

Analysis of implementation of the Construction Products Regulation

Topical Report #3 National Certifications/Quality Marks

prepared for

DG GROW

13th March 2015



Analysis of implementation of the Construction Products Regulation

March 2015

Topical Report

National Certifications/Quality Marks

Quality Assurance	
Project reference / title	J861 CPR Implementation
Report status	Topical Report
Author(s)	Tobe Nwaogu Scott Marshall
Approved for issue by	Tobe Nwaogu, Project Manager
Date of issue	13 th March 2015

Document Change Record			
Report	Version	Date	Change details

1 Background

Free movement of goods is a cornerstone of the Single Market and the mechanisms in place to achieve this aim are based on **prevention of new barriers to trade, mutual recognition and technical harmonisation**. Prior to the CPR, it was evident that trade in construction products between Member States (MS) had been impeded in various countries¹. Building on the CPD, one of the aims of the CPR is to remove technical barriers to trade in the field of construction products in order to enhance their free movement in the Internal Market, via harmonised standards for construction products and European Technical Assessments (ETAs).

Article 8(3) of the CPR specifies that, for any construction product covered by a harmonised standard, or for which a ETA has been issued, the **CE marking shall be the only marking** which attests conformity of the construction product with the declared performance in relation to the essential characteristics, covered by that harmonised standard or by the ETA.

Under the CPR, quality marks (whether public or private and including those with national connotations) are not allowed to cover characteristics already included in harmonised European standards (hENs). This includes situations where a manufacturer has not declared the performance of his product in relation to some characteristics (i.e. has used the “No Performance Declared” option referred to in Article 6(3)(f)). Since Article 4(2) of the CPR renders the use of the DoP as the only manner to declare performance and Article 8(3) specifies the CE marking as the only mark which attests conformity of construction products with the declared performance, the manufacturer cannot turn to other options here. Put simply, **for products covered by hENs**, performance in relation to essential characteristics included in hENs can only be attested using the CE marking².

Within the territory of an EU Member State, a **national technical specification** (e.g. a technical standard) for a construction product can be issued for **products not covered by a hEN** or if the **national technical specification transposes hENs** (see Article 17(5)). However, the national technical specification is to respect the limits imposed by the CPR (Article 8(4)-(6)) and comply with other applicable EU legislation (for example, the notification in conformity with Directive 98/34/EC) as well as with the provisions governing free movement of goods in non-harmonised sectors.

In this context, it is important to note that Member States retain the competence to set technical requirements for the performance of construction products, in particular for specific uses of the products in a building or civil engineering work (e.g. fire safety requirements for escape routes). In case these national technical requirements imply limits to the use of CE-marked construction products, these limits need to be duly justified and proportionate and not constitute a means of arbitrary discrimination or a disguised restriction on trade between Member States. In any case, the

¹ For instance, in 2008, the European Court of Justice (ECJ) found that the practice of Belgian authorities encouraging economic operators to obtain Belgian marks of conformity prior to the marketing of construction products that had been manufactured/marketed in accordance with the CPD in another Member State infringed the free movement of goods principle. See Judgment of 13 March 2008, C-227/06, Commission v Belgium. More recently, the ECJ considered contrary to the CPD the additional national requirements (including the national Ü Mark) imposed in Germany to CE marked products (see judgement of 16 October 2014 on case C-100/13).

² Frequently Asked Questions on the Construction Products Regulation (CPR) See http://ec.europa.eu/growth/sectors/construction/product-regulation/faq/index_en.htm

burden of proof in justifying the measures lies with the Member State and not with the economic operator. Put simply, for **products not covered by hENs**, national provisions referring to national marks are not to discriminate against products which do not bear such marks².

This paper **examines the problems encountered by manufacturers (and other stakeholders) in placing their products on the market in countries where national certifications/quality marks exist**. Put succinctly, many manufacturers of construction products have indicated that they feel obliged to obtain these marks as they would effectively not have access to national markets without them – the question to be considered is, therefore, **to what extent do national certifications /quality marks constitute a barrier to trade?** In attempting to answer this question, this paper draws on the perception of/and feedback provided by stakeholders, rather than a thorough legal or technical analysis of the exact nature/status of the various marks identified.

