

COMMISSION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES

COM(93) 669 final

Brussels, 15 December 1993

COMMUNICATION FROM THE COMMISSION TO THE COUNCIL
AND THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

MANAGEMENT OF THE MUTUAL RECOGNITION OF NATIONAL RULES AFTER 1992

**- Operational conclusions reached in the light of the Inventory
drawn up pursuant to Article 100b of the EC Treaty -**

MANAGEMENT OF THE MUTUAL RECOGNITION OF NATIONAL RULES AFTER 1992

- Operational conclusions reached in the light of the inventory drawn up pursuant to Article 100b of the EC Treaty -

1. In this communication, the Commission wishes to present the conclusions it has drawn from work under Article 100b, in the light of progress in implementing the 1985 White Paper.

I. THE AIMS OF ARTICLE 100b

2. Article 100b of the Treaty provides that "during 1992, the Commission shall, together with each Member State, draw up an inventory of national laws, regulations and administrative provisions which fall under Article 100a and which have not been harmonized pursuant to that Article".

3. The aim of such an inventory is to enable the Commission, where appropriate, to propose that the Council decide that the provisions in force in a Member State must be recognized as equivalent to those applied by another Member State.

4. Article 100b is not, therefore, a second legal basis designed to harmonize notionally what has not been harmonized under Article 100a, but a provision aimed at facilitating the mutual recognition of non-harmonized national provisions; this is because, in areas where the Community has not deemed it necessary to harmonize, only mutual recognition can guarantee completion of the internal market.

5. Now that the harmonization programme set out in the White Paper of June 1985 on completing the internal market is reaching completion, the Community must henceforth see to it that the internal market functions smoothly, basing its action chiefly on existing Community provisions and establishing the necessary conditions for consistent application of mutual recognition.

6. Moreover, the principle of proportionality, which goes hand-in-hand with the principle of subsidiarity enshrined in the Treaty on European Union, should

furthermore prompt the Community to set up a system for managing mutual recognition that can prevent any excessive regulatory activity.

7. Steps also have to be taken to ensure that exceptions to the principle of free movement, which must be specific and limited but are allowed by the Treaty (in Article 36, for example), can be contemplated only in conditions that make for the prevention or swift treatment of problems and the transparency that is essential in a context where mutual confidence is central to the overall approach.

8. The Community will thus have to set up machinery which:

- ensures that the aims of the Internal Market are achieved ;
- affords some degree of legal certainty to economic operators, with the principle of the acceptance of goods coming from other Member States, notably through mutual recognition of non-harmonized national provisions, being confirmed in particular;
- allows differences between national rules to remain where they do not affect the smooth functioning of the internal market;
- allows Member States to safeguard their general interests in conditions that make for transparency and prevention or rapid treatment of problems, thereby strengthening mutual confidence and settling problems before they develop into formal disputes;
- encourages Member States to limit their rules to what is strictly necessary for the smooth and harmonious functioning of the large internal market.

II. IMPLEMENTATION OF ARTICLE 100b

A. THE INVENTORY OF BARRIERS

9. By letter of 7 June 1990, the Commission requested Member States to begin the preparatory work for the implementation of Article 100b, by examining the barriers that still stood in the way of establishment of the area without internal frontiers.

10. In response to concerns voiced by most Member States at the scale of the task, compilation of the inventory was organized in two stages:

- work initially focused on goods. A letter to that effect was sent to the Member States on 30 July 1990, in response to which all except Luxembourg sent in contributions. In view of the uneven quality of these contributions, the Commission, as well as discussing them with the internal market coordinators, tabled them at meetings of expert groups on telecommunications and foodstuffs;

- by letter dated 28 August 1991, the information-gathering exercise was subsequently extended to cover all aspects of the internal market (services, agriculture, transport, etc.) and Member States were requested to send in further contributions on such topics.

B. ANALYSIS OF THE INVENTORY

11. A number of conclusions can be drawn from the inventory compiled under Article 100b(1):

12. Composed of contributions received from Member States that relate chiefly to remaining barriers to the free movement of goods and supplemented by the Commission's own observations, the inventory has not revealed any sector that is not dealt with either by measures taken under the 1985 White Paper programme or by infringement proceedings initiated under Article 169 of the Treaty for failure to fulfil obligations under Article 30 in particular; it has, however, identified specific barriers that are mostly confined to bilateral relations between a few Member States and concern a particular product in isolation (e.g. aërials and pencils).

