

# Minutes of the Fit for Future Platform expert group

Brussels, December 2022

Fifth plenary meeting of the Fit for Future Platform<sup>1</sup>  
5 December 2022

## Summary

The Fit for Future Platform held its fifth plenary meeting on 5 December 2022, which was chaired by Vice-President Maroš Šefčovič. The meeting focused predominantly on presenting and adopting the Platform's 2022 annual work programme opinions, resulting in the adoption of 9 out of 10 opinions. The members also exchanged views on the possible topics for the Platform's 2023 annual work programme and touched briefly on the experience with the Platform's amended working methods.

## 1 Summary of main points discussed

The Platform proceeded with presentation and adoption of its 2022 opinion. 9 out of 10 opinions were adopted during the meeting while one was put forward for a written procedure shortly afterwards. The Platform touched base on the preparations of the next year's annual work programme, raising further ideas and briefly touching upon some aspects of the working methods, which will be discussed in detail in a dedicated meeting.

## 2 Introductory address

The agenda included progress of the Platform's work on the AWP 2022 opinions, leading up to the adoption of the opinions, and the Platform's annual work programme for 2023 inclusive of experience with the adjusted working methods introduced in 2022.

The agenda was adopted without amendments.

**Vice-President Šefčovič** opened the meeting and greeted the participants, first time in physical presence. He congratulated the Platform members for their accomplishment and thanked everyone, in particular the rapporteurs, for the ongoing commitment in very unstable times of post-Covid recovery and the Russian war on Ukraine with all its implication. In this context, the **Vice-President** underlined the new geopolitical reality impacting EU's citizens, businesses and communities exacerbated by the generational challenges like achieving the twin green and digital transitions.

Against this backdrop, **Vice-President Šefčovič** recalled the Commission's 2023 work programme, which includes 51 flagship initiatives aiming jointly to make the Union more green, digital, fair and resilient. He reminded that many of the Commission's initiatives emerged from recommendations made at the Conference on the future of Europe and made reference to the new generation of European citizens' panels, which will support several of next year's initiatives.

The Commission's 2023 work programme contains eight initiatives proposed for revision under our regulatory fitness and performance programme, REFIT, which are particularly relevant for the

---

<sup>1</sup> Published in the [Register of Commission Expert Groups and Other Similar Entities, code number 3729- FIT FOR FUTURE PLATFORM](#)

Platform's work. The **Vice-President** highlighted that several of the Platform's opinions were ready already to feed into the Commission's works, for example on REACH, food waste or the late payments.

**Vice-President Šefčovič** recalled the ways in which these opinions can aid the Commission's ongoing and future work.

Firstly, he recalled the Platform's first horizontal opinion on the interconnectivity between the digital and green transitions, echoing the Commission's 2022 Strategic Foresight Report, which identified the need for a future-proof and agile EU regulatory framework as key for a successful twinning between the green and digital transitions. The 'do no significant harm' principle, use of strategic foresight in policymaking or the 'digital by default' principle already feature prominently in the Commission's evaluations, impact assessments and stakeholder consultations.

Secondly, the **Vice-President** stressed that the Platform's opinions were already being shared with the relevant services, even if not yet adopted, and fed into the policy proposals.

Thirdly, he stressed that the Platform's opinions also help the Commission to guide the implementation of new initiatives, such as with delegated and implementing acts, the preparation of guidelines or training activities.

**Vice-President Šefčovič** reminded the members of the 2021 annual burden survey –published in July 2022 – which reports on how the Commission followed up on the 2021 opinions. The survey included the lessons learnt from the first 10 pilot projects for the application of the 'one in, one out' principle carried out in 2021. The Vice-President stressed the importance of the enhanced quantification of the costs and benefits that are reported in the opinions of the Regulatory Scrutiny Board on impact assessments which accompany new initiatives. The next edition of the annual burden survey in 2023 will report on the first year of full implementation of the 'one in, one out'.

**Vice-President Šefčovič** also recalled the RegHub's special report on the obstacles faced in rolling out infrastructure projects, which must be overcome in order to accelerate the green and digital transition.

### 3 Opinions

**Vice-President Šefčovič** summed up the Platform's achievement with its 10 opinions under the annual work programme 2022, recalling some notable examples of pragmatic suggestions for simplification, reduction of burden or digitalisation of the EU laws, based on the experience of the members and their stakeholders.

Significant potential for *burden reduction* was flagged in opinions like on VAT in the digital age or REACH. The latter also provided *simplification* suggestions, present as well in the opinion on facilitating SMEs' access to capital.

The *digital opportunities* were at the core of the opinion on Governments' interoperability strategy, or in the opinion on the end-of-life vehicles.

