

e-mail: anec@anec.eu - internet: www.anec.eu - TVA/VAT :BE0457696481

Friends of Standards Roundtable – 1 July 2015 ANEC contribution to European highlights

I am no modern day Mark Antony.

I come to praise European standardisation and not to bury it.

Of course, the ESS is not perfect, as Luis Romero said. We in ANEC think it needs fine tuning, notably in respect of the inclusiveness of weaker stakeholders in the standards development process, in order to complement the national delegation principle. We recognise the importance of the national delegation principle and do not oppose it, let alone want to destroy it.

You should have seen our position paper on the EY report which goes into some detail on the recommendations of the report. But as Peter Ziethen (DIN), said this morning, the ESS is the best mechanism in the world for the development of standards. It is a public-private partnership that aims to bring together all partners – from the regulator through to the users of standards – in developing standards to support the Single European Market. As we heard from the presentations on the economic benefits of standards this morning, one European Standard becomes the national standard in at least 33 countries, giving access to a market of over 600 million citizens and consumers. Not only that, but bearing in mind the close relationships between ISO-CEN and IEC-CENELEC, the ESS is also the best model that exists for the implementation of international standards.

Without the New Approach, and the ESS that supports it, the Single Market for products would never have happened. Full stop.

So **please** think very carefully about fundamental changes to the ESS, its role and its focus.

Against the background of globalisation, we do understand the wish of European industry to develop standards at the international level and not within Europe. For the so-called "purely voluntary" standards, initiated exclusively by industry, we can even support that wish. But remember why the ESS was created. Why the ESS has received so much political and financial support over the past 30 years. Why the ESS is now underpinned by Regulation 1025. **To develop the standards needed to support European legislation and public policy.**



ANEC is supported financially by the European Union & EFTA

EU Transparency Register No. 507800799-30

For those reasons, we urge that the development or revision of standards under Commission mandate or standardisation request remains in CEN, CENELEC or ETSI – remains within the European Standardisation System - unless there is unanimous agreement among European stakeholders that the work be done in ISO or IEC. Don't try to force European principles on the many other countries in ISO and IEC. **Just do it in Europe**.

More broadly, we welcome the confidence in the ESS that Regulation 1025 represents. ANEC welcomes the special focus the Regulation places on the representation of the weaker stakeholders at national level through the Annex III Organisations. We also welcome the strengthened and more formalised consideration of standardisation mandates offered to us, and the observership in the Committee of Standards.

On that point, personally, I share the concerns of – for want of a better term - "bigger" industry that it does not have a direct voice in the Committee. To protect the neutrality of the other participants in the Committee, and to ensure all stakeholders have confidence in the decisions of the Committee, I believe it would be wise to make an observership available to these industry stakeholders and welcome the moves made by INGRESS in this direction.

A final point. Although we appreciate the latest studies by BSI and AFNOR on the economic benefits of standardisation, and welcome the confirmation they provide of the importance of standards, you will have seen there have been several studies on the economic benefits since the original DIN study of 1999. **Although economic growth is important, it is not an end in itself.**

Economic growth should lead to an improvement in the quality of life. That's why we would like to see the Commission, or another friend here, undertake a study into the societal and economic benefits of standardisation. And, although there are many examples, perhaps the most obvious is the degree to which standards for the safety of products result in fewer accidents, fewer fatalities, reduced costs of healthcare and fewer days lost from work or school.

Stephen RUSSELL 1 July 2015

ANEC-SG-2015-G-014