COMMISSION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES

Brussels, 16.06.1999

COM(1999)299 final

COMMUNICATION FROM THE COMMISSION TO THE COUNCIL AND THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

Mutual recognition in the context of the follow-up to the Action Plan for the Single Market

CONTENTS

SUMMARY

The principle of mutual recognition plays a central role in the Single Market by ensuring free movement of goods and services without making it necessary to harmonise national legislation. As a result, mutual recognition is a powerful factor for economic integration, which respects the principle of subsidiarity.

There is, in a number of Member States, a perception - shared in some cases by the Commission - that the principle of mutual recognition is not operating satisfactorily and is still posing problems for economic operators.

According to the Commission's analysis, the application of mutual recognition is producing results, but grey areas persist, chiefly because of ignorance of the principle and of its operational consequences on the part of the users of the system, be they Member States or economic operators.

In keeping with the spirit of the Action Plan for the Single Market, the Commission is proposing a series of initiatives designed to improve the application of the principle of mutual recognition. Some of the solutions put forward are aimed at economic operators whilst others will have to be implemented by the Member States. The Commission also undertakes to be more vigilant in ensuring the effective application of this principle.

INTRODUCTION

The Internal Market Council of March 1998 stressed the need for political attention to be directed towards to the effective application of mutual recognition. It also underscored the direct responsibility of the Member States in this matter. The Commission was asked to submit to the Council and European Parliament a Communication analysing the difficulties observed in the application of mutual recognition and suggesting ways of making it work more effectively. This analysis was to cover both products and services.

The aim of this Communication is to point out the fundamental importance of the principle of mutual recognition for the Single Market, to examine the actual situation on the ground and to make proposals for improving the operation of mutual recognition. It also follows on in a direct line from the first report on the operation of markets for products and capital submitted by the Commission in response to the conclusions of the Cardiff European Council (Cardiff I report).

The Communication is addressed to the European Parliament and the Council. Some of the suggestions it contains are aimed primarily at economic operators, in keeping with the spirit of the Dialogue with Citizens and Businesses successfully introduced by the Commission.

I. THE IMPORTANCE OF MUTUAL RECOGNITION FOR THE SINGLE MARKET

The principle of mutual recognition plays a central role in the operation of the Single Market. It allows free movement of goods and services without the need for harmonisation of national legislation at Community level.

Under this principle, a Member State may not forbid the sale on its territory of a product lawfully produced and marketed in another Member State, even if that product is

produced according to different technical or quality specifications from those applied to its own products. The Member State of destination may waive this rule only under very strictly defined circumstances, where overriding requirements of public interest, such as health, consumer protection or the environment are at stake. It must be pointed out, for example, that Community policy on the environment seeks to achieve a high level of protection and is based, among other things, on the precautionary principle; this policy may, in certain cases, be used to justify restricting the free movement of goods. However, in such cases, the measures taken by the Member State must comply with the principles of need and proportionality.

The same principle applies to services. This means that an economic operator lawfully providing a service in a Member State must be able freely to provide the same service in the other Member States. The Member State of destination may oppose the lawful provision of a service by a provider established in another Member State only under extremely restrictive conditions that involve overriding reasons of general interest, such as the protection of consumers.

The application of mutual recognition is fully consistent with the Single Market philosophy according to which the rules of the Member State of origin normally prevail. The application of this principle is also consonant with the idea of a dynamic approach to the application of subsidiarity; by avoiding the systematic creation of detailed rules at Community level, mutual recognition ensures greater observance of local, regional and national traditions and makes it possible to maintain the diversity of products and services which come onto the markets. **It is thus a pragmatic and powerful tool for economic integration.**

In the light of the commitments undertaken by the Commission to legislate less but to legislate better, the principle of mutual recognition finds its place which is essential for the operation of the Single Market.

