



The role of technology in market surveillance – future for level playing field

**Date: 02/03/2016
Market Watch Final Event**

Michał Zakrzewski – Trade & Safety Policy Director

▣ Relevance of Market Surveillance

- Market Surveillance has always been high on CECED's agenda
- CECED has always advocated for more and better coordinated MS activities across the EU
- CECED not only talks, but **does**:
 - Internal Bilateral Verification Procedure (BVP)
 - ATLETE I project – refrigerators and freezers – 2009-2011
 - ATLETE II project – washing machines – 2012-2014
 - ATLETE III project - vacuum cleaners submitted, but not accepted within Horizon 2020 call

▣ Market Surveillance tools for level playing field



- Role of the EU financed projects
- Template test reports
- *Product fiche (product information sheet) availability*
- Different ways of sharing information
- Product database

▣ Role of the EU financed projects

- CECED was directly involved in ATLETE Projects and member of Advisory Committee of Ecopliant Project
- ATLETE Projects proved that:
 - Pan-European Market Surveillance is possible within limited timeframe and budget
 - There are good, independent laboratories able to test household appliances for MS purposes
 - Test reports issued by laboratory in country “A” can be used in country “B”
- Ecopliant project proved that:
 - Cooperation between different MSAs is possible and welcomed
 - Such cooperation enhances overall Market Surveillance in Europe
- EU financed projects provided very good examples, but is there a need to continue them?

▣ Template test reports

- ATLETE projects observed that some Member States do not want (cannot) use test reports coming from another Member State and in non-official language of the given Member State
- ATLETE II made an attempt to work out language neutral test reports – values always in the same cells; cover sheet with respective language to be used
- Further work could be continued in respective standardisation committees

▣ Different ways of sharing information

- Legislation should be future proof and permit the development of electronic means of sharing information:
 - Labels could continue being provided with products as today
 - Possibly, in the future, delegated acts could define electronic solutions, provided all stakeholders agree
- Product information sheet (*old product fiche*) is not language neutral, so should be able to be delivered by electronic means (e.g. online catalogues or websites)
- Manufacturers use many different marketing routes for products being placed on the market and different means of providing the information sheet needs to be in line with this

Product database

- A mandatory registration in a database cannot be:
 - a substitute for real product compliance test or
 - the basis for starting selection of products to be tested (*it would be enough not to register to escape from market control*)
- Members States should check that data is complete and correct
- Prevent that unscrupulous actors can get a competitive advantage by avoiding to register in the data base, or by registering false performance data
- Without such provisions in the Framework legislation, any product database would not provide added value to market surveillance and consumer trust in the label
- The database should be set up in a way which fully respects the sensitive nature of compliance information provided by companies

Product database (2)



- Only testing of appliances can determine if they are correctly labelled