

# **BUSINESSEUROPE's views on the review of the European standardisation system**

Paul Coebergh van den Braak  
BUSINESSEUROPE, Chairman of  
WG IM - Free Movement of Goods

Philips Intellectual Property & Standards

# BUSINESSEUROPE key views

---

- We welcome improving ESS by evolution not revolution
- ESS must foster good, market-relevant standards
- Standardisation must remain private and voluntary
- Appropriate participation is already possible and mainly a stakeholder responsibility
- Subsidies for informing on how to use standards should respect the level playing field for trade associations
- We support referencing relevant ICT standards in public procurement
- Standards are not legislation but can support it subject to their voluntary take-up

# Standards are not legislation

---

- Standardisation helped create prosperous EU market
  - Value for EU economic actors
  - Support for legislation; such as in New Approach style regulation
- Package links standardisation to many policy goals, but
  - Standards are a voluntary, private market tool to support innovation and business
    - 70% of European standards have no relation with public interests
  - Can support policies and laws but not become a tool of politics
    - Policies define “what and why”, experts define “how” in standards
  - Political choices in the political area, not in standardisation
- Exploit the mutual support but do not mix them up



# Private or public need?



# Foster good, market-relevant standards

- Low quality or irrelevance is harmful and can result from
  - Planning top-down without stakeholder consultation
  - Participants lacking expertise on technology or application field.
  - Wasted effort: best case unused; worst case unavoidable
- International alignment is key for most standards
  - Agreements: Vienna ISO – CEN, Dresden IEC – CENELEC
  - Global uniformity reduces cost and creates level playing field
- Only directly affected stakeholders can judge relevance
  - Do not “push” standards
  - Consult stakeholders: we suggest a multi-stakeholder platform
  - What worked for products might not simply transpose to services
- Only truly committed experts make quality standards



# Appropriate participation is already possible

- All stakeholders get informed and can join on equal terms
- “Weak stakeholders” should self-organise to share efforts
  - E.g. very good German model for SMEs
  - E.g. MSs market authorities
- Genuine interests and available expertise should lead, not formal balancing rules
- There are more business associations representing SMEs than the one in Annex III
  - All should be consulted on equal terms for plans and mandates
- Annex III organisations should not verify standards for quality or conformity to EU policies and legislation (A12d)
  - Not impartial and unclear why they would be qualified



# Speeding up the process?

---

- Quality and market relevance come first
- Sometimes speed is a key factor, often only one of many goals
- Slow pace does in general not result from time-consuming or bureaucratic processes but from
  - Need to achieve consensus
  - Deeply divided stakeholder interests
  - Missing key inputs



**Thank you for your attention**