

September 2015

Energy efficiency labelling

Impact Assessment (SWD (2015) 139, SWD (2015) 140 (summary)) accompanying a Commission proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council setting a framework for energy efficiency labelling and repealing Directive 2010/30/EU (COM (2015) 341)

Background

This note seeks to provide an initial analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the European Commission's Impact Assessment (IA) accompanying the above proposal, adopted on 15 July 2015, and referred to Parliament's Committee on Industry, Research and Energy. The proposal repeals Directive 2010/30/EU on the indication by labelling and standard product information of the consumption of energy and other resources by energy-related products.¹

The proposal for a revision of the rules regulating energy efficiency labelling forms part of the energy package that the European Commission announced mid-July 2015 with a view to implementing the priorities set out by Commission President Juncker under the Energy Union.² The revision aims to ensure that consumers make better informed purchase decisions of energy efficient products, and thereby reduce energy consumption and associated energy bills (as well as other major environmental impacts of products).

According to Article 14 of the Energy Labelling Directive, the Commission was required to review the Directive and its delegated acts by 2014. The present IA includes the results of the review of the Energy Labelling Directive as well as the Ecodesign Directive³ (which was already reviewed in 2012), since the effects of both legal instruments are considered to be linked and complementary. However, the accompanying legislative proposal covers only the Energy Labelling Directive.

Problem definition

The Commission's initiative aims to address problems that have evolved under the existing framework of the Energy Labelling Directive and the Ecodesign Directive. Initially, these Directives were put in place to deal with the negative consequences that products may have on the environment depending on how they are made, used and disposed of. The Energy Labelling Directive aims to encourage more purchases of more energy efficient products through standardised energy labelling and thereby better informing consumers. The objective of the Ecodesign Directive is to reduce energy consumption, and other negative environmental impacts of production, by banning the least efficient products (IA, p. 9).

According to the Commission, the review of these Directives revealed the need, firstly, for a possible re-scaling, since energy labels have proven successful and most products are now in top classes of the energy label, and, secondly, to tackle non-compliance of ecodesign and labelling requirements, which is partly due to weak enforcement by national authorities in charge of market surveillance (IA, p. 10).

¹ Directive 2010/30/EU, OJ L153, 18.6.2010, p. 1.

² For further information, see [G. Malmersjö, 'Energy Efficiency', EPRS Briefing - Implementation Appraisal, May 2015](#); see also [E. Claros, 'Energy Consumption in the EU', EPRS Briefing - Statistical Spotlight, April 2015](#).

³ Directive 2009/125/EC, OJ L 285, 31.10.2009, p. 10.

More specifically, the IA identifies the following six key problems:

- A reduced effectiveness of labels, following the introduction of classes A+ and above
- Increase in size of appliances
- Long rule-making process
- Too low level of ambition for a number of product measures
- Weak enforcement
- Little reduction of non-energy environmental impacts

The scale of the above problems is illustrated by a number of examples. For instance, regarding the labelling issue, the IA indicates that the difference of energy consumption between A+++ and A+ washing machines (with 7 kg load) is 50kWh/year. This difference amounts, after a period of fifteen years, to more than 11 TWh/year electricity use based on sales of more than 15 million washing machines a year for all washing machines bought in that period.

Weak enforcement poses a problem: around 10 per cent of envisaged energy savings are said to be lost due to non-compliance, as found by a specially commissioned evaluation study (IA, pp. 18 and 20). The IA lists a number of underlying drivers, including insufficient resources: '80 per cent of the respondents to the public consultation think that not enough resources are given to the market surveillance authorities'(IA, p. 21). While government bodies formed part of the respondents to the public consultation, it is not clear how the national market authorities consider and evaluate their financial situation and capacities. Annex 3 of the IA merely states that no precise figures on total Member States' expenditure on market surveillance are available and that 'based on (incomplete) data collected from Member States it is currently likely to be around EUR 10 million'(IA, p. 98 - Annex 3).

The EU dimension of the identified problems is clearly set out: 'The objective of reducing negative environmental impacts of products, in particular energy use, cannot be sufficiently achieved by the Member States, because this would lead to divergent national provisions and procedures that would generate undue costs for industry and obstacles to the free movement of goods within the EU'(IA, p. 26).

Taking into account that the causes of the current problems have been to a large extent triggered, or at least not mitigated, by previously adopted EU law (the re-scaling issue was, in fact, already predicted to become problematic at the time the three A+ classes were introduced with the recast of the Energy Labelling Directive in 2010), the IA emphasises the need to take EU action to address the identified problems.