13. In spite of the fact that the contributions received were confined to merely reporting barriers, it can be considered that Article 100b will apply to a limited number of residual cases where it is difficult in practice to determine whether the national measures concerned fall under Article 30 or whether harmonization at Community level is genuinely necessary.

14. In the light of the information it has received, the Commission does not see the need for any specific measures for the recognition of equivalence at Community level.

15. Above all, however, the establishment in 1992 of a procedure for bilateral or multilateral recognition, between any Member States and on a case-by-case basis, of the equivalence of national provisions deemed liable to create barriers to trade would not have been a sufficiently general, comprehensive and therefore appropriate solution for meeting the 31 December 1992 deadline and thus ensuring that the aims of the internal market were achieved; such an approach:

- would have required more determined and more extensive cooperation from Member States, on a generalized bilateral or multilateral basis (a slow and cumbersome procedure);
- would not have achieved recognition of equivalence in all possible eventualities (Member State by Member State);
- would not have ensured rapid and appropriate treatment of any barriers possibly emerging after 31 December 1992 (non-exhaustive nature of the inventory of actual or potential barriers);

- would not have facilitated the adaptation of national rules to new circumstances (resulting from experience or scientific and technological progress) if national provisions were specifically and formally recognized as equivalent on a particular date.

16. On the other hand, the present state of Community law, as enshrined in Article 30 of the Treaty and secondary legislation and developed through decisions of the Court of Justice, has already established the principle of the acceptance of goods coming from other Member States. This principle is based in particular on the mutual recognition of national rules and may be departed from only to satisfy mandatory requirements or on the grounds listed in Article 36, such as health, safety or the protection of consumers or the environment.

17. In view of the forthcoming completion of the White Paper programme and in the light of the conclusions drawn from the inventory provided for in Article 100b, it is therefore essential to ensure compliance with the principle of the acceptance of goods coming from other Member States, by managing transparently, effectively and consistently what must remain exceptions to that principle.

III. THE PRESENT STATE OF COMMUNITY LAW: THE FREE MOVEMENT PRINCIPLE STRENGTHENED

A. A FIRM BODY OF CASE-LAW

18. As the Court of Justice held in Cassis de Dijon (Case 120/78 [1979] ECR 649) and subsequent judgments spelling out the rule, any product lawfully produced and marketed in one Member State must, in principle, be admitted to the market of any other Member State.

19. Exceptions to this principle may be accepted only if the national rules in the commercial or technical field that are liable to create barriers:

- are such as to satisfy mandatory requirements or grounds listed in Article 36 such as public health, public security, consumer protection or protection of the environment;
- are proportionate to the objective to be attained, i.e. are an instrument which is necessary and hinders trade least.

20 This case-law prompted the Commission to develop a number of guidelines, which it presented for the first time in its communication concerning the consequences of the judgment given by the Court of Justice in the above mentioned Case 120/78 (Cassis de Dijon). In that communication (OJ No C 256, 30.10.1980), the Commission stressed the following points in particular:

"The principles deduced by the Court imply that a Member State may not in principle prohibit the sale in its territory of a product lawfully produced and marketed in another Member State even if the product is produced according to technical or quality requirements which differ from those imposed on its domestic products. Where a product 'suitably and satisfactorily' fulfils the legitimate objective of a Member State's own rules (public safety, protection of the consumer or the environment, etc.), the importing country cannot justify prohibiting its sale in its territory by claiming that the way it fulfils the objective is different from that imposed on domestic products.

In such a case, an absolute prohibition of sale could not be considered 'necessary' to satisfy a 'mandatory requirement' because it would not be an 'essential guarantee' in the sense defined in the Court's judgment."

21. The Court has in a line of decisions clarified the scope of the principle of the acceptance of goods coming from other Member States; it has thus been prompted to draw a distinction between cases where barriers to free movement are based on consumer protection and those where barriers have to do with the protection of public health.

In the first set of cases, the Court has applied the principle whereby, where proper labelling is adequate to inform the purchaser, a Member State is not entitled on consumer protection grounds to prevent an imported product being marketed.

Where public health is concerned, the Court has taken the view that although a Member State is always entitled to ban a product that would endanger the health of its citizens, it is for the authorities of the Member State that wishes to prohibit the sale of a product imported from another Member State, where it is lawfully produced and/or marketed, to check in each particular case that the product in question constitutes a real risk.