Several opinions identified areas that need better *enforcement and implementation*. These included the opinion on the Regulation on Governance of the Energy Union and Climate Action or the opinion on the victims' rights acquis.

Finally, numerous opinions aimed to *future-proof* and *streamline* EU legislation, for example, in the domain of biosolutions, the end-of-life vehicles opinion, or the food waste and food donation opinion.

Nine out of ten opinions were proposed for adoption during the plenary meeting, except the opinion on biosolutions, which required last touch-ups. Vice-President Šefčovič gave the floor to all rapporteurs present to briefly present their opinions.

**DK** informed that whereas they could support all of the opinions, their representative was unable to consult nationally, in particular against the fact of a still forming government in Denmark and tight deadlines but promised to come back with a written position by the end of the week. **DK** requested to insert the observation “pending approval by DK” for the opinions adopted, which following the plenary meeting, was lifted by **DK**.

**Ms Ursula Pachi (BEUC)** requested that all dissenting views are accompanied by a justification and possibly alternative suggestion.

**Ms Agnès Mathis (Cooperatives Europe)** re-emphasised the importance of timely contributions and consultations as well as rapporteur’s expected consolidating work to be scheduled outside of the holiday period. She also stressed that to ensure a smooth process it is essential receiving solely amendments to the existing suggestions in the last round of consultations rather than new lengthy contributions.

**Vice-President Šefčovič** acknowledged these points and informed that the Secretariat would look how to further minimise the risk of last minute substantive changes and enhance the discipline on the deadlines, which depends on the commitment of all.

### 3.1 SBGR1\_01 How to favour interconnectivity between the Digital and the Green transition, including through simplification?

**Rapporteur: Ms Valeria Ronzitti (SGIEurope)**

**Ms Ronzitti** presented the Platform’s first transversal opinion broadly supported by all members and the four suggestions it included:

1. Better reflect assessments of combined effects of legislation in evaluations and reinforce the assessments of non-action in impact assessments;
2. Explore extending sustainability assessment standards to assess sustainability and digitalisation levels of enterprises;
3. Improve access to data through improved broadband infrastructure and governance;
4. Make better use of strategic foresight and other tools to support the design of future-proof policies.

**Ms Ronzitti** proposed this opinion for the Platform’s 2022 annual work programme to follow up on the work already started under the REFIT Platform, to give these ideas a new momentum and link them to the Commission’s foresight exercise. She expressed her view that the Platform should be the Commission’s ally in better policy making and help the Commission identify pragmatic examples of how to bring coherence between the different pieces of legislation targeting the digital and green transitions so that these do not contradict each other.

To reap full benefits of the Platform’s work in the context of the foresight exercise, **Ms Ronzitti** stressed that the timing of opinions linked to the foresight report must be adjusted, allowing the Platform’s opinion to inform the Commission’s report and thus be adopted by April. Despite stakeholders being already consulted through different channels, she proposed that such horizontal opinion become a standard feature in the Platform’s annual work, particularly given the shared interest it attracts.

The **Vice-President** agreed that the importance of social aspects of the twin transitions have also been recognised by the incoming Spanish Presidency favouring the use of anticipatory governance

and foresight. This will also be discussed at the informal HoSG meeting in Cordoba under the Spanish Presidency, for which a paper was under preparation.

The opinion was **adopted** with no further comments.

### 3.2 SBGR1\_02 Enterprise friendly VAT in the digital age

Rapporteur: Mr Christoph Bausch (BusinessEurope)

Co-rapporteur: Ms Valeria Ronzitti (SGIEurope)

**Mr Bausch** introduced the main problems tackled by the opinion and the six suggestions that stem from them.

The opinion on the VAT includes the following suggestions:

1. Avoid additional registration through change of VAT rules on processing in another Member State before exporting and extension of the VAT One-Stop-Shop to the transfer of own goods;
2. Remove the need for explicit derogations regarding the introduction of mandatory e-invoicing and define common minimum standards and requirements for e-invoicing;
3. Change rules on VAT exemptions for services related to the importation of goods;
4. Coordinate rules on VAT bad debt relief;
5. Align VAT rules with insolvency procedures;
6. Coordinate VAT registration processes.

**Mr Bausch** presented the expected benefits of all six suggestions, the common theme being that they would all reduce burdens for taxable entities.

The opinion was **adopted** with no further comments. **FI** abstained.