II. PROBLEMS IN THE APPLICATION OF MUTUAL RECOGNITION AND ANALYSIS OF THE CAUSES

The Commission wishes to stress, first of all, that more reliable information were needed in order to assess accurately the application of mutual recognition. The information currently available does not allow a precise estimation of the economic importance of mutual recognition, but figures in the annex show that this mechanism is indeed very important for a number of industry and services sectors[1].

The Commission has a duty to deal with cases of refusal to implement mutual recognition, whether it is alerted by a complaint from an economic operator or through own-motion detection. The Commission is also informed of draft standards and technical regulations via notifications from the Member States (Directive 98/34/EC) and of

[1] There are currently no statistics for all the cases where mutual recognition works without any problem; nor are there any for cases where economic operators have chosen to comply with the requirements of the country of destination or have decided not to market their products and services in other Member States. When the application of mutual recognition does not raise difficulties, there is no complaint; moreover, complaints registered with the Commission probably represent only a fraction of the problems encountered by economic operators.

national measures derogating from the principle of free movement of goods (Decision 3052/95). These cases as a whole provide an indication of the way in which mutual recognition is being applied in practice.

Despite the results already achieved through the application of mutual recognition, problems still exist both for products[2] and, perhaps even more so, for services. When questioned about obstacles to cross-border trade, firms in the services sector take the view, more so than those in the products sector, that the obstacles within the Single Market remained "virtually unchanged" between 1996 and 1998 (30% as against 24%).

There are difficulties in implementing the rules designed, inter alia, to protect the consumer and this is often linked to a perception that the consumer can only be fully protected by checks in the country of destination. In fact, such checks are not always needed in order to provide the necessary protection for the consumer.

Some complaints sent to the Commission have highlighted poor internal organisation in the administration, which leads to administrative delays, procedural costs, dissuasive measures and inability of the authority concerned to deal with complex situations (for example, involving innovative products or services).

There are other administrative practices which cause difficulties: some officials in the country of import are reluctant to take personal responsibility for approving a product with which they are unfamiliar or certificates drawn up in languages which they do not master; this administrative attitude is often accompanied by a mutual lack of confidence in acts adopted by the authorities of the Member States of origin.

Some of the practices mentioned cause operators to refrain from calling for the application of mutual recognition by the national authority concerned and eventually adapt their products to local requirements or establish a branch office or a subsidiary. In extreme cases they may even forego marketing their products or services in another Member State altogether. In these cases either no complaint is lodged with the Commission or, if complaints are made, they are subsequently withdrawn; nevertheless the problem remains.

1. Products

Difficulties arise when economic operators have to deal with the requirement to observe a specific level of protection, in particular with regard to complex products or those involving considerations of protection of health or safety[3] or consumer protection. In this

---

[2] According to the results of a survey of industry conducted for the "Single Market Scoreboard" published in October 1998, 80% of the businesses covered believed that there were still obstacles preventing the full benefits of a Single Market without frontiers from being gained. As for the type of obstacles encountered, 41% of the businesses mentioned differences in standards and technical regulations and 34% mentioned testing, certification and authorisation procedures.

[3] Some 20% of notifications received under Direcive 98/34 in 1998 related to food supplements or foodstuffs. This figure rises to 65% for the notifications received pursuant to Decision 3052/95 since its entry into force. In the Green Paper on the general principles of legislation in the agri-food sector the Commission has identified certain areas (such as food supplements) where harmonisation is preferable to the application of mutual recognition.

kind of situation the Member State of destination is often convinced that the method it proposes for protecting the general interest is the right one.

The sectors in which problems are most frequently reported are foodstuffs, electrical engineering, vehicles, precious metals, construction and chemicals (see fig. 1 and 2 in annex).

2. Services

For services, it is difficult to obtain full information or statistics on the application of mutual recognition, especially since this is an area which encompasses a wide range of aspects.

