

Summary report of the open public consultation on the Evaluation of the Machinery Directive 2006/42/EC

The open public consultation ran from 22 September to 16 December 2016. It was conducted in the context of the evaluation of the Machinery Directive. This summary report takes stock of the contributions and presents preliminary trends that emerge from them, focusing on the quantitative aspects of the consultation input.

1. Objectives of the consultation

The objective of the consultation was to collect input on the performance of the Machinery Directive since it became applicable, in 2009.

The questions in the survey were organised by five evaluation areas:

- Relevance – the extent to which the original objectives of the Machinery Directive are still relevant to the needs of the machinery market, including manufacturers and users. The two main objectives of the Directive relate to facilitating the functioning of the internal market for machinery, and ensuring a high level of safety of machinery;
- Effectiveness – the extent to which the two objectives of the Directive were achieved (and factors preventing this);
- Coherence – the extent to which the Directive is coherent with other legislation;
- Efficiency – the extent to which the two objectives of the Directive were achieved at a reasonable cost;
- EU added value – the extent to which the European Directive adds value as compared to what could have been achieved at Member State level.

Respondents were free to contribute to whichever sections or questions they wanted to and also to complement with a position paper.

2. Who replied to the consultation?

The consultation targeted businesses of all sizes and sectors (including manufacturers and users of connected devices, operators and users of online platforms, data brokers, businesses commercialising data-based products and services), but also public authorities, non-governmental organisations, researchers, research organisations and consumers. A quarter of the businesses and organisation that took part are SMEs.

The online survey gathered a total of 342 contributions distributed as:

- 19 replied as a national authority
- 16 as a notified body
- 42 as industry associations
- 159 as representing the industry
- 68 as workers or consumers
- 31 as consultancy companies or service providers relating to machinery safety

- 1 replied on behalf of the standardisation bodies
- 6 respondents did not identified themselves as part of any of the categories above

Respondents to the public questionnaires came across the EU and EFTA countries, as well as Canada, the US and Japan.

3. Preliminary findings

- *Findings in relation to the Context of the Directive*

Over the past 10 years, what has happened to.... Machinery sector turnover / profitability?

	Decreased significantly	Decreased slightly	No change	Increased slightly	Increased significantly	n
Turnover and profitability of the European machinery sector/businesses	7%	26%	19%	39%	9%	227

Source: Machinery Directive Public Consultation

Over the past 10 years, what has happened to.... Machinery innovation?

	Decreased significantly	Decreased slightly	No change	Increased slightly	Increased significantly	n
The rate and extent of innovation in the machinery sector	1%	4%	16%	44%	36%	314

Source: Machinery Directive Public Consultation

Over the past 10 years, what has happened to.... Machinery sector trade?

	Decreased significantly	Decreased slightly	No change	Increased slightly	Increased significantly	n
The volume/value of intra-EU trade in Machinery	8%	13%	30%	38%	12%	216
The international competitiveness of the European machinery sector/businesses	5%	19%	29%	33%	15%	262

Source: Machinery Directive Public Consultation

Over the past 10 years, what has happened to.... Machinery-related health and safety?

	Decreased significantly	Decreased slightly	No change	Increased slightly	Increased significantly	n
The cost of ensuring that machinery is safe	2%	5%	8%	36%	49%	321
The level of safety/protection for users of machinery (workers/consumers)	2%	5%	10%	51%	32%	327
Usefulness of information provided with machinery when purchased	2%	6%	21%	41%	30%	328
User confidence in machinery safety	2%	5%	26%	44%	23%	318
The number of unsafe/non-compliant machinery on the market/in use	11%	34%	19%	28%	8%	285
The number of machinery-related accidents and injuries	16%	54%	22%	8%	1%	270
The severity of machinery-related accidents and injuries	23%	47%	20%	8%	2%	261

Source: Machinery Directive Public Consultation

○ *Findings in relation to the Relevance of the Directive*

How important is the objective of ensuring the free movement of machinery?

	Not at all important	Slightly important	Moderately important	Very important	n
Ensuring the free movement of machinery within the European single market	1%	4%	17%	78%	398

Source: Machinery Directive Public and Targeted Consultation. Excludes 'don't knows' and non-respondents.

Is the Machinery Directive an appropriate means to contribute to its objectives?

	Not all appropriate	Somewhat appropriate	Entirely appropriate	n
Ensuring the free movement of machinery within the Single Market	1%	10%	88%	86

Source: Machinery Directive Targeted Consultation. Excludes 'don't knows' and non-respondents.

How important is the objective of ensuring a high level of health and safety for users of machinery?