### 3.3 SBGR1\_03 Regulation on the Governance of the Energy Union and Climate Action

Rapporteur: Ms Rebecca Humphries (WWF)

**Ms Humphries** presented the context of the Regulation, the reasoning driving the opinion and the six suggestions put forward:

1. Announce the revision of the Governance Regulation upon the completion of trilogue negotiations on the Fit for 55 package to ensure consistency in view of the new legal and political context and lessons learnt from the first iteration of National Energy and Climate Plans and for national Long-term Strategies;
2. Propose that Member States set a national level, economy-wide climate-neutrality target and reflect it in their national long-term strategy;
3. Update the 'Clean Planet for All Europeans' long-term strategy to ensure it remains up to date and fit for future;
4. Modernise the template for national energy and climate plans (NECPs) and national long-term strategies;
5. Modernise the 'energy efficiency' dimension of the Governance Regulation in line with the recast of the Energy Efficiency Directive;
6. Improve public participation in the elaboration of NECPs and national long-term strategies.

**Ms Humphries** explained the process arriving at the compromise text, acknowledging that it may not fully satisfy all parties but it reached nevertheless general support.

The opinion was **adopted** with no further comments. **FI** abstained while **AT** tabled a dissenting view to be annexed to the opinion.

### 3.4 SBGR2\_04 SMEs' access to capital

Rapporteur: Mr Vasco Linhares de Lima Álvares de Mello (EESC)

Co-rapporteur: Mr Antonios Angelakis (Small Enterprises' Institute at Hellenic Confederation of Professionals, Craftsmen and Merchants)

**Mr de Mello** presented the two leading problems that drove the opinion and the rationale of the three suggestions that constitute the opinion. Some other issues identified were included under the problem definition but they were not translated into suggestions.

The opinion on the SMEs access to capital includes the following suggestions:

1. Align the concepts of SME for capital market purposes across relevant legislation;
2. Simplification of the procedures for the admissibility of securities issued by SMEs and of administrative obligations;
3. Standardised and simplified rules concerning accounting obligations.

Amongst the problems that were not translated in the opinion's suggestion **Mr de Mello** mentioned the crucial role of the European Single Access Points (ESAP) in centralising information through a single database for all investors in the EU. He also mentioned the need for better and more useful information for investors. Finally, **Mr de Mello** mentioned the need for an EU-wide scheme with funding options as a more efficient option for companies and investors.

The opinion was **adopted** with no further comments.

### 3.5 SBGR\_05 Revision of the end-of-life vehicles directive and the directive on the type-approval of motor vehicles

Rapporteur: Mr Mark Speich (CoR)

The rapporteur was unable to attend the meeting and present the opinion. The opinion tabled for adoption comprised the following six suggestions:

1. Consider a digital vehicle passport including details on used materials;
2. Refine the definitions for end-of-life vehicles and used vehicles;
3. Consider (1) full digitalisation of the registration system and (2) installation of a central registration system and/or interoperable systems or ensuring the compatibility and coordination of the registration systems across and within Member States;
4. Enforce the certificate of destruction (COD) necessary for deregistration and implement a systemic differentiation between temporary and permanent deregistration;
5. Improve implementability of the ELV-Directive's requirements through a reward system for deregistration and/or dismantling;
6. Ensure coherence with other legislation, e.g., the Batteries Directive 2006/66/EC and the REACH Regulation.

The opinion was **adopted** with no further comments.

### 3.6 SBGR2\_06 REACH Regulation

Rapporteur: Ms Véronique Willems (SMEunited)

**Ms Willems** presented the opinion and the process of arriving at the compromise opinion on this complex regulation.

This opinion includes the following six suggestions, which the rapporteur explained in detail, including their expected benefits:

1. Improve communication up and down the supply chain;
2. Facilitate registration and evaluation;
3. Develop IT-tools more adequate for SMEs;
4. Enhance transparency supporting regulatory actions and innovation;
5. Strengthen enforcement;
6. Streamline authorisation and restriction.

**Ms Pachl** requested that the simplification measures under suggestion 6 do not have any compromising impact on the protection of health and environment and asked to replace the word 'contesting' by 'compromising' under suggestion 6, paragraph 3. The change was accepted by the rapporteur; no other members raised concerns during the meeting regarding this change.

The opinion was **adopted** with the single change by **Ms Pachl**.

(Following the plenary meeting EEB and WWF tabled dissenting views for this opinion, given that they had not received the correct final text in due time for them to finalise position.)

### 3.7 SBGR3\_07 Revision of the victims' rights acquis

Rapporteur: Ms Goranka Lalić Novak (University of Zagreb)

**Ms Lalić Novak** was unable to attend the meeting and present the opinion. The opinion comprises the following two suggestions:

1. More efficient mechanisms need to be put in place to monitor regularly the measures taken by Member States to ensure the systematic and continuous education of all stakeholders in the victim support system, including police officers and members of the judiciary;
2. It would be advisable at EU level to prescribe in more detail the 'individual victim assessment' of Article 22 of the Victims' Directive, modelled on legal systems that involve a wide range of actors in the individual assessment - police officers, prosecutors, judges, expert assistants at courts but also non-governmental organizations specialized in supporting victims, especially certain categories of vulnerable victims. This would also ensure a greater level of awareness of all stakeholders who come into contact with victims during criminal proceedings, but also before and outside of criminal proceedings.

