

Revision of the General Product Safety Directive

This briefing is one in a series of 'implementation appraisals', produced by the European Parliamentary Research Service (EPRS), on the operation of existing EU legislation in practice. Each briefing focuses on a specific EU law which is likely to be amended or reviewed, as foreseen in the European Commission's annual work programme. 'Implementation appraisals' aim at providing a succinct overview of publicly available material on the implementation, application and effectiveness to date of specific EU law, drawing on input from EU institutions and bodies, as well as external organisations. They are provided by the Ex-Post Evaluation Unit of the EPRS, to assist parliamentary committees in their consideration of new European Commission proposals, once tabled.

SUMMARY

To ensure the safety of non-food consumer products on the internal market, the European co-legislators adopted the General Product Safety Directive (GPSD, 2001/95/EC) in 2001. The GPSD functions as a 'safety net', by imposing general safety requirements on products to which no specific provisions – such as EU harmonised legislation for specific products – with the same safety objective in other EU legislation apply.

Two decades after the entry into force of the GPSD, the internal market is witnessing an increasing presence of products made with the use of or involving new technologies, online marketplaces are mushrooming, and a growing amount of products are entering the internal market from outside the European Union through these online marketplaces. Since the GPSD does not have any provisions to guarantee that these products are safe for use, there are concerns that consumer protection on the internal market might be compromised.

In order to keep guaranteeing the safety of all products, the GPSD needs to be revised. The European Commission's forthcoming proposal will aim to deal with these new challenges for product safety and to find a balance between ensuring unhindered trade and guaranteeing the safety of all products on the internal market.

1. Background information

1.1. Short overview of the history of product safety in the EU

The Council adopted the first directive on general product safety (the 1992 Directive) in 1992.¹ Community action was deemed necessary because disparities among the Member States' national legislation or the absence of such legislation in some Member States risked creating barriers to trade and impeding competition within the internal market.

However, based on a Commission report on the implementation of the 1992 Directive, the co-legislators considered it incomplete and some of its provisions indistinct. Due to some relevant developments as regards consumer product safety after the adoption of the 1992 Directive, it was recast and replaced by the 2001 General Product Safety Directive (GPSD).²

The GPSD is more comprehensive than the 1992 Directive. However, it is still quite general, but contains a *lex specialis* in Article 1(2), which means that it only applies to consumer products when 'there are no specific provisions with the same objective in rules of Community law governing the safety of the products concerned'. The effect of this provision is that product safety legislation is quite fragmented, with some products being regulated by the GPSD, others by the Market Surveillance Directive and some others by sector-specific legislation.³

To simplify this system, in 2013 the European Commission proposed a legislative package with the intention to revise both the GPSD and the Market Surveillance Directive. However, the proposal was blocked in the Council due to disagreements over country-of-origin labelling issues. In 2019, the Market Surveillance Directive was amended by the new [Regulation on Market Surveillance and Compliance](#) (Regulation (EU) 2019/1020) which will enter into force in July 2021 (with some provisions already in force as of January 2021). After that, the European Commission announced its plan to revise the GPSD and launch a back-to-back evaluation and impact assessment on product safety.⁴ Meanwhile, Parliament highlighted the need to adapt product safety rules to new market realities and the digital transition. The Parliament stressed the importance of addressing the fragmentation of the single market again in its 2020 resolution on product safety (see Section 3 on 'European Parliament's position' for further details).⁵

1.2. Main aspects of the GPSD

The GPSD was adopted to strengthen the level of consumer protection in the community. It contains provisions applicable to businesses and national market surveillance authorities.⁶ In short, businesses must:

- comply with minimum safety standards set forth in the GPSD;
- inform consumers of any risks associated with the products they supply;
- cooperate with the competent authorities in actions aimed at preventing risks and inform the authorities when a product appears to be dangerous.

National market surveillance authorities must:

- monitor the safety of products available on the market;
- inform consumers of risks associated with products available on the market;
- collaborate with the relevant authorities from the other Member States to effectively ensure the attainment of the objectives of the GPSD.

According to Article 2a of the GPSD, '...any product placed on the market, or otherwise supplied or made available to consumers, intended for consumers, or likely to be used by consumers under reasonably foreseeable conditions even if not intended for them' falls within the scope of the directive.