Generally speaking, difficulties arise in the application of mutual recognition to services when Member States take steps to protect the "general interest", as with consumer protection. By this means, free provision of services within the Single Market can be hindered. The service sectors for which the Commission currently receives most complaints are business communications, construction, patent agents and security services (Fig. 3). However, the criterion for receiving complaints is not very appropriate in that providers of financial services, for example, do not tend to submit complaints to the Commission. In actual fact, these complaints in most cases should be directed to the host Member State's monitoring authorities with whom the service provider is required to develop a long-term relationship.

In the regulated professions the difficulties experienced with the application of the principle of mutual recognition of diplomas affect individuals more than businesses[4]. Although the indicators show that mutual recognition has had a positive effect in this area, there are still very many individual complaints, as the report by the Citizens Signpost Service carried out for the Commission in February 1999 shows. The main sticking point is that the equivalence of training acquired has to be assessed in each individual case (see Fig. 4 in annex).

In the area of financial services, there is evidence of the, in some cases, inappropriate use of the concept of "general interest" to justify exemptions to the application of mutual recognition and to prevent the marketing of financial products which are sold validly in the Member State of origin. The Commission has found that this misuse of the concept of "general interest" stems from differences in interpretation and application by Member States.

If all the Member States applied the same basic criteria to consumer protection they would be more likely to allow financial enterprises which have been approved in the Member State of origin to deal with national clients under the right of establishment or the right to provide services, and to offer them products marketed in other Member States without imposing any further requirements on them. This is why the Commission has announced in its Communication entitled "Implementation of the action framework for financial services: action plan"[5] that it will draw up, in co-operation with the Member

---

[4] The directives on the mutual recognition of professional qualifications directly benefit the people who hold those qualifications. However, some directives provide for freedom of establishment for firms which is linked to the qualifications or experience of the managers of such firms.

[5] COM (99) 232 final, 11.5.1999

States, a list of obstacles to cross-border transactions between businesses and consumers for the financial services concerned and that it will analyse the conditions in which the rules for protecting the consumers of the host country should be applied.

In the business communications sector, the problems mainly stem from disparities between national regulations, especially regarding advertising. The same legitimate concerns (public health protection, protection of minors) have aroused vastly differing responses (total prohibition, partial bans, self-regulation, etc.). In this field, the Commission has developed an innovative approach which involves the Member States in discussions by a group of experts at a very early stage.

In the electronic trade sector, the Commission has identified legal obstacles which result in the limiting of opportunities provided by the Single Market could not be eliminated simply by applying the Treaty. The Commission has therefore presented a draft directive on certain legal aspects of electronic trade aimed at ensuring free movement of information society services between Member States by establishing a clear and stable legal framework. The directive provides for the harmonisation of certain areas which entail specific problems, and relies on existing harmonisation and mutual recognition for other areas.

According to the analysis carried out by the Commission, there is a need to improve and reinforce the knowledge of economic operators and the competent authorities of the Member States regarding the principle of mutual recognition.

III. PROPOSED APROACHES

The aim of the Commission is to maintain mutual recognition as the centrepiece of the operation of the Single Market, by making the adjustments necessary for it to work even better.

1. Credible monitoring of the application of mutual recognition

- In order to assess the progress made in the application of mutual recognition and to have statistics which are both reliable and more complete than at present, the Commission will prepare, every two years, an **evaluation report** which will be forwarded to the Council and the European Parliament. The main conclusions of the report will be incorporated in the Single Market Scoreboard[6]. The biennial report must allow better determination of the areas where mutual recognition still poses problems, as well as to identify the solutions which have been found on a bilateral basis with specific Member States in order to make other Member States facing similar cases aware. - The Commission's first biennial report on this subject is attached to this Communication.

- The Commission will continue to ensure systematically, with increased speed and attention, that **obligations** are met by Member States in accordance with the full application of Community law in the field of mutual recognition. On the basis of the

[6] Information on the notifications received by the Commission regarding Directive 98/34 (standards and technical regulations) and Decision 3052/95 (national measures on exemption from the principle of free movement of goods) is already included in the Scoreboard.

complaints submitted, it will check whether a problem encountered in a Member State in a particular sector also arises in other Member States and if so, it will automatically start the infringement proceedings provided for under the Treaty in all the cases concerned.

