

2020 Public consultation on the Review of the Construction Products Regulation

Fields marked with * are mandatory.

Introduction

Following up on the conclusions of the evaluation of the **EU Construction Products Regulation (CPR)** published in 2019 ([available via this link](#)), the European Commission has identified **five different policy options** for how to improve the functioning of the **EU market for construction products**.

It is important to understand the preferences and expected impacts of the policy options from as many relevant and interested stakeholders as possible. **We are inviting you to share your insights, facts and expectations in this public consultation survey.** Your input is highly valuable in order to contribute to the evolution and design of the EU legislation on construction products.

The survey consists of **two parts**: the first part focuses on some **background information** about you / your organisation, and the **second part focuses on the policy options and the impacts you expect them to have**. If you are responding as an **individual in your personal capacity, you will be able to choose if you wish to respond to a shorter CPR-related questionnaire** of a more general nature, or if you wish to respond to a longer, more detailed CPR-related questionnaire that requires a certain level of prior knowledge of the CPR.

If you encounter any issues or have questions regarding the questionnaire, please feel free to contact Copenhagen Economics and the Danish Technological Institute on: CPRsurvey@dti.dk (Copenhagen Economics and the Danish Technological Institute are part of the external contractor in charge of the supporting study commissioned by the European Commission for the assessment of the impacts of future options).

Thank you for your participation.

About you

* Language of my contribution

- Bulgarian
- Croatian
- Czech

- Danish
- Dutch
- English
- Estonian
- Finnish
- French
- Gaelic
- German
- Greek
- Hungarian
- Italian
- Latvian
- Lithuanian
- Maltese
- Polish
- Portuguese
- Romanian
- Slovak
- Slovenian
- Spanish
- Swedish

* I am giving my contribution as

- Academic/research institution
- Business association
- Company/business organisation
- Consumer organisation
- EU citizen
- Environmental organisation
- Non-EU citizen
- Non-governmental organisation (NGO)
- Public authority
- Trade union
- Other

* Are you an independent professional / self-employed?

- Yes
- No

* Type of company/business organisation/independent professional/self-employed

- Manufacturer of construction products
- Distributor of construction products
- Construction company
- Designer (architect, civil engineer, specifier, etc.)
- Raw material supplier
- Other, related to the construction sector
- Other, not related to the construction sector

* Are you, or your company, importing construction products from countries not covered by the CPR, i.e. countries outside the EU, the UK, Norway, Switzerland, Iceland, Liechtenstein and Turkey?

- Yes
- No

* Is your organisation a Technical Body (*e.g. a Notified Body, Technical Assessment Body, standardisation organisation, CEN, EOTA, consultancy for national competent authorities*)?

- Yes
- No

* First name

Alexis

* Surname

Kuhl

* Email (this won't be published)

alexis.kuhl@europanel.org

* Organisation name

255 character(s) maximum

European Panel Federation

* Organisation size

- Micro (1 to 9 employees)
- Small (10 to 49 employees)
- Medium (50 to 249 employees)
- Large (250 or more)

Transparency register number

255 character(s) maximum

Check if your organisation is on the [transparency register](#). It's a voluntary database for organisations seeking to influence EU decision-making.

572064811767-22

* Country of origin

Please add your country of origin, or that of your organisation.

- | | | | |
|---|--|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="radio"/> Afghanistan | <input type="radio"/> Djibouti | <input type="radio"/> Libya | <input type="radio"/> Saint Martin |
| <input type="radio"/> Åland Islands | <input type="radio"/> Dominica | <input type="radio"/> Liechtenstein | <input type="radio"/> Saint Pierre and Miquelon |
| <input type="radio"/> Albania | <input type="radio"/> Dominican Republic | <input type="radio"/> Lithuania | <input type="radio"/> Saint Vincent and the Grenadines |
| <input type="radio"/> Algeria | <input type="radio"/> Ecuador | <input type="radio"/> Luxembourg | <input type="radio"/> Samoa |
| <input type="radio"/> American Samoa | <input type="radio"/> Egypt | <input type="radio"/> Macau | <input type="radio"/> San Marino |
| <input type="radio"/> Andorra | <input type="radio"/> El Salvador | <input type="radio"/> Madagascar | <input type="radio"/> São Tomé and Príncipe |
| <input type="radio"/> Angola | <input type="radio"/> Equatorial Guinea | <input type="radio"/> Malawi | <input type="radio"/> Saudi Arabia |
| <input type="radio"/> Anguilla | <input type="radio"/> Eritrea | <input type="radio"/> Malaysia | <input type="radio"/> Senegal |
| <input type="radio"/> Antarctica | <input type="radio"/> Estonia | <input type="radio"/> Maldives | <input type="radio"/> Serbia |
| <input type="radio"/> Antigua and Barbuda | <input type="radio"/> Eswatini | <input type="radio"/> Mali | <input type="radio"/> Seychelles |
| <input type="radio"/> Argentina | <input type="radio"/> Ethiopia | <input type="radio"/> Malta | <input type="radio"/> Sierra Leone |