In this context, it is relevant to mention one of the most cited quality marks by stakeholders: the **‘Ü mark’ in Germany**. In Germany, as well as the CE marking required at EU level, the Ü mark imposes additional and compulsory requirements on certain construction products to be used indoors. For example, floor coverings that had the CE marking in accordance with EN 14041 also had to carry the Ü mark if they were to be installed in German buildings in rooms where humans were to stay longer than transiently. The Ü mark is placed on the product following confirmation of conformity by the German Institute for Construction Technology (DIBt) who administers it. To obtain the Ü mark, a manufacturer must provide test results accepted from laboratories recognised by the DIBt.³ **Effectively, the Ü mark is a mandatory mark with legal standing (not a voluntary mark)**. Consequently, manufacturers have been prevented from accessing the German market or have incurred additional administrative and compliance costs to market products in Germany.

On 21 June 2012, the European Commission referred Germany to the European Court of Justice (ECJ) for failing to respect EU rules governing the harmonisation of the marketing of construction products. The Commission considers the Ü mark a barrier to trade as it imposes additional requirements for products which are already covered by European harmonised standards and bear the CE mark.

In the above court case, the ECJ ruled in favour of the Commission against the requirement of the German Ü mark for CE marked products under the CPD. The Germans made the case that the additional specifications related to health and the environment and were necessary for the German authorities but were not covered by a harmonised standard. The ECJ answered to this by explaining that Germany should follow the procedures foreseen in the CPD for reacting to harmonised standards or to products considered to present a risk. Although this case was in the context of the CPD and only three construction products⁴, it is expected that **the ECJ decision will be applicable under the CPR and with regard to all construction products with a CE marking**.

³ Eurofins (2012): AgBB/DIBt – German restrictions for VOC emissions, available from <http://www.eurofins.com/media/17642/AgBB-DIBt%20approvals%20-%20en.pdf>. See also: AgBB, DIBt and German Ü mark for construction products, accessed at <http://www.eurofins.com/u-mark.aspx>

⁴ Elastomeric seals for pipes, insulating materials made of mineral wool and gates, windows and exterior doors

2 How Companies Perceive Quality Marks

2.1 Overview

Information obtained from stakeholders indicates that quality marks available on the market pose different problems and, most likely, would require different solutions. For the purposes of this paper, the national/quality marks have been grouped into three categories **to reflect how these marks are typically perceived by companies**. These are not legal categories, but simply reflect the fact that quality marks possess certain common properties which pose common challenges to manufacturers.

These categories are:

- **Standards-related quality marks**, which are typically linked to standards, the CPR or specific CPR requirements (e.g. AVCP);
- **De facto mandatory quality marks**, typically required by important third parties in the construction supply chain (e.g. in public procurement notices and by insurers); and
- **Market-driven quality marks**, which are recognised/highly rated by customers.

In this context, it should be noted that national/quality marks do not necessarily/always fit perfectly into the categories identified (e.g. a mark could be de facto mandatory and also market driven); however, this grouping allows for some consideration of the problems posed and possible solutions.

2.2 Standards-related marks

2.2.1 Problem definition

Standards-related marks are used, in this context, to refer to national/quality marks which are directly or indirectly supported by, related to, linked to, or measured against standards which are of relevance to the CPR.

The main problem with these marks is that it is not always clear to manufacturers whether or not they fulfil a different/complementary function to the CPR, safety assessments, CE marking (e.g. in terms of covering essential characteristics) and/or whether, overall, they potentially confuse third parties as to the meaning of the CE marking. As noted by one manufacturer, these national marks very often follow the EN standards but sometimes with a minor deviation and/or, in some cases, upgrade the level of AVCP from 3 to 1⁵.

In discussing these standards-related marks, it is difficult to determine easily whether each is:

- a national technical specification (e.g. a technical standard) for a construction product for a products not covered by a hEN ;
- a national technical specification transposing a hEN;

⁵ It should be noted that it is not allowed under the CPR for a MS to upgrade the level of AVCP from 3 to 1.

- a national technical specification transposing a hEN, but not respecting the limits imposed by the CPR or the provisions governing free movement of goods in non-harmonised sectors);
- a national technical requirement setting specific uses of the products in a building or civil engineering work, which may (or may not be) justified or proportionate. As noted earlier, the choice of required performance values for specific intended uses to which construction products are put rests with each Member State and this sometimes reflects in national certifications/marks.