- Full use should be made of the possibilities offered by the **notification procedure** in Directive 98/34/EC as an instrument for promoting mutual recognition because it plays a decisive role in preventing the creation of obstacles to the free movement of goods and information society services[7]. In non-harmonised sectors, where more and more technical regulations are developing, enshrining the principle of mutual recognition in national laws is a first step towards guaranteeing the application of that principle and ensuring that economic operators are informed about their rights, thereby actually putting the aforementioned principle into practice.

2. Measures aimed at citizens and economic operators

Action by the Commission

The Commission has committed itself to facilitating dialogue with citizens and businesses. Numerous initiatives have been taken in this area: work under the Action Plan for the Single Market of June 1997 has led to the setting up of "contact points" in each Member State, the Dialogue with Citizens and Businesses was launched in June 1998 and an Internet site for businesses was opened at the beginning of 1999[8]. The procedure introduced by Directive 98/34 will become even more transparent thanks to the new PISA Internet site which will be launched during the summer of 1999 and will enable all Community economic operators to find out about the status of national legislative initiatives to regulate all the products and services of the information society[9].

Improve information and economic analysis

The Commission stresses that mutual recognition requires a major effort on the ground: one of the areas in which the investment of such an effort is essential is the area of **information**.

To this end the Commission will launch several new projects.

- The Commission will draw up and publish, in 2000, a **Guide** to the application of the principle of mutual recognition to industrial products, specifically aimed at the main players in this area (national and regional administrations, businesses, lawyers, etc.). In certain sensitive sectors the Commission will consult the circles concerned, for instance in the form of **questionnaires**. Eventually **guides** on the application of mutual recognition in specific sectors will be prepared in conjunction with the

---

[7] Directive 98/48 of 20 July 1998 which comes into force on 5 August 1999, OJ No L217 of 5.8.98, p.18.

[8] http://europa.eu.int/business

[9] Mention should also be made of the brochure entitled "Directive 83/189/EC (now Directive 98/34/EC) explained", a guide to information procedures for national standards and technical regulations which provides economic operators with useful and comprehensive information on the notification procedure.

interested parties. In this context particular attention will be paid to the position of SMEs.

- The Commission will produce, for a wide readership (economic operators, professional federations) an **explanatory brochure** on the application of Decision 3052/95 on national measures derogating from the principle of the free movement of goods. Furthermore, as part of its administrative co-operation, the Commission is currently preparing an update of the **Guide** to the application of this decision mainly targeted at Member State administrations.

- In the future, the biannual report on the application of mutual recognition should be preceded by **an economic analysis** of the application of this principle in several **sectors**. It is important to have a better evaluation of the economic significance of mutual recognition; this could also contribute to the reflections made in the context of the Cardiff I process on monitoring the goods, services and capital markets. This economic analysis should measure not only the costs of non-application of mutual recognition in some sectors but also the advantages that it brings when properly applied. This should serve to measure the ambit of the problems which remain and to define priorities for action in the future.

- For a number of financial products, the Commission has undertaken to analyse national rules for protecting consumers (including general provisions affecting products/suppliers originating from other Member States). It will perform detailed work to establish any areas of equivalence between rules which are clearly similar. This work should lead to the presentation of a detailed report to the Council and European Parliament, the conclusions of which will provide the basis for future policies in that area. The Commission will also publish a Communication on the application of the concept of "general interest" in the insurance sector. Finally, to increase the number of financial service transactions via electronic trading and to ensure adequate protection for consumers, the financial services Action Plan specifies that a Green Paper on electronic trading and financial services will be prepared.