While the GPSD does not apply to services, ensuring the effective realisation of its objectives requires that its provisions also apply to products that are available to consumers in the context of services provision for use by them. The GPSD imposes general requirements regarding consumer product safety. In other words, for (aspects of) products for which there are more specific, harmonised provisions in place, it is those provisions that are applicable. This will usually be the Market Surveillance Regulation and sector-specific legislation.⁷ In addition, the safety of food, pharmaceuticals and medical devices is governed by separate directives.⁸

2. The 2021 European Commission proposal

2.1. Objectives of the Commission proposal

The current GPSD functions as a safety net for consumers. However, it is nearing its 20th anniversary and some of its provisions are unfit to ensure the safety of all the products that are available to consumers on the internal market.⁹ Therefore, to bring the GPSD on a par with the current realities, the Commission believes that its revision should have the following objectives:¹⁰

- It must ensure that the EU legal framework provides for general safety rules for all consumer products and risks on the internal market, including those linked to new technologies. A problem of the current GPSD is that it is unclear to what extent new products, such as software, fall within its scope. The risks of digital products can also materialise themselves in ways that the current GPSD does not provide for.
- It must tackle product safety challenges presented by online sales. The product safety rules for the operators that undertake these new types of transactions are unclear and the Member States' authorities do not have sufficient instruments for online market surveillance.
- It needs to ensure that product recalls are more effective and efficient. The level of effectiveness of consumer product recalls is currently low.
- It has to improve market surveillance and impose equal obligations on the different market players regardless of whether they are dealing with products that are subject to harmonised rules or to non-harmonised rules.¹¹
- It must address safety concerns related to food imitating products. Currently, the legal framework for food imitating products differs from country to country.

2.2. Main aspects of the European Commission proposal

The abovementioned objectives can be regarded as both an extension of the scope and an improvement of the current GPSD. To achieve the desired results, the Commission has set forth different policy options that vary in their legal impact.¹² It is possible that the forthcoming proposal will consist of a combination of policy options.

Table 1 – Policy options considered in the revision of the GPSD

<p>Option 0 - Status quo</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The GPSD remains unchanged. 	<p>Option 1 - Improved implementation and enforcement of the GPSD. This policy option does not require making legal changes to the GPSD, but addresses the five objectives of its revision by means of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • developing guidance on the risks posed by new technologies and exploring the use of European standards; • supporting and promoting the product safety pledge (a voluntary commitment for third-party players in online marketplaces to ensure the safety of non-food products); • developing guidance on product recalls; • increasing funding for market surveillance activities; • revising the Food Imitating Products Directive in order to clarify its scope. 	<p>Option 2 - Targeted revision of the GPSD. This policy option does require a legal revision of the directive itself, albeit small. It addresses the five objectives of the revision by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • specifying how the scope of the provisions and the definitions apply to new technologies, but without directly applying it to standalone software; • making some of the provisions of the safety pledge legally binding for online marketplaces; • adding requirements to the product recall provisions to make them more effective; • ensuring alignment with rules applicable to harmonized products, while at the same keeping different legal instruments time; • integrating the risk assessment provisions of the Food Imitating Products Directive into the GPSD.
<p>Option 3 - Full revision of the GPSD. This option would replace the directive with a regulation. It would provide for the measures listed under option 2, while also:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • extending the definition of products to standalone software; • integrating new requirements for players in the online sales channels; • establishing mandatory requirements for product recalls and registration of dangerous products; • giving stronger enforcement powers to Member States and arbitration powers to the Commission in case a Member State assesses the safety of products differently; • possibly banning the marketing and sale of all food imitating products on the EU market. 	<p>Option 4 - A new legal instrument that ingrates the GPSD and the Regulation on Market Surveillance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This policy option would include all elements of option three but also provide for a single set of rules applicable to both harmonised and non-harmonised products. 	

Source: Author's compilation, based on the European Commission's [Inception Impact Assessment](#), June 2020.

2.3. Consumer Safety Network

In the policy-making process, the Consumer Safety Network (CSN) assists the European Commission in the implementation of the GPSD and in the preparation of legislative proposals and initiatives in the area of product safety. The CSN is made up of experts from EU and EFTA/EEA countries specialised in product safety, as well as relevant stakeholder representatives, and is chaired by the European Commission.¹³

At its meeting on 27 September 2019, the CSN evaluated the implementation of the product safety pledge. The first monitoring report showed good results, for example, that the numbers of listings removed had improved, as had cooperation between the platforms and the Member States. However, the report also highlighted the need for enhancing cooperation, as well as the need for platforms to better engage in preventive and educational actions. Furthermore, the report insisted that companies should make efforts to prevent unsafe products from reappearing on the market and increase their use of new technologies to better detect unsafe products online. For the product safety pledge, the European Commission stated that its objectives were to increase the number of signatories and to improve the results of the pledge and its functioning, by enhancing cooperation between platforms and authorities.¹⁴ France also reaffirmed its support to the product safety pledge and suggested making the pledge mandatory through a revision of the GPSD or the e-Commerce Directive.