**Ms Ioana Condurat (Fit for Future Platform Secretariat)**, mandated by the rapporteur and on her behalf, presented a proposal to modify suggestion 2 aiming to accommodate an **AT** comment, supported also by **DE**. The rapporteur agreed in suggestion 2 to change from:

*It would be advisable at EU level to prescribe in more detail the 'individual victim assessment' of Article 22 of the Victims' Directive, modelled on legal systems that involve a wide range of actors in the individual assessment - police officers, prosecutors, judges, expert assistants at courts but also non-governmental organizations specialized in supporting victims, especially certain categories of vulnerable victims. This would also ensure a greater level of awareness of*

*all stakeholders who come into contact with victims during criminal proceedings, but also before and outside of criminal proceedings.*

to

*It would be advisable at EU level to explore more ways to involve a wide range of actors in the assessment of victims' needs - police officers, prosecutors, judges, expert assistants at courts but also non-governmental organizations specialized in supporting victims, especially certain categories of vulnerable victims. Involving expert assistance could ensure a greater level of awareness of all stakeholders who come into contact with victims during criminal proceedings, but also before and outside of criminal proceedings.*

No member raised objections to the change.

Upon **DE** request, **DE**'s position is recorded in the minutes:

1. In Germany, state compensation can already be claimed in the course of criminal proceedings, not only at the end of that process. This might be the case in other Member States also. **DE** asked to acknowledge this in relation to the problem description and also delete the reference to state compensation.
2. **DE** notes that is necessary to avoid general statements that do not cater for specific situations. This is why **DE** noted that it is not always but "**often**" the case that victims continue to face difficulties in certain areas, lack sufficient information about their rights or still do not have effective access to in person and online support services.
3. Regarding suggestion 1, **DE** agreed to it but noted that regarding the systematic and continuous education in the victim support system, police officers and members of the judiciary should be concerned **where relevant.**"

The opinion was **adopted** with the **AT** change on suggestion 2. Pending approval coming from **NL** by the end of the week. (Following the plenary meeting, **NL** confirmed its approval)

### 3.8 SBGR3\_08 Biosolutions

Rapporteur: Mr Lasse Hamilton Heidemann (Danish Chamber of Commerce)

**Vice-President Šefčovič** informed the members that this opinion required final touch-ups and would be adopted in a written procedure to be launched as soon as possible after the meeting.

**Mr Lasse Hamilton Heidemann (Danish Chamber of Commerce)** presented the context behind the topic and the underlying problems that drove the opinion. The opinion contains the following 10 suggestions:

1. Modifications of the current regulatory framework to speed up the authorisations of microbiological and low-risk products within Regulation (EC) 1107/2009;
2. Further develop legally binding data requirements for other biological control categories than microbial products, namely semiochemicals, natural substances within Regulation (EU) 283/2013 and Regulation (EU) 284/2013 setting the data requirements under Regulation (EC) 1107/2009;
3. Adopt fast-track approval procedures for innovative, low-risk biological and sustainability-enabling pesticides;
4. Allow extension of the use on one crop to all other crops without the addition of upfront efficacy data for biological control product under Regulation (EC) 1107/2009;
5. Further develop the regulatory framework for biological control products;

6. Analyse opportunities and challenges when revising existing relevant legislation to focus on the potential risk pertaining to the product itself rather than the production process employed;
7. Support adoption of novel food products while ensuring food safety;
8. Improve the harmonization of the use of the term 'probiotics' in the context of the health claims across the EU Member States to provide clarity for industry and consumers;
9. Develop industry guideline for food cultures as food ingredients;
10. Update EU NACE codes.

The **EL** representative expressed his thanks to the work of the rapporteur, which enabled members to understand the complexity of this technical opinion and arrive at the final text.

**Vice-President Šefčovič** announced that the written procedure for the opinion on biosolutions will be launched soon and closed within five working days.

### 3.9 SBGR3\_09 Food waste/donation

**Rapporteur: Ms Agnès Mathis (Cooperatives Europe)**

**Ms Mathis** explained the rationale and importance of the topic on the fight against food waste and poverty while keeping in mind the interest of the various economic actors, with the specific focus on the SMEs. The following five suggestions constitute the opinion:

1. Easing administrative burden for food donors;
2. Explore how to ensure coherence of the Directive for the promotion of renewable energy (RED) with the revised waste Directive in order to ensure that waste hierarchy is fully applied to surplus food;
3. Better link between ESF+ (ex-FEAD, Fund for European Aid to the most Deprived) and financial instruments at Member States' level;
4. Encourage further the integration of market organization measures into food donation policies;
5. Encourage EU research on food packaging.