Training

- Furthermore, the Commission is intending to hold **sectoral Round Tables** at European level on mutual recognition, to which representatives of the competent authorities of the Member States and the respective professional bodies of the sectors most directly concerned by the application of mutual recognition will be invited. It also suggests that each Member State should organise in parallel national, regional or local **seminars** on mutual recognition attended by the various authorities concerned and a number of representatives of economic operators. Small and medium size enterprises are particularly encouraged to participate in these initiatives.

- Basing itself on what was done to improve knowledge of Community law for lawyers and magistrates ("Action Robert Schuman"), the Commission intends to invite Member States to submit **specific projects** aimed at improving awareness of the principle of mutual recognition within certain target groups and to contribute to the funding of such projects, be they at national level or involving several Member States. An interactive information policy dealing with activities exercised by Member States should thus become established.

Render mechanisms for dealing with problems more effective

- The Commission's biennial report on the application of mutual recognition will allow a more accurate assessment to be made of the need for a new **harmonisation** initiative or further harmonisation in specific areas in compliance with the subsidiarity principle. Harmonisation must be applied when it is considered necessary, for example, when every effort to apply mutual recognition has failed and whenever Community intervention provides added value. In each case, the economic cost of lack of harmonisation in the given area should be examined.

- The Commission will prepare a **specimen application form** which will be forwarded to the European and national federations concerned so that their members can use it in their contacts with the authorities responsible for applying mutual recognition. It considers in fact that when they are confronted with a decision to refuse to apply mutual recognition, economic operators should be able to demand the rapid provision by the appropriate administrations of the country of destination of a detailed statement of the reasons, based on scientific arguments, for which a product or service which is lawfully marketed in the Member State of origin does not guarantee equivalent protection of the general interest of the Member State of destination.

- In applying the internal rules recently put into practice[10] and following the recent improvements made in the treatment of cases, the Commission will continue to give all necessary attention and will try to reduce the time required to deal **with** individual **complaints** it receives on the application of mutual recognition. It will also try to ensure better application of the principle by means of targeted action in problem sectors.

- Package meetings organised on a bilateral basis by the Commission with a Member State in the field of goods will be extended to the services sector (these meetings must evidently not result in a delay in the start of infringement proceedings). There will be more systematic monitoring of the proposals for solutions presented by Member States at these meetings.

- In the field of business communications, a modern approach for assessing and applying mutual recognition has been established which entails greater involvement of the respective authorities in the Member States[11]. Taking this model as a basis, the Commission is convinced of the value of putting in place **mechanisms** which allow it to improve the synergy between itself and the Member States. This method could be applied to **other areas** in the field of services.

- In the area of retail financial services, the Commission has undertaken to consider the development of a **Community network for dealing with complaints** (with a mediator specialising in financial services) to promote co-operation between the

---

[10] "Improvement of the Commission's working methods in relation to infringement proceedings", SEC (1998) 1109, 24 June 1998.

[11] After examining existing national measures, the Member States' experts are called upon to express an opinion on the application of mutual recognition on the basis of similarities identified in the various national legislations. Where there are differences, the most appropriate response (harmonisation or other measure) can be discussed.

national bodies responsible for the amicable settlement of disputes with a view to dealing with cross-border disputes for the benefit of European consumers[12].

- Some specific sectoral initiatives will also contribute to a better functioning of the principle of mutual recognition in the area of **services**, notably in the air transport sector (through the proposal to establish the European Aviation Safety Authority) and in the telecommunications sector (future Communication from the Commission on the regulatory framework for telecommunications).

The international dimension

- Mutual recognition also plays an important role in the Community's **relations with third countries**, as a means to remove or at least reduce obstacles to trade. In the area of services, the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) provides opportunities to conclude agreements for the mutual recognition of qualifications, licences, regulations and other requirements concerning the provisions of services. In the area of goods, the WTO Agreement on Technical Barriers to Trade allows and even encourages WTO Members to conclude mutual recognition agreements. Mutual recognition in this context does not go as far as it does in the context of the Internal Market, but it remains a very useful tool in the Community's external trade policy. In this context, the Community has concluded and / or is negotiating a number of Mutual Recognition Agreements on conformity assessment. Within the Transatlantic Partnership (TEP) the Community is exploring mutual recognition of technical regulations in different goods and services fields.