	Not at all important	Slightly important	Moderately important	Very important	n
Ensuring a high level of health and safety for users of machinery (workers/consumers)	1%	1%	8%	91%	400

Source: Machinery Directive Public and Targeted Consultation. Excludes 'don't knows' and non-respondents.

1 Is the Machinery Directive an appropriate means to contribute to its objectives?

	Not all appropriate	Somewhat appropriate	Entirely appropriate	n
Ensuring a high level of health and safety for users of machinery (workers and consumers)	0%	16%	84%	86

Source: Machinery Directive Targeted Consultation. Excludes 'don't knows' and non-respondents.

To what extent does the current Directive sufficiently allow for innovation – three perspectives?

	Not at all	To a small extent	To a moderate extent	To a large extent	Entirely	n
Took account sufficiently of new innovations and new technologies at the time?	1%	11%	26%	45%	16%	87
Has been able to deal with new innovations and new technologies since?	0%	12%	32%	29%	27%	85
Is likely to be able to deal with new innovations and technologies over the next 10 years?	0%	20%	32%	23%	26%	82

Source: Machinery Directive Targeted Consultation. Excludes 'don't knows' and non-respondents.

To what extent does the current Directive sufficiently allow for a changing business environment – three perspectives?

	Not at all	To a small extent	To a moderate extent	To a large extent	Entirely	n
Sufficiently took account of recent changes in the business environment (i.e. in the machinery sector / market / trade) at the time?	3%	12%	27%	36%	23%	78
Has been able to deal with changes in the business environment since?	1%	16%	34%	34%	14%	79
Is likely to be able to deal with changes to the business environment over the next 10 years?	3%	19%	33%	37%	8%	73

Source: Machinery Directive Targeted Consultation. Excludes 'don't knows' and non-respondents.

Impact of the Directive on rate and extent of innovation

	Substantial decrease	Some decrease	No change	Some increase	Substantial increase	n
The rate and extent of innovation in the sector	1%	8%	47%	31%	13%	209

Source: Machinery Directive Public Consultation. Excludes 'don't knows' and non-respondents

○ *Findings in relation to the Effectiveness of the Directive*

The extent to which the Directive has been fully and consistently interpreted and applied

	Not at all	To a small extent	To a moderate extent	To a large extent	Entirely	n
The transposition of the Directive into national legislation	0%	2%	14%	49%	35%	88
The appointment of Notified Bodies to carry out conformity assessment	1%	4%	18%	34%	43%	74
The conformity assessment procedures available to companies	0%	6%	17%	36%	41%	87
Not prohibiting, restricting or impeding machinery that complies with the Directive	1%	9%	24%	52%	14%	79
The assessments undertaken by Notified Bodies	1%	8%	41%	42%	8%	76
The suspension, withdrawal or placement of restrictions on certificates issued	0%	25%	50%	20%	5%	40
The approach of Market Surveillance Authorities to determining compliance	6%	46%	21%	24%	3%	80
Taking measures to withdraw / prohibit machinery that may compromise health and safety	5%	60%	21%	10%	4%	78
The establishment of effective, proportionate and dissuasive penalties for infringements	22%	53%	9%	16%	0%	68
The number of market surveillance activities	23%	53%	15%	8%	1%	75

Source: Machinery Directive Targeted Consultation. Excludes 'don't knows' and non-respondents.

The extent to which the Directive has contributed to objectives

a) Impact of the Directive on market efficiency and the effective operating of the internal market

	Very negative	Negative	None	Positive	Very positive	n
The range of machinery products available	0%	5%	41%	49%	5%	39
Turnover and profitability of the European machinery sector / businesses	3%	3%	36%	50%	8%	36
The international competitiveness of the European machinery sector / businesses	0%	0%	22%	67%	11%	36
The volume / value of intra-EU trade in Machinery	0%	0%	19%	68%	13%	31
Barriers to the internal market / free movement of machinery	0%	0%	21%	37%	42%	38

Source: Machinery Directive Targeted Consultation. Excludes 'don't knows' and non-respondents

b) Impact of the Directive on the machinery sector and trade in Europe

	Substantial decrease	Some decrease	No change	Some increase	Substantial increase	n
The range and quality of machinery products available	1%	4%	25%	55%	15%	231
The international competitiveness of the European machinery sector/businesses	6%	12%	29%	42%	12%	194
Turnover and profitability of the European machinery sector/businesses	4%	19%	38%	34%	5%	154
The volume/value of intra-EU trade in Machinery	3%	10%	50%	32%	5%	146
Barriers to the internal market/free movement of machinery	28%	20%	29%	18%	4%	213