Objectives of the legislative proposal

According to the IA, the *general* objective of the initiative is to ensure the functioning of the internal market through the free movement of goods that safeguards a high level of environmental and consumer protection. The *specific* objective is to update the policy framework in order to reduce energy consumption and other significant environmental impacts of products, by better informing consumers and allowing industry to transform environmental challenges into economic opportunities. In particular, the IA underlines that this update should be relevant, useful, cost-effective, in line with international obligations and easy to understand for consumers, as well as easily and appropriately enforceable (IA, p. 27).

Range of options considered

The IA first presents 15 measures to address the identified problems and subsequently examines five policy options, including the baseline scenario:

1. Option 0: No changes, baseline

This option 'does not address the problems, but represents the baseline [...] with which other options can be compared'(IA, p. 38).

2. Option 1: Improvements within the existing regulatory framework

The Commission identifies this option as the one that does not require changes to the existing legal framework and 'at least in part' could address the problem. It is explicitly acknowledged, however, that this option cannot tackle the

problem of reduced effectiveness of labels, as that would require amendments to the Energy Labelling Directive. This option suggests *inter alia* the expansion of the database study on ecodesign and energy labelling, the support of joint actions and more emphasis on absolute energy consumption on the label.

3. Option 1+: Option 1 combined with some improvements in the legal framework, notably for energy labelling

The IA points out that this option foresees some legislative changes to the Energy Labelling Directive, which are expected to better address the problems in comparison to Option 1, including addressing the problem of reduced effectiveness of labels by changing the label. The problem with the increase in size of appliances is proposed to be tackled by requiring a higher efficiency to reach a certain label class for larger appliances. The suggested product registration database would only apply to products falling under energy labelling. This option further envisages aligning the Energy Labelling and the Ecodesign Directives with the proposal for the market surveillance for products regulation.⁴

4. Option 2: Significant reform of both ecodesign and energy labelling

This option is said to aim 'to address all problems in an ambitious way without a complete overhaul of the legislative framework'(IA, p. 40). It includes all of the most ambitious measures, *except* for the following three: changing the least life cycle cost requirement; introducing an EU market surveillance authority, and extending the scope to non-energy related products. The product registration database would apply to products covered by energy labelling and products covered only by ecodesign.

5. Option 3: Comprehensive reform of ecodesign and energy labelling extending the scope to non-energy related products to centralise market surveillance

The Commission identified this option as a complete overhaul aiming to address other environmental impacts than energy use in a comprehensive way. The scope of the Directives (foreseen to be changed to Regulations) would be extended so as to include product groups other than energy-related products. Energy Labelling would cover all life cycle phases and all environmental impacts. Market surveillance would be centralised by means of an EU market surveillance authority, because some product-specific requirements would necessitate a chain of custody evidence throughout the life-cycle.

Sub-option to Options 1+, 2 and 3: Merge ecodesign and energy labelling into one legal instrument

This sub-option would address the incoherencies between ecodesign and energy labelling (such as the lack of a working plan and a stakeholder forum for Energy Labelling) by merging the two Directives and revising them into one Regulation.

This IA presents a variety of different options, including non-regulatory ones. It discusses the respective degrees of changes to the legislative framework, the prevailing level of ambition to tackle the underlying problems, and the respective advantages and disadvantages of each option generally speaking in a reasonable way. It is noticeable, however, that in comparison to the other options presented, the IA discusses Option 1+ in greatest detail.

Regarding the problem of increase in size of appliances, the IA does not specify the conditions under which an appliance would qualify as 'large'. When discussing the possible requirement of a higher efficiency for larger appliances, the IA merely states that 'it should be considered on a product by product basis whether for larger appliances a higher efficiency (energy use per amount of service, such as the screen size of a TV or the load capacity of a washing machine) is required to reach certain classes on the label'(IA , p. 30).

With regard to the baseline scenario, the IA clarifies that the current framework will continue to generate further energy and other environmental savings, however, non-compliance and the present energy labelling will continue to pose problems (for more details on the quantification of the baseline, see Annex 5).

⁴ COM(2013) 75, 13.2.2013; Parliament adopted its first reading position on this proposal in April 2014. At the time of writing, the file is awaiting the Council's first reading position.

