



Completing the Single Market

together

**10th Symposium on the EU Construction Products Regulation
Berlin, 8 November 2018**

**Fulvia Raffaelli,
Head of Unit - Clean Technologies and Products
European Commission**

1. Background
2. The CPR review process
3. Preliminary conclusions of the Evaluation
4. Analysis of possible options
5. Next steps

1 – Background of the CPR Review

- Adoption of the CPR, 2011
- Full application of the CPR, July 2013
- Implementation Report, July 2016
- Communication Clean Energy for all Europeans, November 2016

2 –CPR Review Process

- Collecting evidence: several studies
 - Economic impacts of the CPR, 2017
 - Cross border trade, 2018
 - Survey on economic users' needs, 2018
 - Survey on Member States' needs, 2018
 - Survey on Member States' regulatory practices, 2018

2 –CPR Review Process

- Wide consultation:
 - European Parliament, hearing IMCO, 2017
 - 5 technical platforms, 2016-2017
 - Open public consultation, 2018: 641 replies
 - Interviews/surveys, 2017-2018: 920 participants
 - Validation workshop, 2018: 96 stakeholders
 - Meetings with Member States (bilaterals + 28.05.18)

3 – Conclusions of the evaluation

- General support to the basic CPR approach
 - > confirmation of the common technical language approach based on performance
- But also requests for improvement and more flexibility

3 – Conclusions of the evaluation

Effectiveness: impacts on cross-border trade cannot be demonstrated

Effectiveness affected by:

- Persistence of national marks / requirements
- Insufficient market surveillance / enforcement
- Weak standardisation process, quality of standards, access to standards
- Legal clarity/certainty not achieved
- Ineffective simplification provisions

3 – Conclusions of the evaluation

Efficiency: overall acceptable level but not meeting initial expectations

- Main benefits: better perceived access to other EU markets, facilitated by the common technical language; more uniform information for end-users; improvement of some companies' production processes due to the requirements to implement Factory Production Control.
- Main regulatory and administrative costs of the CPR: supply of the DoP and CE marking (manufacturers).
- Costs estimated at 0.6%-1.1% of the sector's turnover

3 – Conclusions of the evaluation

Relevance: CPR seen as relevant to the needs of the Internal Market for construction products.

CPR not seen as hindering innovation.

Additional needs identified: safety, sustainability, fitness for use.

Potential for more cross-border trade: varies according to products and countries.

3 – Conclusions of the evaluation

Internal coherence: affected by issues of standards and simplification provisions.

External coherence:

To be ensured with other EU legislation:
Standardisation regulation, Eco-design directive
and specific new approach internal market
directives.

Conflicts with national legislation on construction.

3 – Conclusions of the evaluation

The EU added value of the CPR appears largely uncontested.

Action at national level could not have achieved the same results (improved conditions for cross-border trade and facilitated access for economic operators to cross-border markets, which have helped reduce barriers within the Internal Market and reduce fragmentation of the market).

3 – Conclusions of the evaluation

Main issues identified

- Definition of scope (including overlaps with other EU legislation)
- Single harmonisation route
- Exhaustiveness of harmonisation, need for flexibility
- Safety and environment (objectives)
- Mandatory nature of harmonised standards
- Product information (Fitness for use, format of DoP)
- Simplification process
- Specific market surveillance / enforcement

4 – Options initially envisaged

- O: Baseline – no action at all
- I: Enhanced baseline – soft law measures
- II: Legislative revision
 - IIA - Limited to issues of Implementation Report
 - IIB – Wider revision modifying the scope of harmonisation -> IIB1, IIB2, IIB3
 - IIC – Profound revision changing the division of tasks between EU and MSs -> IIC1, IIC2, IIC3
- III: Repeal

4 – Options for the future initially envisaged

- Conclusions of the study point to a clear preference for no change or incremental changes only.

but:

- Definition of « incremental » changes in the presence of contradictory interpretations of current provisions
- Options insufficiently linked with the issues to be addressed, not fully understood by stakeholders
- Need for deeper analysis of legal issues

5 – Next steps

- Keep focusing in the implementation of current CPR
 - **Continuous dialogue with CEN and stakeholders to ease the standardisation process**
 - **Delegated and Implementing Acts on AVCP, classes and thresholds**
 - **Open dialogue with MS on enforcement issues**

5 – Next steps

- Evaluation: CSWD to be adopted 1st quarter 2019
- Impact assessment:
 - Refining the potential options
 - Consultation of stakeholders: new open public consultation, interviews, technical platform
 - CSWD and potential proposal: next College

6 – Future Options

Option will be refined based on the feedback received:

- Link with horizontal questions
- More nuanced / combinable elements
- Logical structure highlighting commonalities

Thank you for your attention!

For more information:

https://ec.europa.eu/growth/sectors/construction/product-regulation_en