Source: Machinery Directive Public Consultation. Excludes 'don't knows' and non-respondents.

c) The contribution of the Machinery Directive towards an effectively operating internal market

	Not at all	To a small extent	To a moderate extent	To a large extent / entirely	n
An effectively operating internal market for the products in its scope?	1%	4%	21%	74%	308

Source: Machinery Directive Public and Targeted Consultation. Excludes 'don't knows' and non-respondents.

d) Impact of the Directive on levels of health and safety

	Substantial decrease	Some decrease	No change	Some increase	Substantial increase	n
The level of user confidence in machinery safety	2%	2%	17%	57%	23%	242
The level of safety/protection for users of machinery (workers/consumers)	3%	4%	7%	53%	33%	249
The number of un-safe/non-compliant machines on the market/in use	18%	46%	17%	12%	7%	209
The number of machinery-related accidents and injuries	27%	55%	14%	5%	0%	200
The severity of machinery-related accidents and injuries	41%	35%	18%	6%	1%	198

Source: Machinery Directive Public Consultation. Excludes 'don't knows' and non-respondents.

e) Contribution of the Directive to protecting the health and safety of consumers / users of products

	Not at all	To a small extent	To a moderate extent	To a large extent / entirely	n
Protecting the health and safety of consumers and users of the products in its scope?	1%	3%	25%	71%	311

Source: Machinery Directive Public and Targeted Consultation. Excludes 'don't knows' and non-respondents.

f) Impact of the Directive on levels of environmental protection

	Substantial decrease	Some decrease	No change	Some increase	Substantial increase	n
The level of environment protection in pesticide applications	5%	7%	33%	45%	9%	75

Source: Machinery Directive Public Consultation. Excludes 'don't knows' and non-respondents.

g) Machinery Directive contribution to protecting the environment for the products in its scope

	Not at all	To a small extent	To a moderate extent	To a large extent / entirely	n
Protecting the environment in relation to machinery for pesticide/herbicide application	6%	17%	34%	44%	156

Source: Machinery Directive Public and Targeted Consultation. Excludes 'don't knows' and non-respondents.

The effectiveness of conformity assessment options

a) Number of times companies have employed each conformity assessment option over 5 years

Conformity Assessment Option	Companies (out of 36) undertaking this option	No. times undertaken (total)	Avg. times undertaken per 'user' Co.	Avg. times undertaken per Co. (all)
Assessment of conformity with internal checks (non-Annex IV products)	30	2605	87	72
Assessment of conformity with internal checks (Annex IV products) using EN	6	328	55	9
EC-type examination (Annex IV products)	13	241	19	7
Approval by a Notified Body of a full quality assurance system (Annex IV products)	2	70	35	2

Source: Machinery Directive Targeted Consultation.

b) Effectiveness of conformity assessment options for facilitating trade and protecting health and safety

Conformity assessment option	Effectiveness at...	Not effective	Slightly ineffective	Moderately effective	Very effective	n
Assessment of conformity with internal checks for products not covered by Annex IV	...facilitating the internal market for machinery?	3%	6%	40%	51%	235
	...protecting the health and safety of machinery users?	4%	18%	46%	32%	252
Assessment of conformity with internal checks for products covered by Annex IV, where a Harmonised Standard is applied that covers all applicable requirements	...facilitating the internal market for machinery?	3%	8%	38%	51%	186
	...protecting the health and safety of machinery users?	4%	13%	42%	41%	201
EC-type examination for Annex IV products	...facilitating the internal market for machinery?	2%	8%	44%	46%	180
	...protecting the health and safety of machinery users?	1%	6%	45%	49%	199
Approval by a Notified Body of a full quality assurance system for Annex IV products (which was introduced with the latest version of the Directive)	...facilitating the internal market for machinery?	7%	9%	49%	35%	136
	...protecting the health and safety of machinery users?	6%	14%	51%	29%	148

Source: Machinery Directive Public and Targeted Consultation. Excludes 'don't knows' and non-respondents.