The Commission discarded the option to repeal one or both Directives and their implementing/delegated acts taking the position that it would not solve the basic problem. The Commission specified that it would moreover not be consistent with the objectives and targets of the Energy Efficiency Directive. The IA makes clear that, in the absence of EU legislation, Member States would regulate, leading to divergent national provisions and procedures and creating undue costs and obstacles to the free movement of goods (IA, p. 38).

According to the executive summary sheet, the Commission's preferred option is Option 1+ combined with the re-introduction of the A-G scale for the label (IA, p. 4).

Scope of the Impact Assessment

The IA evaluates the environmental, economic and social impacts for each option overall in a balanced manner. The impacts of the respective options are generally well-explained and illustrated (which measure contributes to which savings) and visualised by means of tables and figures. Consequently, the options, including the baseline option, are contrasted with each other and the differing results are substantiated.

The IA states in clear terms where the assessing of impacts or the monetising of costs was difficult or impossible to carry out. This is the case, for example, for the environmental and economic impacts that are associated with the extension of the scope in Option 3 to product groups other than energy-related ones because of the vast diversity of what would be classified as a 'product'(IA, pp. 48-49 and 52). The various impacts for the different labels e.g. A-G label, A+++ to D label etc. are assessed separately in each case.

With regard to the environmental impact, the IA points out that Option 1, containing only non-legislative measures, already provides significant energy savings in comparison to the baseline (see Figure 9, IA, p. 46). Option 1+ provides further important energy savings, mainly because the product registration database reduces non-compliance rates for labelled products. Options 2 and 3 give higher energy savings than Option 1+, although the incremental savings are lower than the differences between the baseline, Option 1 and Option 1+. Concerning the label, the IA highlights that the A-G label would provide further significant energy savings (IA, p. 46). The IA also gives information on the impacts of the different options on greenhouse gas emissions, nitrogen oxide emissions and water use quantifying impacts in comparison the baseline (see Table 4, IA, pp. 47-48).

The IA clarifies that the main economic impact is on consumer expenditure. In addition to breaking down the short- and long-term consumer expenditure savings, the IA also specifies the expected revenue for the year 2030 for each option. The IA moreover examines the scope of the administrative burden (meaning the total approximate additional administrative and compliance costs) the relevant actor has to carry in each option.

Overall consumer expenditure/savings are calculated on the basis of two assumptions for future energy price developments, using the preparatory studies for ecodesign and energy labelling, a 2014 Report on 'Ecodesign Impact Accounting'⁵ financed by the European Commission and the PRIMES model (used for the Commission's 2014 Energy Efficiency Communication⁶). The former studies used in the IA are referenced; however, the IA does not provide further explanations as to why these two assumptions were chosen in the first place (the first assumption envisages an increase in energy prices of 4 per cent per year; the second assumption envisages an increase in energy prices of 4 per cent per year up to 2020 and of 0.5 per cent from 2020 onwards (IA, pp. 49-50)).

Under the heading 'social impact', the IA provides data on the expected job creation, but admits at the same time that the results may be significantly over-estimated. The reason for this possible over-estimation of direct job increase is due to a 'generic approach' for all products (direct jobs are calculated from the increase in revenue and average turnover per employee in the various sectors). However, employment effects may depend on specific technologies used for products. Moreover, the IA points out that if the revenues for space heating and cooking are over-estimated, this would naturally entail an over-estimation of the direct jobs increase

⁵ Report 'Ecodesign Impact Accounting - Part I' prepared by R. Kemna (VHK), 30 May 2014.

⁶ European Commission Communication, Energy Efficiency and its contribution to energy security and the 2030 Framework for climate and energy policy, COM(2014)520, 23.7.2014.

(IA, p. 55). Considering these uncertainties, one may wonder to what extent such figures actually inform decision-making or may rather blur the picture.

The IA identifies a gender dimension: the job creation is expected to be skewed towards men rather than women, the main product sector where the increase takes place being the heating sector, which is male dominated (IA, p. 55). The IA further specifies that the product registration database could have an impact on data protection. While the concept of data protection is generally limited to natural persons, it can be extended to legal persons in so far as their official title identifies one or more natural persons. However, the IA highlights that no such cases are known for manufacturers of energy-related products (IA, p. 56).

The impacts of merging ecodesign and energy labelling are assessed under a separate heading. The IA considers that this would only have an impact on administrative burden and that this impact would be small because rules on ecodesign and energy labelling have been developed in parallel in the past.

