

**Question for written answer P-002411/2014
to the Commission**
Rule 117
Paul Rübiger (PPE)

Subject: Duplication in assessment of the sustainability of construction products

For nearly ten years now, work has been going on under the auspices of DG Enterprise and Industry to develop a standard for 'Sustainability of Construction Works' (CEN TC350). During that time the necessary 'state of the art' first had to be developed. Standards already exist for assessing the sustainability of building works (e.g. EN15804). In these, the underlying consensus is that the building as a whole should be assessed in accordance with the three dimensions of sustainability.

In parallel, the Joint Research Centre (JRC) has now developed the Product Environmental Footprint (PEF) model. This model to some extent incorporates other assessment criteria, but it principally assesses the individual (part of the) product and not the building as a whole. This model was been put forward by DG Environment in its communication entitled 'Building the Single Market for Green Products' (COM(2013)196).

On 1 July 2013 the Construction Products Regulation entered into force as part of the Product Safety and Market Surveillance Package (COM(2013)75 and COM(2013)78). This regulation adequately covers product safety and market surveillance. Here, too, there are instances of duplication.

The simultaneous and indeed contradictory activities of several DGs are making the European rules on construction products more confusing.

1. What action should be taken to tackle the simultaneous and indeed contradictory activities of several DGs in the field of construction materials?
2. How should the differing approaches of the individual DGs be assessed and understood, given that some relate to whole buildings while others also cover individual (parts of) products used?
3. Why are additional rules being considered and/or devised even though there are already adequate legal provisions to cover the building products sector?
4. How can greater transparency be created for those concerned, avoiding duplication of rules?