

Question for written answer E-003423/2025
to the Commission
Rule 144
Petra Steger (PfE)

Subject: Mandatory introduction of ill-conceived vehicle systems under the General Product Safety Regulation

The General Product Safety Regulation has applied to newly registered cars since July 2024, forcing Member States to introduce numerous new assistance and monitoring systems. This regulation is yet another example of excessive centralism in Brussels, which imposes expensive, immature technology on citizens in the European Union, thus curtailing both Member States' sovereignty and people's individual freedom.

Experience on the ground and statements from professional associations reveal serious problems: many of these systems are technically immature, prone to errors and, in serious cases, may even override the driver's control. The 'intelligent speed assistant' (ISA) in particular often works unreliably in practice and is an annoyance for drivers. The mandatory installation of accident data recorders and driver monitoring systems also gives rise to concerns as to data protection and surveillance. Purchase and maintenance costs are also skyrocketing, thus pricing vast swathes of the population out of individual mobility.

1. How does the Commission justify the mandatory introduction of technically immature systems that have been proven to malfunction and thus pose a safety risk?
2. What is the Commission doing to ensure that people's privacy is not invaded by systems such as event data recorders and driver monitors and that no further steps are taken towards permanent digital surveillance?
3. What view does the Commission take of the massive additional costs for vehicle owners resulting from these provisions, and why are Member States not free to decide independently on the use of such systems?

Submitted: 4.9.2025