Put simply, it is difficult to ascertain clearly (without in-depth technical product knowledge) when these quality marks have gone beyond the remit allowed by the CPR for Member States' discretion. In any case, if the CE marking is publicised as being deficient or as representing a minimum conformity standard (rightly or wrongly), then these national/quality marks become even more important for manufacturers and consumers as an indication/sign of higher quality, safety or reliability. This also means that **companies are required to spend additional resources (and time)** before they can place their products on national markets where these marks exist. As there is no/limited mutual recognition across national markets for these marks, manufacturers could spend a lot of resources in order to take advantage of the Single Market.

2.2.2 Views of stakeholders

Stakeholders have identified various national certifications/quality marks which may qualify under this category. For example, in the **UK**, it has been indicated that the **BBA certificate** maintains a dominant position, even over CE marked products where hENs are in force. According to one manufacturer, the BBA process is costly, unnecessary, and can add one year to the introduction of new products. The BBA is accredited by the United Kingdom Accreditation Service (UKAS) and carries out testing in accordance with ISO/IEC 17025. As noted on the BBA website, *"Products that receive Agrément Certificates are recognised by building control, government departments, architects, specifiers and industry insurers. It's a mark of quality, safety and reliability that provides reassurance of the product's fitness-for-purpose. For new construction products it is vital to achieve this certification if they are to gain a quick route to the marketplace."*⁶

In **France**, the **NF228 standard** has been highlighted as hindering the easy sale of products in France for non-tested products. According to one manufacturer, the EN 12326 standard for roof slates is viewed as inferior and, indeed, publicity of the NF228 highlights the drawbacks of CE marking. As noted on one website: *"NF 228 is a French testing standard – you can think of it as the Michelin Star of the slate world. Slate with an NF mark has passed all the CE tests, and more, to a very high standard."* This manufacturer notes that the NF228 is used as a barrier to prevent EN-marked natural slate successfully selling in France and it costs time and money to obtain the certification. The manufacturer also indicated that they face drawbacks in other national markets where there is only limited awareness of EN 12326 and, as such, the CPR *"while very worthwhile, has not given compliant products any significant advantage..."*. This view is somewhat reflected in further publicity material which notes that: *"The slate industry in the UK looks to a French standard because the current CE certification does not have a pass/fail criteria and the NF standard is a like-for-like replacement of the arduous old British standard BS680"*.⁷

⁶ BBA website: Agrément Certificates, accessed at <http://www.bbacerts.co.uk/product-approval/agreement-certificates/>

⁷ Why The NF Mark is The ONLY Way To Know You're Getting Quality Slate, accessed at <http://www.ssgroup.com/resource-centre/why-the-nf-mark/>

Another example can be seen in the **UK Kitemark**. As noted on the BSI website, “As a Kitemark licensee you are already ahead of your competitors. With the introduction of EN 14351, BSI is modifying the Kitemark for Doors and Windows to include three new characteristics [that are either covered by building regulation or have threshold values in EN 14351]. CE marking may cover only these three areas whereas the Kitemark will include these as well as air permeability, water tightness and resistance to wind loading plus durability and security. ...CE marking may not have the benefit of Kitemark but the introduction of EN 14351 cannot be ignored.”⁸

Other examples mentioned by stakeholders include the **PAS24 in the UK** (and SKG quality mark ‘star concept’ in the Netherlands) for burglary products. One stakeholder noted that these introduce additional requirements outside of the main characteristics in Annex ZA of EN 14351-1 (windows and doors). In both cases, the European Burglar Resistance Standard EN 1627-1630 is “undermined” by additional tests required to qualify for the national marks. Similarly, it has been suggested that the **German RAL quality mark** (RAL GZ after 695) has a meaning in Germany that goes far beyond the requirements of the BauPVO. Here, there is a test sequence for the properties of air permeability (EN 1026), wind load (EN 12211), water tightness (EN 1027) and other properties, which leads to an increase in the requirements. Stakeholders also noted that the “**Bauregelliste**” in Germany defines additional requirements for harmonised products that have to be met by producers placing their products on the German market. One manufacturer indicated that for EN 1317 (Compliant Road Restraint Systems), there was no consensus about part 4 regarding transition; as a result, **France prepared a national regulation (NF 058)** which results in extremely high costs for manufacturers and effectively closes the market to the few operators that can afford these costs.