The Court has thus held that Community law does not permit national rules which make authorization to market products subject to proof by the importer that the product in question is not harmful to health, without prejudice to the right of the national authorities to ask the importer to submit all the information in his possession needed to assess the facts (Case 174/82 Sandoz [1983] ECR 2445).

In the case of products whose harmfulness is not established when they are imported for the first time, the importing Member State must furthermore lay down a procedure for prior authorization and, should it refuse to grant authorization, give the grounds for its decision; operators must also be able to challenge such refusal before the courts (see in particular Case 178/84 Purity requirement for beer [1987] ECR 1227, ground 46).

22. Finally, the Court has completed its case law by drawing a distinction between :

- on the one hand, rules on conditions with which goods must comply in order to be legally manufactured and marketed (such as conditions relating to their denomination, shape, dimensions, weight, composition, presentation, labelling, packaging or handling) and,
- on the other hand, provisions which limit or prohibit certain sales practices (such as a general prohibition on reselling at a loss).

The former, in accordance with the "Cassis de Dijon" judgment mentioned above, constitute measures with an effect equivalent to quantitative restrictions which are prohibited by Article 30, even where these rules are applied without discrimination to all products, unless their application to products from other Member States can be justified on grounds of general interest of such a nature as to take precedence over the requirements of free movements of goods.

Concerning the latter type of provisions, however, the Court considers that national measures which limit or prohibit certain sales practices do not constitute measures having equivalent effect to quantitative restrictions prohibited under Article 30, provided that these provisions are applied to all operators concerned who exercise their activity in the national territory, and provided that they affect in the same way, both in law and in practice, the marketing of national products and those coming from other Member States ("Keck and Mithouard" judgment of 24 November 1993, joined cases C-267 and C-268/91 - prohibition of reselling at a loss-).

B. COMMUNITY LEGISLATION SUPPLEMENTED

23. In the above-mentioned communication on the consequences of the Cassis de Dijon case, the Commission already drew the necessary conclusions and laid down some guidelines for its own action.

24. On the one hand, it has tackled commercial rules laying down technical or qualitative conditions to be met, for admission to the market of one Member State, by products manufactured and marketed in other Member States, in all cases where the trade barriers occasioned by such rules are inadmissible according to the very strict criteria set out by the Court.

25. On the other hand, it has directed harmonization work mainly at national laws having an impact on the functioning of the common market where the barriers to trade to be removed arise from national provisions which are admissible under the criteria set out by the Court.

26. To forestall difficulties that could arise from new national provisions, it proposed that a procedure be introduced for the notification of draft technical regulations; the procedure came into being under Directive 83/189/EEC.

27. Now that the entire programme for completing the internal market, as established in the White Paper of June 1985, is being rounded off and the inventory provided for in Article 100b has not revealed any major barrier still in place that cannot be removed under planned Community measures or through infringement proceedings initiated under Articles 30 to 36 of the Treaty, the principle of the acceptance of goods coming from other Member States has been strengthened.

28. It is thus necessary, if the internal market is to function smoothly, to set up machinery for dealing swiftly, effectively, transparently and consistently with cases where an exception could legitimately be made to the mutual recognition principle.

IV. PROPOSAL: MUTUAL RECOGNITION, LEGAL CERTAINTY AND EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION

29. In addition to the observations made earlier on the small number and nature of the remaining obstacles identified, the principle of the acceptance of goods coming from other Member States has been strengthened by recent developments in Community law stemming from the Treaty (as amended by the Single European Act and the Treaty on European Union), secondary legislation (measures taken under the 1985 White Paper) and decisions of the Court of Justice.

30. It is therefore necessary to ensure from now on that cases where a Member State makes an exception to this principle, to satisfy a mandatory requirement or on grounds listed in Article 36, are brought to the attention of the Commission and the other Member States as soon as they arise, so that such transparency can enable problems to be settled swiftly:

- either, and preferably, on a voluntary basis by the Member States concerned;
- or, if necessary, at Community level before such problems produce all their adverse effects on businesses, consumers and, more generally, Community citizens.

31. This approach offers the advantage of being a pragmatic method of dealing with barriers to the free movement of goods. The cooperation established between the Member States themselves, where necessary with support from the Commission, will thus help ensure that action by the Community does not exceed what is necessary for achieving the free movement objective.

32. On the other hand, problems can be solved without formal disputes only within a framework that is clearly defined and based on mutual confidence.

