as repository. In worst case data might be deleted, data might be tampered with, business and privacy sensitive data might be stolen.	Cyber security is essential for trustworthiness of NAPs and the services building on NAP data. And thus, also for the use of NAPs.	NAP operators, users of NAPs