2.2.3 Possible solutions

According to the CPR, Member States are not to introduce any references, or should withdraw any references, in national measures to a marking attesting conformity with the declared performance in relation to the essential characteristics covered by a harmonised standard other than the CE marking. Put simply, national marks are permitted under the CPR, so long as they do not cover essential characteristics and fulfil a different function to the CE marking. Only the CE mark can be used to demonstrate compliance with the CPR. For the quality marks which would fall under this category, a case-by-case assessment would be required in order to identify the specific problems they pose – however, it is worth considering **whether there is a need for a systematic investigation of national/quality marks which go beyond the EU harmonised standards**.

That said, it is expected that the ECJ ruling on case C-100/13 will have a direct impact on various quality marks which are currently overstepping the mark in several Member States. However, the full impacts of the ECJ judgement in Germany will not be fully known until internal discussions between the DIBt, the Länder and the Federal Government are finalised⁹.

⁸ BSI website: Windows and doors certification schemes, accessed at <http://www.bsigroup.com/en-IN/Our-services/Product-certification/Industry-sector-schemes/Construction/Windows-and-doors/windows-and-doors-certification-schemes/>

⁹ DIBt Press Release, Germany condemned by ECJ for impeding the free movement of construction products, See: https://www.dibt.de/en/Departments/data/ZD5_Press_release_Decision_ECJ_16_October_2014.pdf

2.3 De facto mandatory marks

2.3.1 Problem definition

De facto mandatory marks, are used in this context to refer to national marks which claim to be “voluntary”; however, they are effectively (de facto) mandatory for manufacturers as they will be unable to sell their products on certain markets, or in certain sectors, without them. These include cases where national/quality marks are (compulsory) requirements imposed under public procurement rules or by insurers (without which insurance cannot be obtained). Indeed, Construction Products Europe (CPE)¹⁰ recognises that voluntary marks remain de facto necessary to sell in countries where the AVCP system is perceived as inadequate; when imposed by controls on building site/insurances; and when linked to incentives (e.g. renovation).

2.3.2 Views of stakeholders

In the UK, one stakeholder highlighted the **HAPAS (Highways Authorities Product Approval Scheme)** for the approval of a range of Highways Products. Within this range are Asphalt Thin Surfacing Systems which includes certification of the performance of the asphalt in the road for 2 years prior to certification and ‘maintenance’ of the certification/approval at annual intervals thereafter. This certification covers the supply of CE marked asphalts and an assessment and audit of material installation by approved contractors by the certification body BBA (British Board of Agrément). BBA are currently the sole UK certification body and owner of the HAPAS scheme and supposedly “*insist that they carry out audits of the suppliers’ Factory Production Control for the asphalt manufacture which has already been assessed, audited and certified under AVCP System 2+ as they do not have confidence in the notified bodies’ audits*”. If the supplier does not permit this sequence of secondary or duplicate audits by BBA, BBA will withdraw their Thin Surfacing Certificate of Approval, the holding of which is currently a specified condition of supply of this product type within the UK market, primarily Public Sector Procurers responsible for the Motorways, Trunk and Local Authority roads in the UK.

Another manufacturer mentioned the **CEKAL certification (France)** as a de facto mandatory scheme which hinders the placing of glass products on the French market. The following bullet points lifted and reproduced from some publicity material highlights some of the key issues:¹¹

- For more than 20 years CEKAL certification has been applied to glass products in France as a guarantee of quality, transparency and sustainability, and therefore plays an important role in the market.
- The CEKAL certification system is structured and organised according to the European standard EN 45011, thus ensuring that CEKAL displays the objectivity, impartiality and accuracy that is to be expected of a certification body.
- CEKAL certification of insulating glass units is a voluntary certification process in which the individual components are required to meet quality criteria, thus guaranteeing the quality not just of the end product as a whole, but also of each of its components.

