



Brussels, 10 JUL. 2009  
D(2009) 166985

## Opinion

**Title** **Impact Assessment accompanying the Proposal for a Commission Regulation implementing Directive 2005/32/EC with regard to Ecodesign requirements for pumps**  
**(draft version of 4 June 2009)**

**Lead DG** **DG TREN**

### 1) Impact Assessment Board Opinion

#### (A) Context

This implementing measure is one of the priorities of the Action Plan on Energy Efficiency<sup>1</sup>, and is part of the Catalogue of actions to be adopted by the Commission for the year 2009.<sup>2</sup> This proposal is part of the Commission's commitment announced in the European Economic Recovery Plan to draw up measures for products, which offer very high potential for energy savings. The proposed implementing measure is based on the Directive 2005/32/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing a framework for the Commission to set Ecodesign requirements for energy-using products<sup>3</sup>.

#### (B) Positive aspects

The IA aims at analysing an appropriate range of impacts (costs to industry, effect on consumer price, emissions avoided), as well as an overview of the current and future situation on the pump markets. Technical details for estimation of pump efficiency are provided in the annexes.

#### (C) Main recommendations for improvements

*The recommendations below are listed in order of descending importance. Some more technical comments have been transmitted directly to the author DG and are expected to be incorporated in the final version of the impact assessment report.*

<sup>1</sup> COM(2006)545 final.

<sup>2</sup> COM(2008)11 final.

<sup>3</sup> OJ L 191 of 22.7.2005, p. 29.

**General recommendation:** The IA needs to strengthen the rationale for regulating water pumps, given the uncertainty around both the improvement potential and costs to industry. It should also explain the order of satisfying criteria that are required by the directive. The measure concerning labelling of the pumps should be compared to alternative options aimed at bridging the information gap. Furthermore, the methodology and major assumptions require clarification.

**(1) Rationale and timing for regulating water pumps needs to be strengthened.** The IA should clarify the improvement potential of the proposed implementing measure as compared to the baseline scenario that should include measures that are already adopted or planned for the near future. Uncertainties about the potential impact on energy consumption and reduction of CO2 emissions should be presented more clearly. The IA should also explain, whether there might be any trade-off from the view of the pump industry between investing in changing motor design and the water pump design, for instance by comparing marginal CO2 abatement costs, or by explaining industry structure in more detail. Since DG Transport and Energy is planning to analyse improvement potential in other types of pumps, the rationale for starting with the water pumps should be explained more fully.

**(2) The IA should clarify how all criteria listed in the directive are satisfied.** The directive sets out a list of criteria which might not be consistent in specific cases, e.g. least cost through the life cycle versus keeping investment costs for industry low. The IA should set out transparently how such contradictions have been solved in this specific pump case.

**(3) The case for requiring a label to be put on the pump needs to be strengthened.** The IA should clarify whether the market failure it has identified is related to the lack of adequate information, and if so, examine whether labelling alone, i.e. without minimum product standards, would suffice. If labelling is to be complementary to minimum product requirements, the IA should clarify the purpose it should serve, and examine alternative ways to having the label on the pump to promote purchasing of higher efficiency pumps.

**(4) Methodology applied throughout the IA deserves further clarification.** There seems to be no rationale for applying inflated prices, and discounting at 4% should suffice. Differences between estimated investment costs for industry in the preparatory study and estimates by industry itself should be presented more transparently – and where relevant the impacts of those divergences on policy choices should be discussed.

#### **(D) Procedure and presentation**

Procedural and presentational requirements have been met.

## **2) IAB scrutiny process**

Reference number	(comitology)
Author DG	TREN
External expertise used	No
Date of Board Meeting	Written procedure
Date of adoption of Opinion	10 JUL. 2009