

E. Request to all interested parties for their reactions

Based on the analysis presented in this report and its annexes, stakeholders are invited to answer the following questions:

- 1. Are there any issues not flagged in the evaluation report which should nonetheless be included?**
- 2. Do you have comments on the evaluation report and the CSES recommendations? Please mention examples of real cases where possible.**
- 3. Which of the changes listed in Annex 3 should be made to the MID and why? Please identify in particular:**
 - a) Any barriers to trade experienced (see also Annex 2 on the Mutual Recognition Regulation)
 - b) Any need to adapt to technological development and/or risk that harmonisation would hinder it
 - c) The EU policies to be supported
 - d) Other reasons supporting the need for the change
 - e) The expected costs and benefits of the change, e.g. compliance costs will be raised by x% of turnover and there are resulting benefits of y% of turnover as compared with the costs incurred under a 'no change' option.
 - f) Why standards and/or guidance are not sufficient as alternatives to harmonisation?
- 4. Which of the 26 suggestions identified in Annex 3 for changes to the MID do you oppose and why? In relevant cases, why do you consider standardisation and/or guidance as better alternatives to harmonisation?**
- 5. Which of the sectors identified in Annex 4 should be added to the MID and why? Please identify in particular:**
 - a) Any barriers to trade experienced (see also Annex 2 on the Mutual Recognition Regulation)
 - b) Any need to adapt to technological development and/or risk that harmonisation would hinder it
 - c) The Union policies to be supported
 - d) Other reasons supporting the inclusion of a sector
 - e) The expected costs and benefits of the change, e.g. compliance costs will be raised by x% of turnover and there are resulting benefits of y% of turnover as compared with the costs incurred under a 'no change' option.
 - f) Why standards and/or guidance are not sufficient as alternatives to harmonisation?
- 6. Which of the sectors identified in Annex 4 should not be added to the MID and why? In relevant cases, why do you consider standardisation and/or guidance as better alternatives to harmonisation?**

The Public Consultation is open to all interested parties in the broadest sense: manufacturers, distributors, importers, consumers, users, federations, authorities, potential notified bodies. The public consultation will be open from 6 September 2010 to 1 November 2010.

Received contributions, together with the identity of the contributor, will be published on the Internet, unless the contributor objects to the publication of his/her personal data on the grounds that such publication would harm his/her legitimate interests. In this case the contribution may be published in anonymous form. Otherwise the contribution will not be published nor will, in principle, its content be taken into account."

Respondents are invited to clearly identify themselves, e.g. sector, type of activity, size, turnover, and to send their answers to the above mentioned questions by 1 November 2010 to: entr-metrology@ec.europa.eu.

Commission services' working document

Background documents

1. Evaluation report on the Measuring Instruments Directive by CSES
2. Details of possible changes to MID
3. Details of proposals for new sectors
4. Details relevant for impact assessment of 13 new sectors (by RPA)
5. Survey of SMEs on sectors for inclusion in the Measuring Instruments Directive