- Armenia
- Aruba
- Australia
- Austria
- Azerbaijan
- Bahamas
- Bahrain
- Bangladesh
- Barbados
- Belarus
- Belgium
- Belize
- Benin
- Bermuda
- Bhutan
- Bolivia
- Bonaire Saint Eustatius and Saba
- Bosnia and Herzegovina
- Botswana
- Bouvet Island
- Brazil
- British Indian Ocean Territory
- British Virgin Islands
- Falkland Islands
- Faroe Islands
- Fiji
- Finland
- France
- French Guiana
- French Polynesia
- French Southern and Antarctic Lands
- Gabon
- Georgia
- Germany
- Ghana
- Gibraltar
- Greece
- Greenland
- Grenada
- Guadeloupe
- Guam
- Guatemala
- Guernsey
- Guinea
- Guinea-Bissau
- Guyana
- Marshall Islands
- Martinique
- Mauritania
- Mauritius
- Mayotte
- Mexico
- Micronesia
- Moldova
- Monaco
- Mongolia
- Montenegro
- Montserrat
- Morocco
- Mozambique
- Myanmar /Burma
- Namibia
- Nauru
- Nepal
- Netherlands
- New Caledonia
- New Zealand
- Nicaragua
- Niger
- Singapore
- Sint Maarten
- Slovakia
- Slovenia
- Solomon Islands
- Somalia
- South Africa
- South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands
- South Korea
- South Sudan
- Spain
- Sri Lanka
- Sudan
- Suriname
- Svalbard and Jan Mayen
- Sweden
- Switzerland
- Syria
- Taiwan
- Tajikistan
- Tanzania
- Thailand
- The Gambia

- Brunei
- Bulgaria
- Burkina Faso
- Burundi
- Cambodia
- Cameroon
- Canada
- Cape Verde
- Cayman Islands
- Central African Republic
- Chad
- Chile
- China
- Christmas Island
- Clipperton
- Cocos (Keeling) Islands
- Colombia
- Comoros
- Congo
- Cook Islands
- Costa Rica
- Côte d'Ivoire
- Croatia
- Haiti
- Heard Island and McDonald Islands
- Honduras
- Hong Kong
- Hungary
- Iceland
- India
- Indonesia
- Iran
- Iraq
- Ireland
- Isle of Man
- Israel
- Italy
- Jamaica
- Japan
- Jersey
- Jordan
- Kazakhstan
- Kenya
- Kiribati
- Kosovo
- Kuwait
- Nigeria
- Niue
- Norfolk Island
- Northern Mariana Islands
- North Korea
- North Macedonia
- Norway
- Oman
- Pakistan
- Palau
- Palestine
- Panama
- Papua New Guinea
- Paraguay
- Peru
- Philippines
- Pitcairn Islands
- Poland
- Portugal
- Puerto Rico
- Qatar
- Réunion
- Romania
- Timor-Leste
- Togo
- Tokelau
- Tonga
- Trinidad and Tobago
- Tunisia
- Turkey
- Turkmenistan
- Turks and Caicos Islands
- Tuvalu
- Uganda
- Ukraine
- United Arab Emirates
- United Kingdom
- United States
- United States Minor Outlying Islands
- Uruguay
- US Virgin Islands
- Uzbekistan
- Vanuatu
- Vatican City
- Venezuela
- Vietnam