**Ms Mathis** saw an important value of the suggestions in their pragmatism and link to existing legislation and other work in the field of food donation and prevention of food waste. She explained that some of the suggestions are more long-term, e.g. further research into sustainable food packaging.

The opinion was **adopted** with no further comments.

### 3.10 SBGR3\_10 Governments' interoperability strategy

**Rapporteur: Ms Anne Karjalainen (Committee of the Regions)**

**Ms Karjalainen** was not able to participate in the meeting and present the opinion. The opinion includes eight suggestions of the opinion on Governments' interoperability strategy:

1. Analyse in relevant impact assessments, the feasibility of setting-up an Interoperability governance system, with well-defined roles at EU and national levels;
2. Proper involvement of subnational authorities in the Interoperability governance;
3. Put in place an effective mechanism that guarantees integration of interoperability from the start on and by design in the legislative procedure at EU level;



4. Use the Join-up platform to promote and organise an exchange of national good practices and solutions;
5. Organisational and semantic interoperability layers need to be improved to reflect time dimension of data;
6. Restructure the existing system of EIF recommendations to reflect their multidimensional aspects (tagging);
7. Reinforce participation of GovTech, Open Source software developers, “early adopting” public administrations and other voluntary third parties in development of interoperability products, giving prominence mainly to open source solutions;
8. Include interoperability experts from public sector administration, also covering local and regional administration, in an EU competence and training support centre.

The opinion was **adopted** with no further comments. **FI** abstained.

## 4 Annual Work Programme 2023

### 4.1 Context and process

**Vice-President Šefčovič** recalled the information sources sent to the Platform in October to help the members to identify topics for the Platform’s work. He reminded that these sources are to guide the Platform but not prevent members from selecting other topics of particular relevance. He recalled the importance of focusing on the items with the highest burden reduction and simplification potential but also to take into account the policy-making cycle, to make sure that opinions can be meaningfully followed and contribute to better laws.

The **Vice-President** reminded also the guiding rules of the submission on the ‘Have Your Say: Simplify!’ portal, which are retained for the Platform’s work when they are relevant for its mandate and do not fall into one of the exclusion criteria. He also reminded of the two topics carried over from last year’s discussions, the GDPR Regulation and the use of QR codes on products.

In terms of the members’ initial input for the 2023 annual work programme, the Vice-President informed that the Secretariat received at the time of the plenary 14 proposals, of which 13 were retained following the Secretariat’s assessment guided by the following considerations: respecting the Platform’s mandate; previous work of the Platform and their status in the policy-cycle; the exclusion criteria. One topic submitted through the Have your say: Simplify! Portal - Revision of the Packaging and Packaging Waste Directive - was not retained as the Commission has adopted a proposal to revise it on 30 November 2022.

The up to date retained topics – together with any additional ones proposed during the meeting – would be submitted to the Platform through an EU survey, which serves the purpose of gauging the members’ support for each topic and their readiness to take up a rapporteurship. Based on the results, the Secretariat would short-list up to 10 most supported topics with rapporteur and submit this proposal to the Platform. **Ms Pahl** and **Ms Ronzitti** asked that all topics to be put through the survey be accompanied by a description of the item and its place in the Commission’s policy-cycle. **AT** asked for a timeline for the 2023 annual work programme to accompany the package too. **Ms Willems** took the opportunity to highlight the importance respecting the Platform’s own working methods and of forward planning and concrete dates and deadlines to which all must commit.

### 4.2 AWP 2023 proposals

**Mr Karl-Heinz Lambertz (CoR)** spoke on behalf of the Committee of the Regions members of the Platform, who could not participate in the plenary meeting. **Mr Lambertz** introduced a new member from the CoR, taking the seat of Ms Ulrika Landergren, **Mr Michiel Rijsberman**. **Mr Lambertz**

reiterated the CoR's commitment of the objectives of better regulations and to the Platforms' work. He reflected on the role of the CoR and the RegHub network in this process and the importance of synchronisation of the works between the various stakeholders. He explained the importance of the involvement of the regions, cities and towns that have the data and experience that the Commission needs. **Mr Lambertz** expressed his satisfaction on the progress that the Platform has made over the years and how the results translated into concrete measures. He reiterated the CoR members' commitment to the Platform's work, already resulting in five opinions led by the CoR members, and presented three additional topic suggestions for the AWP 2023, yet to be analysed by the Secretariat:

- Working Time Directive,
- Public Service Obligation Regulation, and
- Digital Europe Programme.

