



Ms Francoise Le Bail
Deputy Director General
Commission's SME Envoy
DG Enterprise and Industry
European Commission
200, rue de la Loi
1049 Brussels

8 March 2010

Dear Mrs Le Bail,

Following the recent impact assessment on the Standardisation Package we would like to provide you with some remarks on this process. The Commission Guidelines on Impact Assessments state that an impact assessment is a tool to ensure that Commission initiatives and EU legislation are prepared on the basis of transparent, comprehensive and balanced evidence. Furthermore, all affected stakeholders should be engaged and given the opportunity to provide input on relevant issues. Appropriate tools, timing and format should be used to reach them. We believe that the Technopolis impact assessment study does not sufficiently safeguard these objectives, due to the timeframe and the scope of the questions directed towards various stakeholders.

First, we would like to express our surprise that the impact assessment started long before the EXPRESS report was published. Our impression throughout this process has been that the recommendations of EXPRESS would form part of the basis of the proposal for a new standardisation package. However, despite of this, policy options submitted for an impact assessment were already decided prior to the completion of the EXPRESS report. In light of this, we would like to know how and to which degree the EXPRESS report will be taken into account in the whole procedure, possibly leading to a proposal for a standardisation package.

Also, relating to the time schedule we believe that there has been given insufficient time to produce sufficient data to the Technopolis impact assessment study. This concern has also been echoed by the National Standards Bodies. We received the questionnaires on 14 January with a request to provide input by 5 February. Such a short deadline risks going at the expense of the quality of the answers and thus of the assessment outcomes.

We would also like to communicate our disappointment with having been asked for input only on a very limited number of questions in the context of the Impact Assessment study. Standards are utilised and produced by business and we would be affected by options we were not asked to provide input on. Compared with the National Standards Bodies we received a very limited number of questions in the consultation, although several of the questions raised to National Standards Bodies (NSB) were

equally relevant to business. This is also reflected by our members being contacted by NSB representatives on the questions raised to them. We believe that input from BUSINESSEUROPE on many of these issues is necessary to obtain sufficiently balanced and comprehensive evidence.

Also, in the request for input received by BUSINESSEUROPE there was very little background information, leading to misinterpretations concerning the full intention of the questions. The first question posed concerned the extended notification of national standards. In the request for information sent to NSBs it is clear that the extended notifications concern services standards/deliverables. This information was missing in the documentation we received. If it had been specified in the request for input from BUSINESSEUROPE, our reply would have been more supportive of the proposal.

Finally, we would like to address the scope of the impact assessment as it seems that some of the provisions under consideration would not be supported by any stakeholders. Provision 25, representing something of a complete 'overhaul' of the way in which European standardisation takes place, to our best knowledge only prompts surprise and concern amongst all stakeholder groups

We hope these comments are useful and would appreciate that they were taken into account. We would be happy to provide input to future impact assessments and consultations on this topic. We will send a copy of this letter to Secretary General Catherine Day.

Yours sincerely,



Philippe de Buck