The Member State concerned must thus transmit the information at the earliest opportunity, explaining the reasons why it deems it legitimate to impose compliance with its (existing) legislation on goods coming from another Member State.

33. The necessary information procedure should cover four types of decision:

- a general ban on a model or type of product;
- refusal to grant authorization for a model or type of product which is being placed on the market of the Member State concerned for the first time and which is subject to an authorization procedure along the lines of that resulting from the case-law of the Court of Justice and described by the Commission in its communication on the free movement of foodstuffs within the Community (OJ No C 271, 24.10.1989, p. 3)

- a requirement that the model or type of product concerned be modified before it can be placed on the market in question;
- withdrawal from the market of a model, type or category of product.

34. The information procedure would concern only the main decision taken on a model or type of product (general ban, refusal to grant authorization, withdrawal from the market) and not the measures preparing or leading up to that decision (preventive measures, investigations, etc.).

35. Furthermore, this procedure for the exchange of information should cater for only those cases which are not already covered by existing notification procedures:

- technical regulations which have already been notified at the draft stage under Directive 83/189/EEC should not be notified under these arrangements. Only (negative) decisions taken in pursuance of such technical regulations would be concerned;
- likewise, where it is decided to impose a general ban on a category of products, to refuse to grant authorization in respect of a particular product, or to withdraw a product from the market, on the grounds of the hazard it represents for the health and safety of consumers, specific procedures are already provided for under Decision 89/45/EEC on a Community system for the rapid exchange of information on dangers arising from the use of consumer products and Directive 92/59/EEC on general product safety (from 29 June 1994);
- lastly, certain directives contain safeguard clauses that require Member States to notify national measures they may take in certain well-defined circumstances.

36. Emphasis should be placed here on the role played by the procedure established by Directive 83/189/EEC in ensuring the mutual recognition of differing national rules. Through the systematic insertion of mutual recognition clauses in national draft technical regulations and through the possibility open to Member States of having their own rules recognized in drafts notified by other Member States, businesses are able to enjoy greater legal certainty. The Directive thus weeds out many potential cases of non-recognition. Given the large number of notifications made under the procedure (over 400 a year), Directive 83/189/EEC is making a significant contribution to the unity of the single market.

37. On the other hand, Community provisions currently in force do not always make it possible to ascertain, as soon as they arise, cases where a Member State considers it legitimate and necessary to impose compliance with its own national rules on a model or type of product which is nevertheless lawfully and fairly produced and/or marketed in another Member State.

38. However, in an internal market in which priority is to be given to mutual recognition in cases where national rules have not been harmonized, it must at least be possible to identify swiftly any cases where mutual recognition is not applied.

Businesses must be able to operate in a legal environment based on clear principles to which only rare exceptions are allowed.

The proposed information procedure should thus enable any exceptions to be identified swiftly and should help to find a solution that re-establishes or strengthens the principle of the free movement of goods.

CONCLUSIONS

39. In its resolution on making the single market work¹, the Council undertook to work in partnership with all Community institutions and Member States to ensure that the single market worked effectively, and to act speedily if new barriers were found which could jeopardize its operation; it also invited the Commission to propose any practical arrangements to help ensure the smooth running of the single market.

40. In view of the foregoing and in full accordance with the conclusions it intends to draw in particular from the report of the high-level group chaired by Mr Sutherland on the operation of the internal market after 1992, the Commission will thus be transmitting to the Council and the Parliament a proposal to establish a simple and pragmatic procedure for the exchange of information between Member States and the Commission to enable the Community to manage more transparently the mutual recognition of national rules which have not been harmonized at Community level.

¹ Council Resolution of 7 December 1992 on making the single market work, OJ No C 334, 18.12.1992, p. 1 (see points 7 and 24 in particular).

**Inventory of barriers to trade in goods
drawn up under Article 100b:**

**barriers to trade in specific products
reported by Member States**

IMPORTANT NOTE

The following table sets out in summary form the barriers to trade in specific products reported by Member States.

It should, however, be stressed that:

- 1- the contributions which the Commission received from Member States varied widely:

For those Member States which sent in a written contribution (all except Luxembourg), the information was presented in different forms, ranging from a fairly detailed list (Belgium) to a simple letter setting out the general position of the Member State concerned on Article 100b (Spain), with a variety of combinations, worked out to varying degrees of detail, in between;

- 2- the table is merely indicative:

The information compiled was transmitted under the responsibility of the Member States concerned, and the observations made were not usually accompanied by an analysis of the legality of the barriers reported;

- 3- the barriers were identified by Member States over a period (1990-92) in which many of the Community measures planned in the 1985 White Paper were yet to be adopted or to enter into force.