**Ms Ronzitti** put also forward two additional ideas for the topics for the AWP 2023:

- Social economy entities and their access to finance, state aid, public procurement and taxation,
- Ensuring a future-proof regulatory framework for the Single Market, conducive to Europe's sustainability and strategic autonomy: the F4F Platform contribution to the 2023 Foresight report.

**Mr Hubert Gambs (Director, DG GROW)** recalled the topics that were tabled on behalf of the SME envoys network:

- SMEs test application,
- Digital fairness – fitness check on EU consumer law,
- Evaluation of the functioning of Regulation (EU) No 1025/2012 on European standardisation with regard to the new developments and challenges facing European standardisation,
- Evaluation of the Digital Contracts Directives,
- Evaluation of the 2012 Directive on waste from electrical and electronic equipment.

**Vice-President Šefčovič** invited all members who still had ideas for 2023 topics to send them to the Secretariat by close of business. Members took the floor to explain some of the topics they put forward or express their support for the topics tabled by others.

**Ms Willems** briefly presented the broadly shared topic of the SME test application, based on the analysis of 26 impact assessments checking in which way the SME test was conducted and applied.

**Mr Angelakis** expressed his interest in this and welcomed more information about the topics.

**Mr Hubert Gambs**, Deputy Director-General in DG GROW, expressed gratitude on behalf of the SME envoys network for the dialogue that the network has with the Fit for Future Platform. **Mr Gambs** recalled the vulnerability of the SMEs in current times to do business and stressed the importance of the SME test, supporting the inclusion of the corresponding topic in the Platform's annual work programme 2023. He recognised the Commission's ongoing work striving to further improve the test and the process of its application. He also mentioned the application of an SME filter looking at the upcoming initiatives and assessing their relevance for the SMEs early in the policy making.

The **NL**, despite not being able to take rapporteurship on the topics they proposed, advocated for the importance of the ideas they put forward and called on other members to step in as rapporteurs.

**Ms Elena Córdoba Azcárate** prepared two proposals for topics triggered by two non-legislative proposals that the Commission is preparing: single market celebrating 30<sup>th</sup> anniversary and mental health in the workplaces. She pointed out to the importance of looking broadly into all available instruments, not only the EU ones.

**Ms Humphries** supported the Platform working on more horizontal opinions, which should also allow the Platform to go further forward, looking also into application of such principles as the application of "do no significant harm" or the climate check application since its entry into force last year. From

her experience as a rapporteur, **Ms Humphries** indicated that a lot of discussion focused on simplification whereas not enough was on the fit for future angle, foresight and the long-term challenges.

### 4.3 Working methods

**Vice-President Šefčovič** underlined the importance of rapporteurship ensured for all of the Platform's opinions and expressed his expectation that members who propose a particular topic are also ready to assume the role of the rapporteur.

He also recalled the experience of previous years showing the importance of a timely adoption of the Platform's annual work programmes, seconded by many members who would like to see the work on the opinions starting earlier. He brought to the attention of the members the fact that some Commission initiatives have adoption dates early in the year while the Platform opinions are only adopted later. Against this backdrop, the **Vice-President** reminded that 2023 will be the last year of the present Commission's mandate with legislative work.

To accommodate the request of some members to adopt the AWP earlier, a written procedure had initially been planned for the adoption of the 2023 annual work programme, but **Ms Silvia Borelli (ETUC)**, **Ms Ursula Pachi (BEUC)** and **Ms Humphries (WWF)** saw great value in having the opportunity to present and discuss the specific topics for the annual work programme.

**Ms Humphries** also called for more occasions throughout the year to meet and discuss the content of the opinions to avoid that new aspects come up at a last stage whereas they could have been avoided if the members had more interactions in person.

**AT** thanked for the inclusion of consolidation boxes into draft opinions, which improved transparency and facilitated national coordination.

The **Vice-President** suggested to proceed with the work on the new opinions in line with the established working methods albeit with one consultation phase less - the first one, based on the opinion templates, given the low rate of contributions from the members in this phase of the opinions cycle. This should enable all opinions to be delivered by the autumn, with the 2024 work programme being adopted at the December 2023 plenary. **Mr Wimmer** stressed the need for enforcement of current rules still, particularly the established timeline, to prevent late arrival of substantive contributions which create pressure on the rapporteurs and the members.

**Vice-President Šefčovič** concluded that a **virtual meeting** will be organised in January 2023 for the approval of the annual work programme, followed by **working level meeting** in February/March to take stock of the working methods and assessment of the Platform work and a **plenary meeting** before the summer break.

**The Vice-President** reminded the Platform members that the next edition of the Annual Burden Survey will again provide an overview of the Platform activities and opinions and how the Commission follows them up, to illustrate the impact of the Platform.