- Cuba
- Curaçao
- Cyprus
- Czechia
- Democratic Republic of the Congo
- Denmark
- Kyrgyzstan
- Laos
- Latvia
- Lebanon
- Lesotho
- Liberia
- Russia
- Rwanda
- Saint Barthélemy
- Saint Helena Ascension and Tristan da Cunha
- Saint Kitts and Nevis
- Saint Lucia
- Wallis and Futuna
- Western Sahara
- Yemen
- Zambia
- Zimbabwe

* Publication privacy settings

The Commission will publish the responses to this public consultation. You can choose whether you would like your details to be made public or to remain anonymous.

Anonymous

Only your type of respondent, country of origin and contribution will be published. All other personal details (name, organisation name and size, transparency register number) will not be published.

Public

Your personal details (name, organisation name and size, transparency register number, country of origin) will be published with your contribution.

I agree with the [personal data protection provisions](#)

Design of detailed survey

5 main policy options have been defined by the European Commission. Policy option C contains three different elements that can either be implemented alone or in combination with each other. Policy option D comes in two different versions, D1 and D2.

A) Baseline: No revision of the CPR, improvements to be made under the current rules and available mechanisms

B) Repairing the CPR: Option A + improvements to be made by revising various aspects of the CPR

C) Focusing the CPR: Option B +

- C1) Limit the CPR to testing methods, and/or

- C2) Limit the CPR to core areas, and/or
- C3) Make the Common Technical Language optional for manufacturers

D) Enhancing the CPR: Option B + introduction of a thin layer of general product requirements applicable to all or almost all construction products, and subsequent gradual introduction of detailed product requirements for specific products via one of two possible approaches

- D1) Essential product requirements defined in Commission legal acts + voluntary standards
- D2) Product requirements defined in Commission legal acts, co-prepared with CEN and other stakeholders

E) Repealing the CPR: The general EU Mutual recognition principle applies for construction products

We have broken down the policy options into **13 distinct CPR-related elements**. In the following, we ask you, for each of these 13 elements, to select **your most and your least preferred variant** with regard to that element (labelled as “Best” and “Worst”).

You also have the **option to skip each of these 13 elements** to which you prefer to not provide any input.

Following your selection of most and least preferred variants, we will ask you to estimate how you think your selected variants will impact your organisation and/or the EU market for construction products in general.

Please remember to save your answer responses frequently to avoid them being lost!

Element 1: Scope of EU harmonisation

The scope of EU harmonisation refers to the level of harmonisation between all products covered by the CPR. Currently, the harmonisation consists in the Common Technical Language for assessing construction product performance. Changes in the CPR can either reduce or increase the scope of harmonisation of construction products in the Single Market.

* Do you wish to provide input regarding **Scope of EU harmonisation?**

- Yes
- No

Please select the variants that you like best and worst

	Best	Worst
Variant A) No legislative change, current level of EU harmonisation, continued information efforts where and when needed about the CPR’s scope.	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Variant B) Variant A + Eliminate confusion about the scope of the CPR, for example by excluding some products where there is little need for regulation, little intra-EU trade and little safety or environmental concern. It would also explicitly include certain products where there currently is confusion about whether a product is covered or not (e.g. modules, kits and assemblies).	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Variant C1) Variant B + Limit the CPR's scope to assessment methods only. No performance threshold levels or classes would be laid down at EU level.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Variant C2) Variant B + Limit the CPR's scope to core areas only: i) Where Member States have similar regulatory needs ii) Where there are relevant environmental or safety concerns related to the products iii) Where it is relevant for the market in other ways. Mutual recognition applies for non-core areas.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Variant C3) Variant B + Make it optional for manufacturers to use the Common Technical Language, and Member States may regulate alternative paths to market access not based on the Common Technical Language. However, Member States must offer market access to manufacturers that do use the Common Technical Language.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Variant D1 and D2) Variant B + Continue the current Common Technical Language approach, but gradually complementing it with proper EU-level product requirements. Minimum harmonisation would be the rule, full harmonisation the exception.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Variant E) Repeal the CPR: No EU-level harmonisation, mutual recognition applies but no Common Technical Language to express construction product performance.	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
I do not know/Indifferent	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments:

In reality standardisation requests, European harmonisation and the common technical language can cater for the needs of Member States, manufacturers and consumers and also allow for free movement of goods. They can include products or exclude them should this be necessary and they could also provide minimum safety requirements for products should there be a need.