On some aspects the IA might have been expected to provide somewhat more detailed information. For example, regarding the territorial/regional impacts the IA merely states: 'Job creation for wholesale, retail and installers is expected to be even across the EU. Job creation in industry will be to a different extent in different Member States, depending on the extent of their current manufacturing industry in these sectors'(IA, p. 55).

Subsidiarity / proportionality

The legal basis of the proposed legislation is Article 194(2) TFEU, which allows for the adoption of measures that promote energy efficiency. The IA presents strong arguments that EU action is necessary to address the problems, stressing that the objective of reducing negative environmental impacts of products cannot be sufficiently achieved by the Member States. 'Only through harmonised EU rules on energy labelling and underlying measurements and testing can it be ensured that the same model of a product has the same published energy class throughout the EU'(IA, p. 26). By contrast, divergent national provisions and procedures would create undue costs and obstacles to the free movement of goods.

The IA observes that 'in the absence of EU legislation, it is likely that all Member States would introduce energy efficiency legislation for some product groups, because of consumer protection and because it is difficult to achieve the target of the Energy Efficiency Directive without addressing the energy use of products. Acting at the EU level is the only way to ensure that requirements and labels for products placed on the market are equal in all Member States, thereby ensuring the functioning of the Internal Market underpinned by Article 26 TFEU'(IA, p. 26).

The IA questions the proportionality for Options 2 and 3 because of the requirement for third party certification for all products regardless of it being duly justified and proportionate to the risk of non-compliance. For Option 3, the IA adds that it appears to go beyond what is necessary to achieve the identified objectives, 'at least for those non-energy related products that are covered to a significant extent by existing legislation'(IA, p. 60).

No reasoned opinions from national parliaments have been published on the legislative proposal at the time of writing; the deadline for contributions is 19 October 2015.

Budgetary or public finance implications

The IA informs about the implications on the EU/Commission budget and the Member States' public finance, as well as the costs that other actors would have to bear (IA, pp. 53-54). The total approximate administrative and compliance costs per option are compared to the baseline. Annex 9 provides further details specifying the costs calculated for the different actors for each measure suggested.

The creation of an EU market surveillance authority foreseen in Option 3 produces the main bulk of costs for the EU/Commission (amounting to EUR 32 million/year), while it saves Member States' expenses (amounting to EUR 10 million/year). For Options 1, 1+ and 2 Member States do not bear any additional costs. By contrast, the EU/Commission's budget ranges moderately from EUR 3.0 million/year for Option 1 to EUR 2.3 million/year for Option 2 (IA, p. 54).

SME test / Competitiveness

The IA concludes that the impact on commercial revenues affects larger businesses and SMEs in the same way, but this conclusion is not substantiated. In a footnote it is indicated that the SMEs affected can be found mostly in the retail and installation/maintenance sector (IA, p. 52). The IA does not include any specific information on particular burdens imposed on SMEs.

The executive summary sheet of the IA notes in clear terms that a different regime for micros/SMEs cannot be justified: 'All retailers should be subject to the same rules as energy labels are only useful for consumers if all products are labelled in all retail outlets. There are few SMEs manufacturers and no micros. The same rules should apply to all to ensure fair competition in the single market'(IA, p. 5). It is not clear to what extent SME views have been considered in the public consultation, in which 40 out of 197 responses received to the short survey came from retailers, and 30 responses came from manufacturers (see Annex 1, p. 65). No breakdown is provided in this respect.

The IA underlines that the problem of non-compliance affects society and consumers and the competitiveness of many manufacturers, as it undermines a level playing field (IA, pp. 20-21).

Simplification and other regulatory implications

The proposal would replace the Energy Efficiency Labelling Directive in the form of a new Regulation. The IA states that Option 1+ (upon which the proposed Regulation is based) simplifies legislation through coherence with the market surveillance regulation and the revision of the Energy Labelling Directive. According to the IA, the choice of instrument - a Regulation - is appropriate for obligations that apply directly to economic operators and is in conformity with the EU's better regulation agenda (IA, p. 59). The proposed Regulation does not imply any changes to the Ecodesign Directive.

Relations with third countries

In Section 4.1 on 'Who is affected and how?', the IA acknowledges impact on third countries. This is because the A-G energy label has been copied in many different countries and some have in addition transposed the EU codesign regulations. The IA further emphasises that third countries are affected by WTO law, which aims to ensure that regulations and procedures do not create unnecessary obstacles (IA, p. 26).