Action by Member States

It is the **Member States** who have primary responsibility for the application of this principle and the Commission is in favour of a genuine partnership becoming established between itself and the Member States to improve the functioning of mutual recognition.

- The case law of the Court of Justice has recently confirmed the obligation to include **mutual recognition clauses** in national legislation[13]. The formal inclusion of mutual recognition clauses is the result, in particular, of the implementation of the notification procedure introduced by Directive 98/34/EC; as a result of the examination of national technical regulations at the draft stage, by their peers and by the Commission, Member States are to bring their relevant legislation into line with the requirements of Article 28 of the EC Treaty (ex-Article 30). It is for each Member State to decide on the type of legal instrument chosen for this purpose, but the Commission recommends that this process be given a high profile. It is through such clauses that not only individuals, but also the competent national authorities and the heads of inspection and control bodies become aware of how mutual recognition has to be applied in a given area.

---

[12] "Financial services: Implementing the Framework for Financial markets: Action Plan", COM (1999) 232, 11 May 1999.

[13] Mutual recognition clauses introduced in the legislation of one Member State allow the acceptance on the territory of this Member State, in an individualised way, products which are in conformity with the legislation of another Member State. Case C-184/96, Commission v France ("foie gras"), ECR 1998, p. I-6197

- Except in particularly sensitive cases, Member States should undertake to reply within a **reasonable time** to requests for the application of mutual recognition which are sent to them by economic operators and citizens (for instance, within three months). In the past, inadequacies have been noted in this regard.

- Also, with a view to developing a common administrative culture, Member States should **cooperate** more **between themselves**, to find solutions to the problems encountered in the application of mutual recognition. Meetings between the heads of the co-ordination centres could be useful in this context.

- The dialogue already started among the national administrations and between them and the Commission on the implementation of Directive 98/34/EC will be stepped up thanks to the installation of a new **telematics network**.

- **More systematic use of the "contact points"** set up for all areas of the Single Market as part of the implementation of the 1997 Action Plan and of Decision 3052/95, should henceforth be encouraged by all Member States[14]. In the regulated professions, **national co-ordinators** were instituted under the General System directives. They play a similar role to that of the Single Market contact points and this role must be strengthened.

- In order to underline the role and responsibilities of the Member States in ensuring the proper application of Decision 3052/95, the Commission invites the Member States to draw up, at regular intervals (for instance, annually) a **concise report** on the difficulties encountered in application and on possible improvements.

* * *

The Commission invites the European Parliament and the Council to:

- **Confirm the importance they attach to mutual recognition as a centrepiece of the Single Market.**

- **Take note of this Communication and the first biannual Report on the application of mutual recognition and lend their support to the solutions proposed by the Commission to improve the effective application of the principle of mutual recognition, to improve the knowledge of the rights conferred by this mechanism and of the means available to make them respected.**

- **Lend their support to the initiatives designed to improve the understanding of the economic importance of mutual recognition and to monitor progress made in the implementation of this mechanism, with a view to reducing the existing distortions.**

- **Invite the Member States to take the measures necessary to ensure better application of the principle of mutual recognition at all levels.**

---

[14] Economic operators are still insufficiently aware of the existence of these contact points. The Commission invites the Member States to give the widest possible circulation to information on contact points, wherever possible involving the sub-national authorities concerned.

