

**Federal Public Service Economy, S.M.E., Self-Employed and Energy – Belgium**  
**Directorate general Energy**

**QUESTIONS :**

- (1) How do you suggest the Commission could best ensure coherent product policy?

No comment.

- (2) Do you agree to the general principle of reinforcing the use of energy labelling in order to more vigorously contribute to the Union's objectives on climate mitigation, competitiveness and sustainable product policy?

Yes.

- (3) For energy using products, would you favour the use of an energy label focusing on the energy consumption at use or of an 'eco-design label', (near to the Eco-label showing the 'best') giving the global environmental performance of the product throughout its life-cycle?

We are in favour of an energy label.

- (4) Are you in favour of adding CO<sub>2</sub> on the energy label? How could reliable information be assured in the light of different energy mixes in the 27 Member States?

No. It gives no added value. Could be of interest for products using fossil fuels.

- (5) Are you in favour of adding annual running costs on the energy label? How could reliable information be assured in the light of different energy prices in the 27 Member States?

No.

- (6) Would you like to add other products to the scope of the labelling Directive than those covered at present (household appliances only)? If yes, which products would you suggest (non-household or non energy-using products, 'energy-relevant' product, services such as holiday packages or other)?

Yes, for any 'energy-relevant' product when relevant criteria and information are available.

- (7) In view of dynamic labelling, which approach would you suggest for the transition from an existing labelling scheme to a new labelling classification in order to cause minimum distortions?

We support the CECED proposal.

- (8) Do you want to propose an alternative route beyond the considerations in this document?

No.