With a solid basis for standardisation in the form of standardisation requests, standards can deliver the needs of all stakeholders.

Element 2: CE marking and Declaration of Performance (DoP)

The Declaration of Performance (DoP) provides information on the performance of a construction product – it is a standardised document that must include a set of pre-defined characteristics of the product, no more, no less. The CE marking indicates that a construction product is in conformity with its declared performance and that it has been assessed according to a European standard or that a European Technical Assessment has been issued for the product. Each construction product covered by a European harmonised standard or for which a European Technical Assessment has been issued needs to have this Declaration and has to be CE marked in order to be placed on the EU market.

* Do you wish to provide input regarding **CE marking and Declaration of Performance (DoP)**?

- Yes
- No

Please select the variants that you like best and worst

	Best	Worst
Variant A) No legislative change but continued promotion of the CE marking and DoPs through information/communication efforts	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Variant B) Variant A + Clarify and eliminate information overlaps with DoP. Allow preliminary CE marking when standards are in the pipeline (valid for a limited time period). Make it possible to declare additional characteristics in the DoP.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Variant C2) Same as Variant B, but only applicable to the core areas of the CPR. For products outside the core areas, no CE marking or obligation to draw up or communicate a DoP.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Variant C3) Same as Variant B, but CE marking and DoP is only allowed for manufacturers that use the Common Technical Language. If the Common Technical Language is not used, it is not allowed to use a CE mark or a DoP, or any document that could be mistaken for a DoP.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Variant D1 and D2) Variant B + mandatory CE marking for products covered by EU product requirements (even if they are not covered by national regulation on construction works). DoP supplemented or replaced by a Declaration of Conformity with product requirements.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Variant E) Repeal the CPR: No CE marking or obligation to draw up or communicate a DoP for construction products	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
I do not know/Indifferent	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments:

Some change to the legislation could be made with regards the potential duplication of information in the DoP and on the CE marking. The route to CE marking can be the same as it currently is, as this can add any restrictions to what is CE marked. With an efficient 'front end' to the standardisation process there should be no need for preliminary CE marking which could cause more issues than it solves.

Element 3: Standardisation process

The standardisation process refers to the process of adapting and adding standards under the framework of the Construction Products Regulation. Currently, this refers to standards of the assessment of construction products' performance when incorporated in a construction work, and the Common Technical Language to express such product performance. CEN (European Committee for Standardization) develops these standards, together with Member States, industry representatives and other experts. Currently, there is a problem that many of the standards that are developed are not approved by the Commission – therefore, firms cannot refer to those standards and affix a CE mark on their products.

* Do you wish to provide input regarding **Standardisation process**?

- Yes
- No

Please select the variants that you like best and worst

	Best	Worst
Variant A) No legislative change. Attempt to further streamline standardisation work with CEN within the existing rules.	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Variant B) Variant A + The Commission can complement the Common Technical Language where needed, when no harmonised standards exist or where they are insufficient. This will be based on technical content provided by private bodies and Member States' authorities. All standards will be freely available and translated into all official EU languages. Claims that are not based on Harmonised Technical Standards must be based on 'state of the art' methods or 'best available techniques'.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Variant E) Repeal the CPR: No EU standards and therefore no EU standardisation process for construction products	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
I do not know/Indifferent	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments:

Front loading the standardisation process with Member State input with the requirements clearly defined and assessment during the writing process, with EC approved guidance on writing harmonised standards, that incorporates lessons learnt from court cases, should be able to deliver fit for purpose standards in a timely manner. The emphasis however should not just be on speed but should also encompass thoroughness in the process to ensure all stakeholders' voices are heard. If this were to be shortcut or the shortcut was used by MSs to cut out the other stakeholders this would not represent fairness and might not deliver state of the art in Europe. Having said that a process for fixing standards that are not sufficient could be considered for extraordinary cases but we cannot see that there is a need to bypass standards completely. Industry is engaged with the standards process, so from our point of view we are ready to act swiftly when needs be to find the right solutions.