Furthermore, the Czech representative stressed that a lot of things had changed since the legislative package was presented in 2013 and asked how the Commission planned to proceed in the light of these circumstances. The representative specifically asked the Commission whether it believed that a new proposal should be created from scratch, and if yes, whether this new proposal would be aligned with the 2019 Regulation on Market Surveillance and Compliance.

At the time when the present briefing was drafted (beginning of June 2021), no further information was publicly available on discussions on the revision of the GPSD in subsequent expert group meetings.

2.4. Reactions to the public consultation on the revision

The European Commission held two public consultations on the revision of the GPSD. The revision of the inception impact assessment yielded 44 responses, of which nine came from individual companies/business associations, five from consumer organisations, 20 from business associations, two from NGOs and eight from other or unknown entities.

Companies and business organisations were generally in favour of the proposal to revise the GPSD. Organisations representing the interests of SMEs responded positively towards the ambition to increase the protection of SMEs, but also expressed concerns whether a far-reaching revision would actually enhance their position. Some companies voiced concerns that bringing new technologies within the scope of the GPSD might increase the complexity of the legislation and cause legal uncertainty. Most companies were supportive of harmonising the rules applicable to different products. Some said that they were worried about the insufficient level of recall effectiveness and the complexity of market surveillance rules, and that they hoped the new proposal would enhance both issues. Companies and business associations were generally more likely to support policy option 1, 2 or 3 than option 0 or 4 (as presented in Section 2.2 above, 'Main aspects of the European Commission proposal').

Unlike companies, consumer organisations or NGOs representing consumers' interests were likely to recommend policy option 3 or 4. They agreed that the current GPSD is unfit to ensure safety for products involving new technologies. Uniformity in legislation is also a point that most of the consumer organisations considered essential for the reform.

The second public consultation was launched for the purpose of gathering the views of a wide range of stakeholders – from individual citizens to relevant public and private organisations – on four EU consumer policy initiatives that the Commission had planned to propose in 2020 and 2021.¹⁵¹⁶ Some 257 respondents answered at least one question.¹⁷ Business organisations and EU citizens represented the largest share of the respondents, accounting for 26 % each. They were followed by companies/business organisations (15 %), public authorities (11 %), consumer organisations (8 %), NGOs (7 %), academic/research institutions (3 %), non-EU citizens (1 %) and other entities (3 %). The questions asked in the course of the consultation, as well as the answers given, are shown in Figure 1 below.

Figure 1 - Replies to the public consultation on the revision of the GPSD



Data source: Author's compilation, based on the European Commission's [Factual summary report – public consultation on the review of the GPSD](#), October 2020.

3. European Parliament's position

3.1. Non-legislative resolution of 25 November 2020 on addressing product safety in the single market

In this resolution,¹⁸ the European Parliament highlighted the changes to the GPSD that it considered necessary for ensuring the safety of all products on the single market. It made clear that the revision of the GPSD should seek to simplify the system by making similar rules applicable to more products. Therefore, the Parliament recommended that the Commission align the rules applicable to harmonised and non-harmonised products, and identify and close gaps with existing legislation.

Additionally, the Parliament recommended broadening the scope of the GPSD by redefining the terms 'product' and 'safe product', including products with artificial intelligence (AI), the internet of things and robotics embedded in them, to reflect the complexity of emerging software. The Parliament insisted that the Commission reconsider the timing of the safety test that products must undergo. Currently, this test is performed when a product is placed on the market, but the Parliament questioned this rationale especially for products involving AI and other emerging technologies that can alter the use of a product.

Furthermore, the resolution conveyed the Parliament's concern about the risk-based assessment, emphasising that it should be harmonised to allow mainly micro-, small and medium sized enterprises to benefit from a lesser administrative burden and to enhance consumer safety.

As regards market surveillance, the Parliament recommended increasing the resources and expertise of market surveillance authorities. Parliament proposed introducing minimum sampling rates and encouraging mystery shopping (incognito shopping to assess the quality of the products).

Cooperation with the authorities of third countries should be increased, in particular for exchanging market surveillance-related information on dangerous goods. To reduce the amount of counterfeited products on the market, the Parliament urged the Commission to get a better and clearer picture of the phenomenon. The Parliament also called for improving the recall of unsafe products from consumers.