Fig. 1. Statistics on cases of infringement of mutual recognition in the area of products for the period 1996/1998 (source: Commission departments)

Member State	Number of cases	Cases resolved	Cases filed without further action	Average length of procedure (in months)	Cases still under examination
A	16	4	1	12	11
B	15	2	4	13	9
DK	8	1	3	18	4
D	33	9	10	14.5	14
E	19	5	4	10	10
FIN	6	2	0	28.5	4
F	52	22	5	16.5	25
GR	10	3	2	8.5	5
IRL	1	0	0	N/A	1
I	23	2	4	12.5	17
L	0	0	0	N/A	0
NL	12	4	1	11.5	7
P	7	1	2	14.5	4
S	17	7	3	22.5	7
UK	10	1	3	6	6
Total	228	63	42	15.5	123

Fig. 2. Most commonly affected sectors (1996-1998)

Sector	Number of cases	% of total
Foodstuffs	61	25%
Electrical engineering	58	24%
Motor vehicles	57	23%
Precious metals	18	7%
Construction	17	7%
Chemicals	7	3%
Other	27	11%

Fig. 3 Statistics of cases where mutual recognition has not been applied in the field of non-harmonised services (source: Commission departments)

Activity	Number of infringe-ments	Origin	Type of infringement	Status of infringement procedurest
Training bodies	1	2 complaints	Obligation to be established	Procedure under way since March 1998
Private security services	3	6 complaints	Obligation to be established	Procedures under way since 1993 and 1995. One further case was resolved between 1993 and 1998.
Technical inspectorates for products	1	1 complaint	Obligation to be established	Case resolved between 1997 and 1998 (duration 1year))
Temporary employment agencies, placement agencies	3	10 complaints	Obligation to be established (2) and to have a financial guarantee in the host country (1)	Procedures under way since 1992, 1994 and 1997
Construction	5	50 complaints	Obligation to pay social or professional contributions for seconded salaried employees	Procedures under way since 1990 (1), 1993 (1), 1996 (2) and 1998 (1).
Metallurgy	1	3 complaints	Obligation to pay social or professional contributions for seconded salaried employees	Procedure under way since 1989
Patent agents	5	1 complaint 4 own-motion detections	Obligation to obtain an authorisation or to be registered	1 procedure under way since 1997 and 4 others since 1998 .
Construction	1	3 complaints	Obligation to obtain prior authorisation or prior registration	Procedure under way since 1997.
Construction/ metallurgy	5	5 complaints	Status of a seconded salaried employee from a third country - work permit from the country of origin	Procedures under way since 1995 (3) and 1998 (2)
Business communications	13	complaints	Doubts as to the suitability of the rules in the country of destination of the service	Procedures under way since 1994, 1996, 1998 and 1999.

Fig. 4: Mutual recognition in the area of qualifications for regulated professions (source: Commission departments)

Cases of acceptance of the recognition of diplomas

Profession	Period	Total number	Main Member States of destination	Member States of origin
Doctors	1995/96	18336	UK, B, F	UK, F, E
Nurses	1995/96	3598	UK, NL, B	IRL, UK, NL
Dentists	1995/96	952	UK, E, B	UK, I, E
Midwives	1995/96	324	UK, IRL, NL	UK, IRL, NL
Architects	1991/96	1221	UK, IRL, NL	UK, IRL, NL
Veterinarians	1993/94	1988	UK, F, B	B, IRL, D
Pharmacists	1993/94	306	UK, B, IRL	UK, B, F
Teachers	1995/96	1544	UK, E, D	E, UK, D
Physiotherapists	1995/96	1015	F, D, A	NL, B, D
Engineers	1995/96	386	UK, P, D	NL, D, E
Lawyers	1995/96	311	UK, D, IT	IRL, F, E
Other	1995/96	1959		
Total		31940		

Number of complaints received concerning the general system and sectoral directives (period: 1994-1998)

Profession	**Number of complaints**
Doctors	30
Nurses	18
Dentists	29
Paramedical professions	26
Architects	15
Veterinarians	1
Pharmacists	2
Teachers	38
Engineers	15
Lawyers	14
Other	40
Total	228

ISSN 0254-1475

COM(1999) 299 final

DOCUMENTS

EN **10 08 02 17**

Catalogue number : CB-CO-99-312-EN-C

Office for Official Publications of the European Communities
L-2985 Luxembourg