* What impact do you think that Variant B would have on the issue of delays in the standardisation process?

- Large decrease
- Small decrease
- No or negligible impact
- Small increase
- Large increase
- I do not know/Not relevant

Comments

500 character(s) maximum

If, as we believe, the standardisation process can be improved, there shouldn't be a need except in extraordinary circumstances (and only in very exceptional cases i.e. not be used as a way to circumvent the standardisation process) to short cut it because there wouldn't be a need to.

Element 4: National requirements

The purpose of the Construction Products Regulation is to improve the free circulation of construction products in the EU Single Market. Currently, Member States are not allowed to have additional, national or local, requirements that adds requirements beyond those that are harmonised at EU level. However, Member States are responsible for setting the safety, environmental and energy requirements applicable to buildings and civil engineering works. For example, a Member State is free to set the level of fire safety performance it deems necessary for construction products to be used on its territory, but it must allow market access to any product that has been placed on the market in accordance with the CPR requirements. However, there are instances where Member States do maintain national or local requirements even where they should not be allowed to do so.

* Do you wish to provide input regarding **National requirements**?

- Yes
 No

Please select the variants that you like best and worst

	Best	Worst
Variant A) No legislative change, the Commission will go against national requirements within the existing system	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Variant B) Variant A + National requirements allowed only in specific cases where EU provisions do not yet cover the relevant regulatory need of the Member State	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Variant C2) Same as Variant B for the core areas. For non-core areas, national requirements are allowed	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Variant C3) Variant B + Member States would be allowed to have an alternative path to market access not based on the Common Technical Language, but Member States must offer market access for products that use the Common Technical Language.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Variant D1 and D2) Variant B + EU sets minimum product requirements. Member States may have additional product requirements, unless the EU has fully harmonised the requirements for a product.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Variant E) Repeal the CPR: Member States free to set requirements for all aspects of construction products, not regulated by other EU laws	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
I do not know/Indifferent	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments:

The subsidiarity principle should be respected and MSs prosecuted for introducing laws or requirements that do not respect the system. If the method for deriving requirements in standards met the needs of MSs i.e. well defined standardisation requests, there can be no reason for MSs to impose requirements ahead of them being incorporated in to standards. There should therefore be no need for the other variants which would only serve to move backwards to a fragmented system that has taken 25+ years to achieve.

Element 5: Product safety requirements

Currently, harmonisation of construction products is limited to a harmonised method of assessment of product performance. There are no EU-wide product safety requirements defined for construction products by the CPR. It is important to note the difference between construction product safety requirements (input requirements), which may be introduced in a revised CPR, and construction safety requirements (process requirements) which would not be introduced in a revised CPR.

* Do you wish to provide input regarding **Product safety requirements**?

- Yes
 No

Please select the variants that you like best and worst

	Best	Worst
Variant A) No EU construction product safety requirements. However, national product safety requirements must comply with the general EU free movement principles (non-discrimination and mutual recognition).	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Variant D1) Introduce a thin layer of horizontal EU product safety requirements applicable to the vast majority of construction products. Additional specific requirements would gradually be introduced afterwards, for certain selected products or product families. Where such EU requirements are introduced, manufacturers must comply with them and affix a CE mark, even if their products are not covered by national regulation on construction works. The EU would in most cases introduce minimum product safety requirements, so that Member States can introduce national product safety requirements in addition. In exceptional cases, the EU would introduce full product safety requirements where Member States would not be allowed to introduce national requirements. The additional specific requirements would be introduced via the New Legislative Framework approach: CEN will develop voluntary standards with essential product requirements upon request from the European Commission, and products that comply with those standards would provide presumption of conformity.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Variant D2) Same as Variant D1, except that the additional specific requirements would be introduced via the Technical specifications Approach: Detailed requirements would be included in Harmonised Technical Specifications, i.e. Commission acts would lay down harmonised technical specifications	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Variant E) Repeal the CPR: Same as A, no EU construction product safety requirements. National product safety requirements must comply with the general EU free movement principles (non-discrimination and mutual recognition).	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
I do not know/Indifferent	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments:

Wood-based panels will be deemed safe based on how they are designed and their correct installation into a construction works e.g. a panel with a class E reaction to fire cannot be used where the national requirement is for a class B but this does not make the panel inherently unsafe, just unsafe in that particular situation if it were to be used.

