



UNION EUROPEENNE DE L'ARTISANAT ET DES PETITES ET MOYENNES ENTREPRISES  
EUROPÄISCHE UNION DES HANDWERKS UND DER KLEIN- UND MITTELBETRIEBE  
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION OF CRAFT, SMALL AND MEDIUM-SIZED ENTERPRISES  
UNIONE EUROPEA DELL'ARTIGIANATO E DELLE PICCOLE E MEDIE IMPRESE



European Office of Crafts, Trades and Small and Medium-sized Enterprises for Standardisation  
Bureau Européen de l'Artisanat et des Petites et Moyennes Entreprises pour la Normalisation  
Europäisches Büro des Handwerks und der Klein- und Mittelbetriebe für die Normung

## **Position of UEAPME and NORMAPME on the Methodology for the Ecodesign of Energy- Using Products Directive (MEEuP)**

Following the establishment a group of experts called “Consultation Forum”, which will allow stakeholders to be informed and provide their contribution on the implementation of the Directive 2005/32/EC on Energy using Products, UEAPME would like to express some considerations on the methodology for the preparatory studies on the implementation of the text.

The purpose of the methodology is to allow evaluating whether and to which extent various Energy using Products fulfil the criteria of the Directive. The preparatory studies will indeed determine several important implementation measures, including the definition of the products to be regulated and the definition of the environmental parameters to be assessed for each product.

UEAPME welcomes the fact that all involved stakeholders are called to express their positions and, thus, contribute to the definition process. UEAPME reckons that this approach is very open and appreciates the efforts of the Commission in order to provide stakeholders with enough time to express their positions.

However, life-cycle design of products involves very complicated technical issues, which are very hard to evaluate even for the most advanced research institutes or R&D departments of the largest multinationals.

Therefore, we would like to point out that SMEs do not have the necessary means to respond to any kind of consultation in this respect, due to the extreme complexity of the subject matter and regardless of the time allowed. As far as European and/or national SME associations are concerned, this task might only be carried out through external consultants/experts in the different sectors. Without specific resources allocated by the European Commission to pay for these consultants, it is not possible for SME associations to cope with the financial burden linked to their recruitment.

Besides, the methodology provides a structure for the preparatory studies and assigns several tasks aiming at determining concrete implementation measures for each product. In this respect, UEAPME considers that, prior to the definition of the products to be covered, the studies need to address the analysis of the existing market structure and evaluate the consequences of a sudden introduction of new restrictive measures on the economic operators, namely on SMEs.

Indeed, the methodology includes an impact assessment on industry. However, assessing the impact on industry is the very last task on the schedule (the 8th), and comes after the definition of products and after the assignment of environmental parameters. It is evident that this study comes too late in the consultation process, and that it is more likely to be driven by political considerations, determined by the influential power of the each interested stakeholder, rather than by a scientific analysis of the economic conditions.

UEAPME and NORMAPME have a long track record in contributing to the definition of implementation measures of EU Directives, namely in the “new approach”. Therefore, we would like to mention the case of a Directive on which the economic impact analysis was carried out too late -- the effects of such a delay on SMEs were very negative.

In the framework of the Construction Products Directive (89/106/EEC), the first harmonised standards were published in 2000 and CE marking became mandatory in 2002. However, a study to evaluate the internal market and competitiveness effects of the 89/106/EEC was launched by the European Commission only in 2006. This study, carried out by EIM Business & Policy Research, calculated the average additional costs for the companies due to the introduction of the Directive and estimated the number of years needed in order to pay off this cost. The results are reported in the table below. They show that for some particular sectors, such as windows and thermal insulation, manufacturers will never be able to pay back the additional costs.

**Table 4.1: Summary of direct costs and benefits for manufacturers in the EEA**

<i>Industry sector</i>	<i>Initial + transition costs (€M)</i>	<i>Direct annual cost/benefit (€M)</i>	<i>Production EEA (€bn)</i>	<i>Annual benefit as % of production</i>	<i>Approx years to pay back initial costs</i>
Cement	-11	16	14	0.1%	less than 1
Structural steel					
- steel products	-4	0.5	9	negligible	8
- steel structures & components	-100	10	47	0,02%	10
Rebar	-1	4	15	0.03%	less than 1
Masonry	-50	10	12	0.1%	4
Thermal insulation	-24	-3	12	-0.03%	never
Wood-based panels	-30	3	18	0.02%	10
Ceramic tiles	-13	4	10	0,04%	4
Sanitary appliances	-10	12	7	0,2%	1
Windows	-250	-80	30	-0.3%	never
Geotextiles	-0.5	2	0.8	0,3%	less than 1
Chimneys	-16	2	1.7	0,1%	8 years
Fire fight. Systems	-14	35	8	0.4%	less than 1

Note: The table shows estimated total direct costs/benefits (in €million) for all manufacturers in the EEA (aggregated to the whole industry sector) for introduction of CE-marking in their business, for the 'monde' in comparison with the 'anti-monde'.

Note: benefits are +, costs are - . All costs are order of magnitude estimates.

In this respect, an earlier economic impact study launched before implementing the Directive would have prevented such negative affects on individual companies and on entire sectors, and all expensive corrective measures could have been avoided.

**Therefore, concerning the Methodology for the Ecodesign of Energy-Using Products Directive (MEEuP), UEAPME wishes to put forward the following comments:**

- **SMEs do not have the necessary means to respond to the subject matter of the consultation due to its complexity;**
- **The consequences of a sudden introduction of new restrictive measures on the economic operators, namely on SMEs, must be thoroughly evaluated;**
- **Impact assessment studies on industry should be placed higher in the list of tasks of the suggested methodology.**

We thank you for the consideration you may give to this UEAPME's position paper and remain at your disposal for any clarification you may need.

Brussels, January 2007

***For further information on this position paper, contact:***

Sebastiano Toffaletti  
Standardisation Project Manager  
NORMAPME  
Rue Jacques de Lalaing 4  
B-1040 Brussels (Belgium)  
Tel. +32-2 282 05 38, Fax +32-2 282 05 35  
Mail: [s.toffaletti@normapme.com](mailto:s.toffaletti@normapme.com)