¹⁰ CPE (2014): The manufacturer's point of view by Construction Products Europe (CPE), available at http://www.buildingtestexpo.com/assets/files/Proceedings2014/anne_minne.pdf

¹¹ Glass Global community website: CEKAL and ift Rosenheim sign cooperation agreement, available at http://www.glassglobal.com/news/cekal_and_ift_rosenheim_sign_cooperation_agreement-21062.html

- The CEKAL mark is a visible indication of high product quality, not least because products achieving CEKAL certification must satisfy higher requirements than those set out in the product standards for glass, for example regarding the ageing (UV resistance) of the individual components.
- To ensure consistently high quality the certificate remains valid for just six months and products must undergo surveillance twice a year by independent third parties such as CSTB (Centre Scientifique et Technique du Bâtiment), Ginger CEBTP (Centre Expérimental de Recherches et d'Études du Bâtiment et des Travaux Publics) and now also the ift Rosenheim.
- Voluntary CEKAL certification is very important for insulating glass units in France, particularly because construction insurance companies tend to rely on well-known certification systems before issuing 10 year guarantees at affordable prices
- As a result, window manufacturers can more easily place their windows on the French market if they are made with CEKAL-certified insulating glass units. This makes CEKAL certification essential for insulating glass unit manufacturers who wish to sell their products on the French market.

Other examples mentioned by stakeholders include the **CSTB certificate (Document Technique d'Application (DTA) approval)** which is required in France by insurance companies, design engineers or clients in strong/monopoly positions. In France, the **UPEC classification (NF UPEC mark)** has been highlighted as a de facto obstacle (for insurance reasons) to the free circulation of tiles intended to be used in floors of public areas. The **Avis Technique in France** was also highlighted as a quality mark which is related to insurance requirements, but not required directly by Member States. In **Hungary** and **Poland**, it was noted that additional requirements of approvals and audits are "voluntary" but de facto necessary. In Spain and France, it was noted that there is interference with the free movement of CE marked construction products, because products coming from other countries must comply with **AENOR and AFNOR** marks and regulations. All these marks require additional testing of the products which creates administrative and financial burdens for manufacturers.

2.3.3 Possible solutions

From the consultation, there was a very strong view that more needs to be done in this area by the Commission to address public bodies, or private bodies acting as a public undertaking, that seem to be imposing additional national requirements/standards that impede the free movement of CE marked construction products. In this context, some manufacturers have argued that Article 8(5) is vague and MS have used Recital 33 (which notes that other markings may be used, provided that they help to improve the protection of users of construction products) as justification for these marks.

2.4 Market-driven marks

2.4.1 Problem Definition

Market-driven quality marks, in this context, refer to those quality marks which are recognised and highly rated by customers and consumers. In many cases, they do not clash with the CE marking

and, technically, do not impede the free movement of construction products.¹² However, they occupy a very strong position in the market and, as such, effectively become barriers to trade – as manufacturers are unable to trade their products without these. Or put another way, customers (consumers) will not buy products which do not have these quality marks. For these marks, **the main problem is that that there is no mutual recognition between these marks (or cross-border benefit) which reinforces their importance at the national level.** Where this practice exists, it is **SMEs who are hit hardest**, as larger companies can rely on their good reputation and resources to gain more accreditation and sell more products.

2.4.2 Views of stakeholders

Public authorities, companies, industry associations and construction industry stakeholders all noted the impact of market forces at the local level as being key in terms of determining whether or not the CPR is effective in ensuring the free movement of products. Some views are summarised below:

“The real barriers to trade are the local labels. If your product does not have the local label, no one will buy and install it. Nothing has been done to solve this”.

“For sanitary installations, national labels are predominant and misused by the national certification institutes to protect national markets. If you don't have the label, you can enter the market but won't sell a single item”.

“Customers, especially consumers, are not aware or not interested in CE marking. They care about local / national labels and awards for construction products (e.g. Blaue Engel in Germany, SNJF in France, KOMO in the Netherlands)”.

“... CE-mark makes a product dealable [legal], but not necessarily applicable.... It does not matter whether the [product] is legal, when you are not allowed to use the product in the country. Nobody will buy it, when he is not allowed to use it on the building site.”