There are however areas where inherent safety could be incorporated into standards, for example from REACH restrictions or safe handling that is covered by the GPSD. These can be incorporated into the harmonised standards but we cannot see how the CPR could include inherent safety in areas other than those already covered by those legislations because that would be the task for the national authorities to decide on safety levels in their requirements for buildings using requirements based on the common technical language.

Element 6: Market surveillance and enforcement

Member States are responsible for ensuring proper market surveillance of construction products placed on their market. The purpose of the market surveillance activities is to ensure that construction products comply with the CPR rules. Currently, the CPR has procedures for when construction products are not marketed in conformance with the CPR, but in order to use them it must be that the declared performance of a product is inaccurate and that it poses a risk to health and safety.

A revised CPR could introduce a series of legislative measures to strengthen market surveillance and enforcement of construction products, including:

- *Stronger empowerments for market surveillance authorities related to fact-finding (e.g. the right to confiscate samples or to seize documents related to presumably non-compliant products)*
- *Stronger empowerments for market surveillance authorities to issue punitive measures on non-compliant operators (e.g. by imposing fiscal sanctions or to exclude non-compliant operators from public tenders)*
- *Allow manufacturers to sue non-compliant competitors*
- *Allow consumer and environment organisations to sue non-compliant operators*
- *Set up a sector-specific EU-wide whistle blowing portal for non-compliant construction products*
- *Introduce minimum benchmarks for the number of full-time equivalent staff at national market surveillance authorities*
- *Introduce procedures to ensure the proper performance of market surveillance staff, e.g. EU-wide qualification requirements for hiring staff*

* Do you wish to provide input regarding **Market surveillance and enforcement**?

- Yes
 No

* Are you giving your contribution as a public authority?

- Yes
 No

Please indicate the variants that you like best and worst

	Best	Worst
Variant A) No legislative change. Enhance national market surveillance enforcement through guidance and recommendations to Member State authorities.	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Variant B) Variant A + a legislative package of measures to strengthen market surveillance and enforcement (the following question will allow you to indicate the measures you would prefer to be included and not included, if you select Variant B as your "Best" variant)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Variant E) Repeal the CPR: Market surveillance up to each Member State and according to national rules and procedures.	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
I do not know/Indifferent	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments

Funding and therefore manpower is the biggest issue with market surveillance performance and consistency across Europe. There is already legislation, if this is not working, better implementation is what is needed rather than more legislation or legislation in a different place.

Element 7: EOTA and Technical Assessment Bodies (TABs)

EOTA is the European Organisation for Technical Assessment. Its purpose is to develop European Assessment Documents (EADs) which is a document providing information about the performance of a construction product. Technical Assessment Bodies (TABs) are the executive arm of EOTA and in charge of the technical assessment of construction products not covered or not fully covered by current standards. TABs are entitled to issue European Technical Assessments (ETAs) based on the EADs. ETAs can be used as an alternative route to market access where there are no harmonised European standards.

* Do you wish to provide input regarding **EOTA and Technical Assessment Bodies (TABs)**?

- Yes
 No

Element 8: Notified Bodies

Notified Bodies are the only recognised third parties to carry out the assessment of performance of construction products covered by the standards set in the CPR. They are appointed by the responsible authority in each Member State. Notified Bodies assess the performance of construction products, they can certify constancy of performance, and certify factory production control systems. They can carry out these activities for all, a few, or just one of the 7 Basic Requirements for construction Works (BWRs) (for example, some specialise in fire safety assessments only). However, calculating and assessing environmental impacts (BWR7) would only be possible for a few Notified Bodies, as such calculations are a science of their own.

* Do you wish to provide input regarding **Notified Bodies**?