Quality of data, research and analysis

Generally speaking, the research and analysis upon which this IA is based seems sound, up to date and comprehensive. A wide range of external expertise has been used for the IA. Two external studies were specifically commissioned to serve as basis for the review, one on the evaluation of the Energy Labelling Directive and one on consumer understanding and behaviour related to energy labels. Another third study provided specific analysis for the options set out in the IA. For more details on this latter study, see Annex 5. A substantial number of further studies requested by the Commission provided input to the IA, most of which date from 2014, see Annex 1.

The assumptions made and the conclusions drawn in the IA appear overall reasonable and coherent, and backed by credible examples and relevant research results. The IA flags uncertainties and indicates instances where no data is available. The IA makes good use of quantitative and qualitative assessments.

Stakeholder consultation

The stakeholder consultation appears at first sight to be broad and balanced with relevant international input. The IA identifies the key stakeholders and explains in what ways they are affected. The stakeholders include consumers, retailers, manufacturers, society, Member States, third countries and standardisation organisations (IA, pp. 25-26).

The IA makes clear that stakeholders were consulted through a variety of means, including:

- three stakeholder meetings organised by the contractor of the evaluation study;
- a public consultation on the 'Your voice in Europe' webpage that ran from 31 August to 30 November 2013 leading to 335 responses to two surveys;

- a stakeholder meeting organised by the Commission on selecting the energy label designs to be tested in the second phase of the 'consumer behaviour study';
- an international conference organised by the Commission on products policy with more than 400 participants from approximately 50 countries;
- an Ecodesign Consultation Forum meeting organised by the Commission.

Further details on stakeholder consultation can be found in Annex 1.

Upon closer examination, however, the stakeholder consultation might not be as broad and balanced as portrayed. The Background Report II on Survey Results highlights that the statistics (of the multiple choice answers to the surveys) should be carefully interpreted: 'Most importantly, numbers do not necessarily provide a balanced representation of European stakeholders. Some respondents represent large interests or interest groups, while others provided answers as an individual EU citizen and consumer or on behalf of a smaller entity'(Ecofys Background Report II on Survey Results, p. 1).

The IA specifies the stakeholder support for the various options in Section 8. Option 1+ has significant support from stakeholders because 'the vast majority is of the view that the Energy Labelling Directive needs to be changed to achieve energy savings closer to full economic technical potential'(IA, p. 60). Option 2 is supported by a smaller share of stakeholders, whereas Options 0, 1 and 3 have little support from stakeholders. Regarding Option 3, the IA notes that this option is supported by environmental NGOs. With regard to the label, most stakeholders support an A-G label. This view is not shared by all manufacturers and retailers, however, their answers ranging widely from 'Strongly agree' to 'Strongly disagree' (IA, pp. 38, 60-61).

Monitoring and evaluation

In view of monitoring and evaluation, the IA does not provide specific benchmarks but sets out a number of so-called indicators of success of a more general nature. A systematic and regular review mechanism that guarantees a coherent evaluation seems not to be considered. This is an aspect which was also criticised by the Commission's own Impact Assessment Board (IAB) in its first (negative) opinion on the IA.⁷

The IA lists as one indicator of success the number of national legislative proposals on environmental impacts of energy-related products that is flagged by the Member States as potentially problematic (the lower the number, the better). The IA states that the objectives of environmental and consumer protection are achieved by the reduction of energy consumption and other significant environmental impacts. In this regard, the IA emphasises that another indicator of success is 'the reduction in the product's impact in the categories regulated in the delegated acts' and that 'progress is monitored product by product'(IA, p. 63). By means of reviews, progress is tracked compared to the situation before amendments were made. Such reviews are planned to be carried out 'some years' after the entry into force of the delegated acts.

In addition, the IA underlines that an energy-related products database study and a mandatory product registration database would provide the Commission with more solid data to monitor and evaluate progress towards meeting the objective of further energy savings.

Next, the IA indicates the new market surveillance regulation, which is expected to provide the Commission with data on enforcement actions and compliance, along with the 'ADCO' group (Administrative Cooperation Group, see Annex 3) set up to exchange information among Member States. Market surveillance mechanisms on ecodesign and energy labelling can play a key role in evaluating progress. In particular, the ADCO group, which generates best practices and guidelines based on first-hand experiences, has great potential to contribute to the provision of important input for evaluation purposes. While the IA took these aspects into consideration, it is striking that it did not attach more importance to them. According to the legislative proposal itself, the Commission will assess the effectiveness of the Directive and of its delegated acts not later than eight years after its entry into force.⁸

⁷ IAB Opinion Ref. Ares(2015)2362423 - 05/06/2015.