One manufacturer of insulating glass units provided a list of various quality marks required in order to trade their products across the EU:

Belgium: Benor, ATG; **Finland:** SFS; **France:** Ceval; **Germany:** GMI (RAL), U-mark; **Italy:** CSI (UNI); **Norway:** Sinteff; **Poland:** B-Safety; **Portugal:** CERTIF; **Spain:** N-mark, AP+; **Sweden:** P-mark; **UK:** Kite-Mark, BM-Trada

A cement manufacturer also indicated that they needed to obtain the BENOR, KOMO and NF Quality marks in order to gain access to the Belgian, Dutch and French markets respectively.

These examples illustrate the need for some mutual recognition or system of marks which goes beyond the national marks.

In discussing these, it is important to note that, many stakeholders/organisations want voluntary marks to remain, as they perform different functions to CE marking. Some were of the view that some well-established voluntary schemes currently provide more credibility compared to the CE marking for construction products and would need to continue in the short term at least. However,

¹² For example, KOMO in the Netherlands has set out the differences between KOMO and CE marking to justify that they are incomparable. See http://en.komo.nl/files/84_engelstalige-leaflet.pdf

as shown in the Table overleaf, for manufacturers and SMEs wishing to trade across the EU, these requirements impact on their resources.

2.4.3 Possible solutions

There is no obvious solution for dealing with market-driven marks, as these marks are effectively recognised and highly rated by customers and consumers. Perhaps, it needs to be considered whether there is scope for some mutual recognition or EU-level quality marks which cover the points addressed by these marks.

3 Questions for discussion

What are your views on the likely impacts of the ECJ rulings on cases C-227/06 and C-100/13 on quality marks?

Which types of quality marks should be investigated as a priority for their compatibility with the CPR? Why?

Are there any suggestions for how to improve mutual recognition of quality marks, so as to reduce costs for manufacturers and SMEs?

Are there any suggested approaches for dealing with De facto mandatory marks?

Are there aware of any national marks or technical specifications which may be impacting on the free movement of CE marked construction products which have not been mentioned in this paper (including the table in the next section)?

4 Key National Marks

The Table below provides a list of key national marks identified to date.

Table 4-1: Examples of national marks identified in various MS from consultation and literature review		
Country	Mark	Details
Austria	Baustoffliste OE	Building Materials List issued by the Austrian Institute for Building Technology
Belgium	BENOR	BENOR mark certifies that a product or service conforms to a technical quality framework adopted by all parties involved in the placing on the market. <i>The BENOR mark for aggregates and concrete is mandatory in public works in Flanders even with AVCP 2+</i>
	EHPA	European Heat Pump Association issues a quality label to heat pumps that undergo tests according to EN 14511 and EN 16147
Denmark	DANAK	National Accreditation Body involved in the accreditation of laboratories, certification bodies and inspection bodies. Also involved in testing or inspecting products for certification.
France	ACERMI	The Association for Certification Materials Isolants scheme is operated by CSTB and LNE. The scheme validates the factory and laboratory characteristics of thermal insulation.
	AFNOR	The national organisation for standardisation whose certification branch is responsible for two quality marks; AFAQ and NF.
	CEKAL Certification	Applied to glass construction products e.g. windows as a guarantee of quality, transparency and sustainability. The certification scheme is structured and organised according to EN 45011. In July 2012, ift Rosenheim was nominated as its first testing partner in Germany.
	CSTB	CSTB (Centre Scientifique et Technique du Bâtiment) is an independent third party involved in the AVCP system (notified body). CSTB also provides voluntary, certification to 'add value' and reward performance of building products. There are three types of evaluation given by a group of experts supported by CSTB: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document Technique d' Application (DTA) - issued for construction products subject to CE marking; • Avis Technique (Atec); and • Appreciation Technique d' Expérimentation (ATex) is applied to innovative construction systems. In some cases DTA are demanded by the designing engineers and insurances.
	NF Environment Mark	Voluntary certification mark issued by AFNOR Certification (notified body) e.g. NF228
	SNJF	SNJF (Syndicat National des Joints et Facades) is a certification body delivering around 600 certificates a year
	UPEC Classification	UPEC, NF-UPEC and NF-UPEC.A++ are systems of certifications established by CSTB for the classification of floor coverings. Being based on classification procedures defined under the NF EN 1307