Furthermore, the Parliament recommended increasing cooperation at EU and international level between consumer protection, market surveillance and customs authorities, to guarantee harmonised and uniform checks. The Parliament urged the Commission to swiftly adopt implementing acts in accordance with the 2019 Regulation on Market Surveillance and Compliance, which lays down benchmarks and techniques for checks on harmonised and non-harmonised products, and to include minimum requirements for these checks. The Commission should also prioritise product safety in its action plan for the customs.

The Parliament also expressed concern about products sold on online marketplaces. To decrease the risk of unsafe products, the Commission should propose mandatory rules on the obligations and responsibilities of marketplaces established both within and beyond the EU. The resolution suggests assessing how online marketplaces could improve their interconnection with the EU safety gate (formerly RAPEX). RAPEX should be made friendlier for use by online marketplaces. The Parliament also expressed support for the negotiation of an ambitious WTO e-commerce agreement.

European Commission follow-up to the European Parliament's non-legislative resolution on addressing product safety in the single market

In its written reply to the resolution,¹⁹ the Commission stated that it shared the Parliament's view on the need to update EU market surveillance rules for non-harmonised products and to better align the legislative framework for harmonised and non-harmonised products. Moreover, the Commission promised to examine the current definitions for 'safety', 'product' and 'placing on the market', to see whether they are still fit for purpose in view of the new technologies that have

emerged. The Commission also said it would explore the links between cybersecurity and safety in general.

Furthermore, the Commission stated that it was also looking into ways to improve product recalls in the upcoming revision. To improve the cooperation between consumer protection, market surveillance and customs authorities, the Commission was examining the possibility to establish an automated process for exchange of information between RAPEX and a newly developed customs risk management system.

With regard to market surveillance on online marketplaces, the Commission stated that it was seeking to strengthen the obligations and responsibilities of online marketplaces relating to product safety. To this end, the Commission said that it was looking at making some commitments contained in the safety pledge compulsory. The Commission also agreed with the Parliament's view that cooperation between online marketplaces and national authorities should be improved, and promised to examine further cooperation instruments for the revision of the GPSD.

3.2. MEPs' questions

[Written question](#) by Krzysztof Hetman (EPP), 16 July 2020

Subject: 'Obligation to indicate the origin of non-food consumer products'

The questioner recalled that the 2013 package on product safety and market surveillance would include a provision on country of origin information. However, it was this provision that had caused division within the Council and made the Commission withdraw the proposal. The questioner recalled that the Commission had announced its intention to make this provision part of the revision. He inquired whether the Commission was indeed planning to include the provision on country of origin information in the new proposal and how much progress had been made.

[Answer](#) given by Mr Reynders on behalf of the European Commission, 7 September 2020

Mr Reynders stated that the Commission was preparing an evaluation of the current GPSD and an impact assessment of the new proposal. The latter would look into the connection between the 'made in' label and product safety. The Commissioner furthermore remarked that an open consultation was being held and that the final text of the revision of the GPSD would take due account of the outcomes of the impact assessment and the public consultation.

[Written question](#) by Eugen Jurzyca (ECR), 16 September 2020

Subject: 'Reporting counterfeits to the Rapid Exchange of Information System (RAPEX) – current practice, capacity and Commission plans'

The questioner noted that it was currently not possible to report information on non-dangerous counterfeits through the RAPEX system. He therefore inquired how Member States normally combat counterfeit products on the market, whether RAPEX can be used to report such products, and, if not, whether the Commission is proposing a plan to make this possible. He furthermore asked whether the potential inclusion of non-dangerous counterfeit products in RAPEX would not undermine its effectiveness.

[Answer](#) given by Mr Reynders on behalf of the European Commission, 15 December 2020

According to the Commission, the current legal basis rules out the possibility of including non-dangerous counterfeit products in RAPEX. If that were possible, the number of counterfeit products in RAPEX would largely outnumber the number of dangerous products, and this would affect the authorities' ability to undertake follow-up actions.

On the question about how Member States normally combat counterfeit trade, the Commission explained that Member States enforce this nationally, but that they share their best practices with each other and the EU bodies through the European Observatory on Infringements of Intellectual Property Rights, which is managed by the European Union Intellectual Property Office.