### 4.4 Miscellanea

**Ms Borelli** pointed out a perceived problem with the composition of the Platform after the departure of one of the ETUC members replaced by another member. **Mr Wimmer** explained that the rules governing Commission expert groups require replacement of a departing member with a candidate from the reserve list. The reserve list candidate from ETUC had been contacted but was no longer available to take the position.

**AT** recalled the annual burden survey 2021, which was the first follow-up to the Platform opinions and suggestions in the Commission's work. In order to further improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the Platform, **AT** propose a discussion on the impact of the work of the Platform as already mentioned during the plenary session of 28 January 2022 and the lessons learnt from the

working methods introduced in 2022. **AT** proposed that the focus of the annual burden survey is sharpened and that it in the future it highlights which suggestions of the Platform were not addressed and why not.

Concerning a general issue not related to the work of the Platform, **Ms Pachl** stressed the importance of the green deal and expressed her concerns about delays with initiatives relevant for consumers such as the Green Claims initiative or the Right-to-Repair initiative. Against the backdrop of negative opinions of the Regulatory Scrutiny Board on those initiatives, **Ms Pachl** suggested to invite the Board and present their work, which was supported by **Ms Humphries**. **Vice-President Šefčovič** explained the objective of the Regulatory Scrutiny Board's work of ensuring quality of what underpins the Commission's proposals in an apolitical manner. He agreed to invite the Board to a forthcoming meeting for a general presentation, while avoiding a discussion about specific initiatives in view of preserving the Board's independence.

## 5 Concluding remarks

**Vice-President Šefčovič** thanked all the members for their work and ideas that led to adoption of nine of out 10 Platform opinions and looked forward to the upcoming discussion of next year's annual work programme.

## 6 Annexes

### Attendance list

#### 6.1 Stakeholder group members

#	Name	Attendance
1	Mr Antonios ANGELAKIS (Small Enterprises' Institute at Hellenic Confederation of Professionals, Craftsmen and Merchants)	Present
2	Mr Christoph BAUSCH (BusinessEurope)	Present
3	Mr Silvia BORELLI (European Trade Union Confederation - ETUC)	Present
4	Mr Patrick BRIERE (French Chamber of Commerce)	Excused
5	Mr Patrizia BUSSI (European Network of Social Integration Enterprises - ENSIE)	Present
6	Ms Elena CÓRBODA AZCÁRATE (Spanish Association of Liberal Professions)	Present
7	Mr Antonio ESTELLA DE NORIEGA (Carlos III University of Madrid)	Excused
8	Mr Lasse HAMILTON HEIDEMANN (Danish Chamber of Commerce)	Present
9	Ms Rebecca HUMPHRIES (World Wide Fund for Nature - WWF)	Present
10	Ms Goranka LALIC NOVAC (University of Zagreb and Croatian Law Centre)	Excused
11	Mr Grzegorz LANG (Federation of Polish Entrepreneurs)	Excused
12	Mr Libor LOCHMAN (Czech railways)	Excused
13	Ms Agnès MATHIS (Cooperatives Europe)	Present
14	Mr Ursula PACHL (European Consumer Organisation - BEUC)	Present
15	Ms Dorthe NIELSEN (Eurocities)	Present
16	Ms Valeria RONZITTI (SGIEurope)	Present
17	Ms Patrick TEN BRINK (European Environmental Bureau - EEB)	Excused
18	Ms Kirsi VÄÄTÄMÖINEN (SOSTE Finnish Federation for Social Affairs and Health)	Present
19	Ms Véronique WILLEMS (SMEunited)	Present
20	Mr Rudolf KOLBE (EESC)	Excused
21	Mr Denis MEYNENT (EESC)	Excused
22	Mr Vasco DE MELLO (EESC)	Present

#### 6.2 Government group members

#	Name	Attendance
1	AT – Dr Franz WIRTENBERGER (replaced by Ana JAKIL-HOLZER)	Present
2	BE – Mr Pieter VAN DEN BOSSCHE	Excused
3	BG – Ms Gergana IVANOVA	Excused
4	CY – Mr Kyriakos ANDREOU	Excused
5	CZ – Mr Jan KRAVČÍK	Excused