- Yes
- No

Please indicate the variants that you like best and worst

	Best	Worst
Variant A) No legislative change, attempt to improve the functioning of the Notified Bodies within the current rules	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Variant B) Variant A + Introduce mandatory qualification and competence requirements that Member States must use when they designate a Notified Body. The Commission can block the designation of a Notified Body if there is not enough evidence to prove its competence. Notified Bodies must apply clear pass-fail criteria towards manufacturers, and must change the staff responsible for certifying products of a given manufacturer every 3 years. In addition to the Notified Bodies, special bodies would be designated with specific responsibility for BWR 7 (environmental impact calculations). The special bodies could be a sub-group of the Notified Bodies, similar to the current ones in charge of fire safety.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Variant E) Repeal the CPR: no role for Notified Bodies	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
I do not know/Indifferent	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments

We can see the benefit in aligning the assessment of Notified Bodies so that they can deliver consistent testing results to improve legal certainty in testing.

Element 9: Product Contact Points for Construction

The main purpose of the national Product Contact Points for Construction is to provide information about Member States' building regulations relevant to the intended use of construction products. They are currently not in charge of providing information on the harmonised system created by and under the CPR, although it happens that Product Contact Points for Construction do this anyway, while it is not clear to what extent they are used for their main purpose.

* Do you wish to provide input regarding **Product Contact Points for Construction**?

- Yes
- No

Element 10: Simplification

The CPR contains some simplification provisions to reduce the administrative burden for manufacturers. For example, manufacturers may refrain from drawing up a Declaration of Performance in some instances (e.g. if a product is custom-made), or by replacing the need for type-testing or type-calculation of a product if it is deemed that the product achieves a certain level or class of performance without further testing or calculation. However, the use of many of these simplification provisions is limited, and there are concerns that the wording of some of these provisions is unclear and difficult to understand.

Between the No change option and the Repeal option, legislative measures could be envisaged to improve simplification, for example:

- Redraft the current simplification provisions of the CPR to clarify them
- Allow Member States to exempt **all firms** from all or some conformity assessment obligations
- Allow Member States to exempt **small, medium and micro firms** from all or some conformity assessment obligations
- Allow Member States to exempt **micro firms** from all or some conformity assessment obligations
- Make it possible for the Commission to reduce or lift AVCP obligations if manufacturers have an appropriate liability insurance in place

* Do you wish to provide input regarding **Simplification**?

- Yes
 No

Please indicate the variants that you like best and worst

	Best	Worst
Variant A) No legislative change, promote the uptake of the current simplification provisions within the CPR to the extent possible	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Variant B) Variant A + legislative measures to improve simplification (to be further examined in the following question if you select Variant B)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Variant E) Repeal the CPR: No need for simplification provisions of the CPR	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
I do not know/Indifferent	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments

The aim of the CPR should be for free and fair trade of safe (as per claimed performances) products. The idea of simplification is a good one, however simplification cannot be made at the expense of safety or an uneven playing field based certain types of business. If a product needs a test to determine its safety that is what is needed, if it can be calculated, so be it, but this fact is no different for a micro enterprise or a large multi national, performance should be determined in the best and most cost effective way by developing the appropriate standardised methods for doing so.

Element 11: New business models / products – 3D-printing, prefabricated houses

Standardised rules as laid down by the CPR refer mostly to traditional construction products. Innovative products, such as 3D printed construction products or pre-fabricated small one-family houses, are usually not, or at least not fully, covered by the CPR's scope.

* Do you wish to provide input regarding **New business models / products – 3D-printing, prefabricated houses?**

- Yes
- No

Please indicate the variants that you like best and worst

	Best	Worst
Variant A) No legislative change, implying no anticipation of/provisions for new business models in the CPR beyond what is currently possible	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Variant B) Legislative change so that the CPR would anticipate new business models, for instance by bringing materials and datasets used for 3D-printing of construction products, and small prefabricated one-family houses, within its scope. Operators of 3D-printshops would be assigned the responsibilities of distributors within the meaning of the current CPR. The Commission would further be empowered to modify the CPR's scope and/or to make clarifications regarding the CPR's application to new business models in the future.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Variant E) Repeal the CPR: No (need for) the CPR to anticipate new business models, up to each Member State to regulate market access for new construction products.	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
I do not know/Indifferent	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments

The issue is that MSs have their own requirements for buildings, any new product has to meet those requirements or meet those requirements once incorporated into a construction. A product could indeed be a prefabricated home but it would have to meet the building regulations within a given MSs. This can be delivered through standards allowing options for adapting to MSs requirements.