[Written question](#) by Petra De Sutter (Greens/EFA), 23 January 2020

Subject: 'Automated decision-making processes: ensuring consumer protection and the free movement of goods and services'

The questioner expressed concern about the extent to which the existing EU product safety and liability frameworks can be adapted to new AI-enabled products and services. She inquired what initiatives the Commission will undertake to ensure that EU safety and liability frameworks are fit for purpose and how market surveillance and other competent authorities will be given adequate means to act.

[Answer](#) in plenary by Thierry Breton, Member of the European Commission, 10 February 2020

The question was addressed in plenary. The respondent acknowledged the increased risks of discrimination that automated decision-making processes result in, but also assured that consumers who use the services/products of companies that make use of automatic decision-making software, and who are at risk of discrimination, are in any cases subject to consumer protection legislation (e.g. in the case of personalised pricing). Likewise, he assured that the General Data Protection Regulation and the Platform for Business regulation respectively curtail the personal data safety risks that AI might cause, and impose transparency obligations on the ranking achieved by the algorithms of online platforms and search engines. The respondent however acknowledged that there are still risks to be addressed, and noted that the Commission is going to reflect further on AI issues with the adaptation of the General Product Safety Directive, the Machinery Directive and the Radio Equipment Directive.

4. Council of the European Union

In its conclusions on the New Consumer Agenda of February 2021, the Council expressed its support to the revision of the GPSD. The revision should, according to the Council, create 'a level playing field for the safety of online and offline products by improving systems of recall, enforcement and traceability, in order to ensure that all products placed on the single market are safe'.²⁰

5. European Economic and Social Committee

In its [2018 opinion](#) regarding two legislative Commission proposals and an accompanying communication on products in the single market (the [goods package](#)), the European Economic and Social Committee (EESC) made some observations and recommendations relating to product safety. According to the EESC opinion:

- the Commission should be required to present regular reports on RAPEX to give consumers, business and organisations representing both of them access to additional information on products identified as unsafe;
- there is a need for a policy enabling Member States to cooperate on the exchange of information;
- the Commission should have the power to assess national measures implemented in respect of harmonisation policy;
- a pan-European injuries database should be established.

6. European Court of Justice

[Judgment](#) in Case C-132/08, *Lidl Magyarország Kereskedelmi bt v Nemzeti Hírközlési Hatóság Tanácsa*

This case concerns the marketing of radio equipment in Hungary by Lidl. The radio equipment was manufactured by a Belgian company that affixed the CE-marking and issued a declaration of conformity. The frequency bands used by the radio equipment were not harmonised. In 2007, Hungary's Public Procurement Authority (Hatóság) expressed the view that the declaration of conformity issued for the equipment did not match the requirements imposed by the Hungarian

legislation and prohibited the marketing of the equipment until a proper declaration of conformity was obtained. Hatóság regarded Lidl as the manufacturer since it was Lidl that placed the equipment on the market in Hungary.

The referring court asked the European Court of Justice (ECJ) whether, in the context of the GPSD, a distributor of radio equipment may be regarded as the producer of that product, even though this distributor did not participate in the production of the product and did not, through its activities, affect the safety properties of the product. The court furthermore inquired whether a 'distributor of equipment manufactured in another Member State (who is not the same person as the producer) can be required to issue a declaration of conformity setting out the technical data relating to the equipment', or whether such a demand may be made subject to the obligations imposed on the producer in the case where the latter does not market the relevant products.

The ECJ answered that the GPSD does not apply to the determination of issues concerning the obligation of a person to provide a declaration of conformity of radio equipment. It also stressed that a person (in this case: Lidl) who markets a product may be regarded as being the producer of that product only under the conditions specified by the GPSD itself in Article 2(e), and as being the distributor of that product only under the conditions set out in Article 2(f).

7. Stakeholder opinions

Business and consumer organisations have issued position papers on the revision of the GPSD. The Confederation of European Business (Business Europe), a lobby group made up of national business federations as its direct members, believes that policy option 2 (as presented in Section 2.2) would be most proportionate.²¹ It stressed in its [position paper](#) that the GPSD functions as a safety net and that it should stay that way. According to Business Europe, specific aspects of the new technologies are better addressed through harmonised regulations, since this would allow for more tailored solutions. Additionally, Business Europe would rather wait for the moment when the Market Surveillance Regulation has been fully implemented and reached optimal effectiveness, rather than build drastic market surveillance measures into the revised GPSD. Business Europe supports RAPEX, which should focus on products that present serious risks. The lobby group believes that the introduction of the precautionary principle to product safety would be disproportionate and would reach much beyond its current application.