6	DE – Ms Gisela HOHENSEE - replaced by Mr Frederik STOECKER	Present
7	DK – Mr Andreas HAUPTMANN – replaced by Mr Preben SANDBERG PETTERSSON	Present
8	EE – Ms Kristina JERJOMINA	Present
9	EL – Mr Ilias KOROMILAS	Present
10	ES – Ms Clara MAPELLI MARCHENA -replaced by Mr Daniel GARCIA ANGULO	Present
11	FI – Ms Anu LAITINEN -replaced by Mr Kangas	Excused
12	FR – Mr Matthieu LAURENT-replaced by Ms Alix MAISONNAVE	Present
13	HR – Ms Nataša MIKUŠ ŽIGMAN -replaced by Ms Ana ŠTRBAC	Present
14	HU – Mr Tamas Istvan RACZ -replaced by Mr Mihaly BAJNOCZI and then by Mr Gergely TORNYAI	Present
15	IE – Mr John SHINE	Excused
16	IT – Nadia MARIN	Excused
17	LT – Mr Tomas URBAN	Excused
18	LU – Ms Annelies VANDENDRIESSCHE	Present
19	LV – Mrs Mara RONE	Present
20	MT – Mr John AQUILINA	Excused
21	NL – Mr Pieter M. WAASDORP- replaced by Ms Veerle VERHEY	Present
22	PL – Ms Joanna POHL	Present
23	PT – Ms Ana Sofia MARTINS -replaced by Mr David RODRIGUES (new member in 2023)	Present
24	RO – Ms Anca MIHAESCU -New member	Excused
25	SE – Ms Anna JOHANSSON	Present
26	SL (SI)– Ms Katja GLAVIC	Present
27	SK – Mr Jan ORAVEC	Excused
28	Mr Mark SPEICH (CoR) – Mr Karl Heinz LAMBERT replacing all CoR Members	Present
29	Ms Anne KARJALAINEN (CoR)	Excused
30	Mr M. RIJSBERMAN (CoR) – new Member and replacement of Ms LANDERGREN	Present

### 6.3 RegHub members

#	Name	Hub name	Attendance
1	Ms Verena AUGSCHOELL	Autonomous Province of Bolzano/Bozen (IT)	Present
2	Mr Andreas BECKER	North Rhine-Westphalia (DE)	Present
3	Ms Heinke BECKER	North Rhine-Westphalia (DE)	Present
4	Mr Félix BELLIDO PLA	Community of Madrid (ES)	Present
5	Ms Martina BUECHEL-GERMANN	Bodensee RegHub (AT, DE, LI)	Present
6	Ms Leticia CASAN	Community of Valencia (ES)	Excused
7	Ms Christine Chien-Hui CHANG	Helsinki Uusimaa (FI)	Present
8	Ms Anne DIRAISON	Hauts-de-France (FR)	Present
9	Ms Sophie DOMAINE	Autonomous Region of Valle d'Aoste (IT)	Present
10	Mr Luka DRAGOJEVIC	Primorje-Gorski Kotar County (HR)	Present
11	Ms Ana ENGUÍDANOS WEYLER	Generalitat Valenciana (ES)	Present
12	Ms Joana GOOD DA SILVA	Alentejo (PT)	Excused
13	Ms Aude KÖRFER	Brittany (FR)	Present
14	Mr Ljudevit KRPAN	Primorje-Gorski Kotar County (HR)	Present
15	Mr Ari-Pekka LAINEVUO	Helsinki Uusimaa (FI)	Present
16	Mr Aikaterini LAPPA	Thessaly (GR)	Present
17	Ms Sara MICHALSKA	Mazovia (PL)	Present
18	Mr Marcos NOGUEIRA	Alentejo (PT)	Excused
19	Mr Angelo PAULON	Friuli Venezia Giulia (IT)	Excused
20	Ms Nerea PEREZ ADRIANO	Eurocidade Chaves-Verín	Present
21	Mr Antonello PISTRITTO	Valle d'Aosta (IT)	Present
22	Ms Sabrina POCESCHI	Umbria Region (IT)	Present
23	Mr Winfried SCHRÖDER	Baden-Württemberg (DE)	Excused
24	Mr Caspar SLUITER	Netherlands RegHub (NL)	Present
25	Mr Krunoslav SRPAK	Vukovar-Srijem County (HR)	Present
26	Mr Andreas THALER	Pinneberg (DE)	Present
27	Ms Alina UNGER	State of Nord Rhein-Westphalia	Present
28	Mr Oriol VALLES FREIXAS	Barcelona Provincial Council (ES)	Present
29	Mr Stefan VAN HEECK	North Rhine-Westphalia (DE)	Present
30	Ms Angeliki VENETI	Thessaly (EL)	Present
31	Ms Charlotte VERHAMME	Flanders (BE)	Present
32	Mr Luka VIDAK	Dubrovnik-Neretva Region (HR)	Present
33	Ms Remedios VIVIENTE RODRIGUEZ	Murcia (ES)	Present

### 6.4 SME Envoy

#	Name	Attendance
	Mr Hubert GAMBS (GROW)	Present
	Mr Artur ROMANEK (GROW)	Present

## 6.5 Other participants

#	Name	Attendance
	Mr Maros SEFČOVIČ (Vice-President)	Present
	Mr Carsten SCHIERENBECK (Cab VP SEFČOVIČ)	Present
	Mr Michael WIMMER (SG)	Present