The table is thus valid only as an indication of the type of barriers to trade in goods which Member States identified between 1990 and 1992 and whose removal is being ensured by the Commission under the powers conferred on it by the Treaty.

The reader should also refer to the operational conclusions reached in the light of the inventory drawn up pursuant to Article 100b of the Treaty and presented by the Commission in its communication to the Council and Parliament on management of the mutual recognition of national rules after 1992.

**Inventory of barriers to trade in goods
drawn up under Article 100b:**

barriers to trade in specific products reported by Member States

SECTOR	PRODUCTS (MS of dispatch)	BARRIERS (MS of destination)
foodstuffs	Food supplements (UK)	Disparities between national rules
	Additives (B-F-UK)	Differences between additives allowed in MS
	Alcoholic drinks (IRL-UK)	Disparities between national rules
	Potatoes (F-UK)	Classification problems (D-F) and import barriers (DK)
	Drinks labelling (F-UK)	Disparities between names allowed in certain MS (D-F-L)
	Beer (B-UK-P)	Purity laws and disparities between labelling or packaging rules (DK-D-EL-E-F-I) or ban on additives (F-B)
	Milk products (B-F)	Barriers resulting from mandatory names (B-DK-EL) or marketing ban (I)
	Peas (B)	Classification problems and quality standards (DK)
	Chocolates (B)	Ban on sorbic acid (F)
	Precooked foods (B)	Disparities between rules on maximum allowable temperatures (EL)
	Lollipops (B)	Disparities between national rules (DK-IRL)
	Hard cheese (B)	Ban on methymycin (DK)
	Prepackaged foods (F)	Obligation to use the imperial metric system for the weights of prepackages for honey, jellies, jams and marmalades (UK)
	Meat and live animals (F)	Import bans, quarantine I (DK-IRL-UK)
	Eggs (F)	Import barriers (IRL)
	Frozen bread (F)	Marketing ban (I)
	Soya protein (DK)	Ban on use (D-EL-E+NL)
	Milk protein, starches (EL)	Ban on use (D)
	Radishes in bunches (NL)	Control of leaf miner fly (UK)
	Exotic fruit (NL)	Plant-health controls (I-E)
Road vehicles	Motor vehicles (B-NL-UK)	Lack of mutual recognition of type approval
	Registration plates (B-UK)	Ban on plastic registration plates in some MS (P)
	Bicycle reflectors (B)	Disparities between rules of certain MS (D)
	Deflectors (B)	Disparities between rules of certain MS (D)
	Glow plugs for diesel engines (B)	Difficulties in obtaining type approval (D)
	Ventilators for caravans (B)	Disparities between rules of certain MS (D-IRL)
	Radiators for caravans (NL)	Difficulties in obtaining type approval (F)

SECTOR	PRODUCTS (MS of dispatch)	BARRIERS (MS of destination)
Road vehicles (cont'd)	Bicycle frames (F)	Mandatory marking (DK)
	Mopeds (F-P)	Difficulties in obtaining type approval (DK)
	Trailers (F)	Difficulties in obtaining type approval (I)
	Tanks (B-F)	Difficulties in obtaining type approval (F-I)
	Invalid carriages(F)	Marketing ban (I)
	Licence-exempt vehicles (F)	Marketing ban (I)
Construction	Fixings (UK)	Disparities between rules of certain MS (D)
	Gas cylinders (UK)	Disparities between rules of certain MS
	Metal structures (B)	Disparities between rules of certain MS (D)
	Sanitary installations: equipment and components (B)	Disparities between rules of certain MS (D)
	Heating appliances (B)	Disparities between rules of certain MS (D)
	Lifts and hoists (B)	Disparities between rules of certain MS (D)
	Welded tubes (B)	Disparities between rules of certain MS (E)
	Galvanized products (F)	Disparities between rules of certain MS (E)
	Extinguishers (F)	Disparities between rules of certain MS (E)
	Bricks and concrete blocks (B)	Mandatory dimensions in certain MS (UK)
	Electric light bulbs (B)	Disparities between rules of certain MS
	Gas appliances (B)	Disparities between rules of certain MS (F)
	Electrical plugs (F)	Obligation to fit an earth terminal (DK)
	Industrial paints (F)	Mandatory composition rules (B)
	Padded furniture (F)	Mandatory fire resistance standards (UK)
	Ceramic tiles (EL)	Difficulties in obtaining type approval (F)
	Construction materials (P)	Difficulties in obtaining type approval (E)
Telecommunications/ radiocommunication	Fax machines (B-UK)	Disparities between rules of certain MS (E-F)
	Collective aerials (DK)	Disparities between rules of certain MS
	Telephones (DK)	Disparities between rules of certain MS
	Answering machines (DK)	Disparities between rules of certain MS
	Computer keyboards (DK)	Disparities between rules of certain MS
	Short-wave radio sets (DK)	Disparities between rules of certain MS
	Video transmission systems (DK)	Disparities between rules of certain MS
	Medical telemetry (DK)	Disparities between rules of certain MS
	Navigation equipment (EL)	Difficulties in obtaining type approval (UK)