Table 4-1: Examples of national marks identified in various MS from consultation and literature review

Country	Mark	Details
		standard, to which they add supplementary requirements.
	VOC labelling	Since 1 st Jan 2012, construction products traded in France must be labelled with an emissions classification on the basis of a VOC emissions test (as stated in the Décret n° 2011-321).
Germany	AgBB/ DiBT	Task force of public health authorities (AgBB) and the Deutsches Institut für Bautechnik (DIBt) developed restriction for VOCs published for a number of construction products including floor coverings, parquet flooring and adhesives.
	Blaue Engel	Voluntary certification system as a way of demonstrating that a construction product is environmentally friendly
	DIBt	Granted approval body as German Technical Approvals (TAB)
	EMICODE	Voluntary certification system aimed at assessing the implications on environmental and indoor air quality
	IFT/Rosenheim	Testing institute (notified body) which specialises in the assessment of the fitness for use of construction products, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Window examination by EN 14351-1; • Facade examination by EN 13830; • Examination of doors, gates, statements, among others; • Testing of building materials, such as glass, sealants or wood; and Fire resistance test according to EN 16034.
	RAL	RAL quality Mark is intended to identify products that are manufacturers to high, precisely specified quality criteria. Products certified include road equipment and photovoltaic components
	Natureplus	A European Association which awards a quality mark to building products which fulfil high standards relating to climate protection, healthy accommodation and sustainability.
	TÜV Rheinland	Among other services, TÜV Rheinland provides material testing and inspection services, including products, systems, functional safety and personnel.
	Ü-Zeichen	Mark of conformity indicating a construction product meets the relevant national building regulations. German national system of "Bauregellisten" (Building Regulations), requires the Ü mark for certain construction products.
Netherlands	KOMO	Voluntary certification system for construction products guaranteeing compliance with the national building regulations. Includes the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attest-with-product certificate for components of solar systems • Attest-with-product certificate for thermal insulation of cavity walls (new buildings)
	SKG	SKG quality mark for glass, hinges, locks and related products. Also certifies products for burglary resistance, security and other specific characteristics. Also licensee to attest and certify construction products with SKG KOMO quality marks.

Table 4-1: Examples of national marks identified in various MS from consultation and literature review

Country	Mark	Details
Poland	B Mark	Mandatory certification mark for electrical and electronic products exported from Poland. Applies to some construction products e.g. fire protection equipment. B marking for intumescent products obtained based on EN13381
Spain	AFEOR	The Spanish Association for Standardisation and Certification provides certification for products with regards to quality. Products can also be certified to show the consideration of environmentally sustainability during sourcing and manufacturing.
	Document of Assessment for fitness of Use (DAU)	ITEC issues several quality marks for innovative products or systems which are not covered by a harmonised standard.
Sweden	BASTA	Voluntary certification scheme for construction products focusing on the content of hazardous substances
United Kingdom	BBA Certificate	Approvals issued by the British Board of Agrément showing the fitness for purpose of constructions products. Certificates are recognised by building control, government departments, architects, local authorities, specifiers and industry insurers.
	Highway Authorities Product Approval Scheme (HAPAS)	Issued by the British Board of Agrément the HAPAS is a nationally recognised approval scheme for innovative products and systems used in highway works.
	LPC	LPC (loss prevention certification board) standards applicable to some construction products e.g. doors, windows, curtain walling etc. e.g. LPC1175 (Loss Prevention standards/secured by design)
	Kitemark	Product quality certification mark owned and operated by the British Standards Institute. Commonly used on products where safety is particularly important e.g. smoke detectors and windows
	PAS 24	A British standard relating to enhanced security performance requirements for doorsets and windows. Testing and certification are carried out by UKAS accredited certification bodies.

More information on quality marks can be found on the ELIOS database <http://signsdirectory.elios-ec.eu/>



Risk & Policy Analysts Limited
Farthing Green House, 1 Beccles Road
Loddon, Norfolk, NR14 6LT, United Kingdom

Tel: +44 1508 528465
Fax: +44 1508 520758
E-mail: post@rpald.co.uk
Website: www.rpald.co.uk

If printed by RPA, this report is published on 100% recycled paper