We believe the CPR should be broad enough to cover any product, new or old through delivering performances in harmonised ways.

Element 12: Environmental aspects (BWR7 Sustainable use of natural resources)

The CPR does not include a harmonised method for assessing and communicating a construction product's environmental performance. It is likely that Member States will increasingly introduce national legislation on how to assess the environmental footprint of buildings and other construction works, and therefore indirectly also the environmental footprint of construction products.

*

Do you wish to provide input regarding **Environmental aspects (BWR7 Sustainable use of natural resources)**?

- Yes
- No

Please indicate the variants that you like best and worst

	Best	Worst
Variant A) Continued slow introduction of requirements regarding environmental aspects in harmonised standards	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Variant B) Introduce a harmonised method for assessing and communicating the environmental performance of construction products. The harmonised method would be based on an existing Life Cycle Assessment method, for example the Commission's Product Environmental Footprint or EN 15804. It is currently open which method that will be chosen.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Variant E) Repeal the CPR: No Basic Works Requirements	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
I do not know/Indifferent	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments

As identified in the questions we already have methods developed i.e. EN 15804 for assessing construction products and structures made with said products and PEF for other products. What should be avoided is many different methods being used so as to not have comparability. For buildings (construction works) and construction materials, using EN 15804 EPDs is the preferred approach.

Element 13: Circular economy

A circular economy is an economic system aimed at eliminating waste and promoting a continued use of resources. Currently, the CPR does not contain specific rules for used or remanufactured (i.e. altered in some way, e.g. by cleaning the products, cutting off damaged parts, or a new coating), construction products.

For this element, there are two alternatives of Variant B, representing two different ways in which a revised CPR could introduce specific rules for used or remanufactured construction products.

* Do you wish to provide input regarding **Circular economy**?

- Yes
- No

Please indicate the variants that you like best and worst

	Best	Worst

Variant A) No specific provisions regarding the placement of used or remanufactured construction products in the EU Single Market	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Variant B1) Allow certain used or remanufactured construction products to obtain CE marking in the same way as new products, with limited obligations for companies. Certain obligations would be introduced for manufacturers to promote the circularity of the construction sector, for example an obligation to take back construction products from a construction site that have not been used, or an obligation to ensure appropriate access to spare parts to repair damaged construction products.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Variant B2) The revised CPR defines a 'gold standard' for (very few) used or remanufactured products and allow free circulation in the EU for those products. Member States would regulate all other products outside the 'gold standard'	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Variant E) Repeal the CPR: Up to each Member State to regulate market access criteria for used and remanufactured construction products	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
I do not know/Indifferent	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments

Under the current framework the CPR could already allow the use of reused or remanufactured products through standardisation.

Each product family should be able to deal with the most appropriate solutions for their sector, as one solution may be suitable for one group of products but not another and a one-size-fits-all approach may not be the best solution for all products.

With any products that address the circular economy under no circumstances can the products have less rigorous testing or assessment to determine their performance as the performance of construction products can have an effect on life safety.

It should also be noted that the production of some types of wood-based panels already contain a high proportion of recycled wood which makes the sector the largest recycler of wood in Europe. Products made in this way are still tested and approved for use in structural construction products without any special dispensation.

Interest in participating in the validation workshop

Later during the course of the project, we will host a validation workshop which will either take place in Brussels or online where the project team will present the findings of the analysis, for discussion among interested stakeholders. If you are interested in joining the validation workshop, please indicate your interest by selecting "yes" in the question below. The expression of interest is non-binding.

*** Would you like to receive an invitation to the validation workshop where the findings and conclusions of the project will be discussed?**

- Yes
- No

Thank you for participating in this survey, providing valuable insights to the work on the EU legislation on construction products. Please submit your reply by clicking “Submit” below.
[Link to Europa page for further updates](#)

Contact

GROW-C1@ec.europa.eu