SECTOR	PRODUCTS (MS of dispatch)	BARRIERS (MS of destination)
Pharmaceutical products and medical equipment	Medicinal products (B-F)	Differences between Member States in the way medicinal products are defined (pharmacists' monopoly) (D) Lack of mutual recognition of marketing authorizations Excessive delays in granting marketing authorizations (E)
	Medical instruments (F)	Obligation to resterilize (B)
	Medical equipment (NL)	Difficulties in obtaining type approval
chemical products	Ethanol (UK)	Sales ban in certain MS (D-EL-P)
	Fertilizers (F)	Marketing ban on fertilizers with a high ammonium nitrate content (B)
	Pesticides (IRL)	Disparities between national rules, with special reference to maximum permissible residues
Miscellaneous	Cosmetics (UK)	Disparities between rules of certain MS (E)
	Pumps for beer or refreshing drinks (B)	Disparities between rules of certain MS (E)
	Precious metals (B-D-F)	Lack of mutual recognition of hallmarks
	Aerosols (B)	Classification problems (F)
	Bedspreads and carpets (B)	Labelling disparities
	Furniture (B)	Fire-resistance requirements (UK)
	Sound recordings (UK)	Differences in duration of legal protection
	Toys (B)	Requirements relating to the concentration of cellulose and toxic substances (IRL)
	Children's nightclothes (B)	Disparities between rules of certain MS (IRL)
	Prams (B)	Disparities between rules of certain MS (IRL)
	Pencils and drawing materials (B)	Requirements relating to the concentration of toxic substances (IRL)
	Raw cashmere (B)	Health certificate (UK)
	Eiderdowns (B)	Labelling and composition (NL-D-F)
	Clothes (B)	Fire-resistance requirements (IRL)
	Teats for feeding-bottles (F)	Sales ban (NL)
	Ski lifts (F)	Marketing ban (I)
	Carpets (B)	Wear-resistance, labelling
	Computer peripherals (F)	Import barriers (E)
	Pressure vessels (DK)	Lack of harmonized standards
	Electric bells and small ancillary items (I)	Conformity declaration (E)
Wine and champagne corks (I)	Problem of tax stamp (F)	
Shoes (I)	Problem of composition labelling (EL-E-F)	

SECTOR	PRODUCTS (MS of dispatch)	BARRIERS (MS of destination)
Miscellaneous (cont'd)	Shoes and other leather goods (I)	New import licence other than the Cites certificate (D) List of permitted leather goods more restrictive than the Washington Convention (NL-UK)
	Use of PCP in leather goods and shoes (I)	Differences between national rules (D) Lack of rules in I
	Furnishing fabrics (I)	Differences between national rules (UK) Flame-retardant standard in UK
	Pressure cookers (I)	Differences between technical standards (D-F)
	Gas-fired water heaters (I)	Differences between national rules (D-F) No rules in I
	Safety footwear (I)	Differences between national rules (D-UK)
	Tanks (F)	Difficulties in obtaining type approval (I)
	Extinguishers (F)	Marketing barriers (DK)
	Packaging (EL)	Recovery (D)
	Flowers (NL)	Control of leaf miner fly (UK)
	Television sets (NL)	Radiation standards (D) Voltage indications (I)
	Housings for television sets (NL)	Fire-resistance requirements (D,UK)
	Mains-operated electrical appliances (NL)	Operating instructions (UK)

COM(93) 669 final

DOCUMENTS

EN

06

Catalogue number : CB-CO-93-722-EN-C

ISBN 92-77-62860-X