⁸ Article 14 of the Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council setting a framework for energy efficiency labelling and repealing Directive 2010/30/EU, COM(2015) 341, 15.7.2015.

Commission Impact Assessment Board

The IAB issued a first, negative opinion on a draft version of the IA on 5 June 2015.⁹ Subsequently, on 16 June 2015, the IAB issued a positive opinion on the re-submitted draft of 8 June 2015.¹⁰ It is unusual for a revised version of an IA report to be submitted so rapidly following a negative opinion of the Board. This is perhaps indicative of the urgency attached to the release of the energy package in July 2015. The final IA addresses most issues raised by the IAB, including informing about the relationship with other energy efficiency and climate policies, explaining the connection of the Energy Labelling and Ecodesign Directives with the new market surveillance regulation, and explicitly stating that the IA supports a new legislative proposal on energy labelling (and not on ecodesign). The IA could perhaps have elaborated more on the specific impacts on individual products, and on the future of the Ecodesign Directive, as requested by the IAB. With regard to the IAB's request to provide more information on the cost-effectiveness of energy labelling and ecodesign measures in comparison to other initiatives contributing to energy efficiency targets, the IA states: 'The scope of the evaluation concerns energy-related products and it does not go into the question of whether energy savings are more or less cost-effectively achieved in other sectors'(IA, p. 12).

Coherence between the Commission's legislative proposal and IA

The legislative proposal of the Commission generally seems to follow the recommendations expressed in the IA. The proposal improves the existing regulatory framework on energy labelling by requiring labelled products to be registered in a new database, changing the current Energy Labelling Directive to a Regulation (which strengthens the legal structure), improving enforcement and clarifying the obligations of the various parties¹¹, updating the label and allowing for rescaling, and aligning it with the market surveillance regulation.

The explanatory memorandum specifies that further non-legislative actions are planned to implement the option chosen (explanatory memorandum to the proposal, p. 6). Presumably, this refers to the suggested review of the MEErP (Methodology for the Ecodesign of Energy-related Products) proposed under Option 1+, to tackle the reduction of non-energy environmental impacts, although this is not entirely clear.

Conclusions

The IA clearly identifies and defines the problems, and demonstrates that EU action is necessary to address them, emphasising that the objective of reducing negative environmental impacts of products cannot be sufficiently achieved by the Member States. The IA appears to provide a viable attempt to assess the possible impacts of the suggested policy options, although, in comparison to the other options presented, the IA discusses the preferred Option 1+ in greatest detail. The overall impression is that the research and analysis upon which this IA is based is reasonable and comprehensive; it is indicated where impacts were difficult to assess. The IA uses a wide range of external expertise. The stakeholder consultation for the IA seems extensive, however, the representation of European stakeholders might not necessarily be as balanced as it might appear, and some further details of SME input and implications would have been helpful. Finally, the IA could perhaps have elaborated in more depth on possibilities to properly ensure progressive evaluation and monitoring making full use of market surveillance mechanisms.

This note, prepared by the Ex-Ante Impact Assessment Unit for the European Parliament's Committee on Industry, Research and Energy (ITRE) of the European Parliament, analyses whether the principal criteria laid down in the Commission's own Impact Assessment Guidelines, as well as additional factors identified by the Parliament in its Impact Assessment Handbook, appear to be met by the IA. It does not attempt to deal with the substance of the proposal. It is drafted for informational and background purposes to assist the relevant parliamentary committee(s) and Members more widely in their work.

To contact the Ex-Ante Impact Assessment Unit, please e-mail: EPRS-ExAnteImpactAssessment@ep.europa.eu

Manuscript completed in September 2015. Brussels © European Union, 2015.

The opinions expressed in this document are the sole responsibility of the author(s) and do not represent an official position of the European Parliament. Reproduction and translation of this document for non-commercial purposes are authorized, provided the source is acknowledged and the publisher is given prior notice and sent a copy.

www.europarl.europa.eu/thinktank (Internet) – www.eptthinktank.eu (blog) – www.eprs.sso.ep.parl.union.eu (Intranet)

⁹ [IAB Opinion Ref. Ares\(2015\)2362423 - 05/06/2015.](#)

¹⁰ [IAB Opinion Ref. Ares\(2015\)2519106 - 16/06/2015.](#)

¹¹ See Article 12 of the proposed Regulation, COM(2015) 341, 15.7.2015, which allows the Commission to adopt delegated acts on product-specific legislation.