Two consumer organisations, the European Bureau of Consumers' Unions (BEUC) and the European Association for the Co-ordination of Consumer Representation in Standardisation (ANEC), issued a joint [position paper](#) voicing their clear support for policy option 4.²² They believe that the GPSD should continue to be based on the precautionary principle, and that it should maintain its function as a safety net covering gaps in specific sector legislation and products that are not covered by any specific sector legislation. Besides, they would like the revision to establish a uniform framework for market surveillance for all consumer products and make the GPSD capable of coping with new technologies. Finally, they would like the revision to set product-specific mandatory safety requirements as a way to provide for legal certainty and ensure compatibility with other policy reforms in the field.

8. International context

The European Commission has bilateral cooperation agreements with countries such as the United States, Canada, China and Japan, all aimed at exchanging information about product safety.²³ In addition, the Commission and the Chinese authorities have a RAPEX-CHINA system in place that facilitates regular and rapid transmission of information between the EU and China on dangerous products of Chinese origin found in the EU.²⁴

Furthermore, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) manages the [Global Recalls portal](#), which brings together information on product recalls being issued around the

world. The portal includes publicly available information on mandatory and voluntary product recalls that were issued by governmental bodies.

MAIN REFERENCES

[Directive 2001/95/EC](#) of 3 December 2001 on general product safety.

European Parliament, [Resolution](#) of 25 November 2020 on addressing product safety in the single market, 2019/2190(INI).

ENDNOTES

- 1 [Council Directive 92/59/EEC](#) of 29 June 1992 on general product safety.
- 2 See recital 1 to [Directive 2001/95/EC](#) of 3 December 2001 on general product safety.
- 3 N. Šajn, [Strengthening market surveillance of harmonised industrial products](#), Briefing, EPRS, European Parliament, July 2019.
- 4 At the time when the present briefing was drafted (beginning of June 2021), the Commission proposal for a revised GPSD, the evaluation and the impact assessment were not yet published (planned for 30 June 2021).
- 5 [Resolution](#) of 25 November 2020 on addressing product safety in the single market (2019/2190(INI), European Parliament.
- 6 [Directive 2001/95/EC](#) of 3 December 2001 on general product safety.
- 7 [Revision of the General Product Safety Directive \(REFIT\)](#), Legislative Train Schedule, European Parliament.
- 8 [General Product Safety Directive](#), European Commission website.
- 9 Combined Evaluation Roadmap/Inception Impact Assessment of the Revision of Directive 2001/95/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council on general product safety, [Ares\(2020\)3256809](#) European Commission, 23 June 2020.
- 10 *ibid.*
- 11 The framework for market surveillance has recently been reformed, while the GPSD, which covers aspects of market surveillance for consumer products that are not covered by the framework, has not.
- 12 *ibid.*
- 13 [Consumer Safety Network](#), European Commission website.
- 14 [Consumer expert groups](#), European Commission website.
- 15 [General Product Safety Directive - review](#), European Commission website.
- 16 The four initiatives are: 1. A new consumer agenda, which will provide a new EU strategic framework for consumer policy in five key priority areas; 2. Empowering the consumer for the green transition, which aims to improve the participation of consumers in the green transition; 3. A review of the Directive on Credit Agreements for Consumers, and 4. a review of the Directive on General Product Safety (see the [Commission website](#)).
- 17 [General Product Safety Directive – review](#), European Commission website.
- 18 European Parliament [resolution](#) 2019/2190(INI).
- 19 Follow-up to the European Parliament non-legislative resolution on addressing product safety in the single market, European Commission, forthcoming publication in [EUR-LEX](#).
- 20 [Council conclusions](#) of 22 February 2021 on the New Consumer Agenda.
- 21 [Revision of the General Product Safety Directive - BusinessEurope comments](#), 8 March 2021.
- 22 [BEUC and ANEC views for a modern regulatory framework on product safety](#), 26 August 2020.
- 23 [Bilateral cooperation](#), European Commission website.
- 24 *ibid.*

DISCLAIMER AND COPYRIGHT

This document is prepared for, and addressed to, the Members and staff of the European Parliament as background material to assist them in their parliamentary work. The content of the document is the sole responsibility of its author(s) and any opinions expressed herein should not be taken to represent an official position of the Parliament.

Reproduction and translation for non-commercial purposes are authorised, provided the source is acknowledged and the European Parliament is given prior notice and sent a copy.

© European Union, 2021.

eprs@ep.europa.eu (contact)

www.eprs.ep.parl.union.eu (intranet)

www.europarl.europa.eu/thinktank (internet)

<http://epthinktank.eu> (blog)