Effectiveness of European harmonised standards

a) Rating aspects of the European Harmonised Standard development process

	Very poor	Poor	Good	Very good	n
The involvement of industry in the development of European Harmonised Standards	2%	15%	38%	44%	82
The length of the European Harmonised Standards development process	16%	44%	36%	4%	283

Source: Machinery Directive Public and Targeted Consultation. Excludes 'don't knows' and non-respondents.

b) Rating aspects of the European Harmonised Standard portfolio

	Very poor	Poor	Good	Very good	n
The scope and coverage of the current portfolio of European Harmonised Standards	1%	6%	67%	26%	82
The extent to which European Harmonised Standards are up-to-date with technological developments	0%	17%	63%	20%	81
The frequency with which existing European Harmonised Standards are reviewed / revised	5%	29%	59%	7%	296
The availability of European Harmonised Standards for new innovative products	11%	52%	32%	5%	257
The cost of European harmonised standards	28%	42%	29%	2%	249

Source: Machinery Directive Public and Targeted Consultation. Excludes 'don't knows' and non-respondents

c) Rating the quality and usability of European Harmonised Standards

	Very poor	Poor	Good	Very good	n
The quality / usability of existing European Harmonised Standards	0%	7%	60%	33%	85
How well European Harmonised Standards explain rules, guidelines and definitions	5%	24%	58%	13%	244
The clarity over which European Harmonised Standards can be used	0%	10%	59%	31%	80

Source: Machinery Directive Targeted Consultation. Excludes 'don't knows' and non-respondents.

Effectiveness of mechanisms relating to non-compliance

a) Drivers of market surveillance activity

	Not at all	Minor influence	Major influence	n
Government policy	14%	43%	43%	7
Previous inspections	0%	43%	57%	7
Complaints	0%	14%	86%	7
Accident reports	0%	0%	100%	7
RAPEX (Rapid Alert System for non-food dangerous products)	0%	29%	71%	7
ICSMS (Information and Communication System for Market Surveillance) systems	0%	43%	57%	7
Joint market surveillance programmes (e.g. PROSAFE Joint Actions)	14%	29%	57%	7
Other (please specify)	25%	0%	75%	4

Source: Machinery Directive Targeted Consultation. Excludes 'don't knows' and non-respondents.

b) National authority assessment of RAPEX

	Very / Poor	Adequate	Very / Good	n
Action taken as a result of notifications	0%	57%	43%	7
Its completeness (in terms of non-compliant findings recorded)	14%	29%	57%	7
Its ease of use (in monitoring others' notifications)	29%	29%	43%	7
Its ease of use (in notifying)	29%	43%	29%	7

Source: Machinery Directive Targeted Consultation. Excludes 'don't knows' and non-respondents.

c) Effectiveness of national authorities in monitoring adherence to the Machinery Directive

	Not at all	To a limited extent	To a large extent	Entirely	n
Monitoring machinery manufacturers on their adherence to health and safety requirements for their products	11%	63%	23%	3%	328

Source: Machinery Directive Public Consultation

d) Views on current levels of market surveillance undertaken

	Too low	About right	Too large	n
The number and frequency of inspections carried out	83%	16%	2%	64
The likelihood of an individual company being inspected	80%	19%	1%	261
The typical time from market entry to inspection / assessment	57%	27%	16%	37
The number of products on the market that have never been assessed	13%	11%	77%	47

Source: Machinery Directive Public and Targeted Consultation. Excludes 'don't knows' and non-respondents

e) Reasons for non-compliance findings

	Minimum	Maximum	Average
Issues with documentation	10%	50%	35%
Technical issues	10%	35%	23%
Issues with CE marketing	25%	80%	43%

Source: Machinery Directive Targeted Consultation. Excludes 'don't knows' and non-respondents.

f) Effectiveness of authorities in monitoring adherence, and identifying & removing unsafe machinery

	Not at all	To a limited extent	To a large extent	Entirely	n
Identifying unsafe machinery and removing it from the market	16%	64%	18%	2%	314

Source: Machinery Directive Public Consultation

g) Views on current levels of market surveillance undertaken

	Too low	About right	Too large	n
The number of products on the market that are non-compliant	13%	10%	77%	52

Source: Machinery Directive Public and Targeted Consultation. Excludes 'don't knows' and non-respondents.

h) Main problem / barrier to identification of non-compliant products and removal from market

	The effective identification of non-compliant products:	The removal of non-compliant products from the market:
Lack of cooperation between customs	9%	7%
Not enough staff	40%	35%
Wrong targeting of inspections/actions	16%	17%
Others	35%	41%

Source: Machinery Directive Public Consultation. Excludes 'don't knows' and non-respondents.

i) Countries cited as good practice examples in effectively identifying/removing non-compliant products

Country	Responses	Country	Responses
DE	42 (31)	SE	5 (6)
UK	21 (13)	AT	4 (0)
FR	16 (15)	FI	3 (3)
IT	7 (5)	PL	3 (3)
CH	6 (3)	Scandinavian/Nordic	3 (3)
DK	6 (5)	USA	3 (3)
NL	5 (4)		

Explanations for countries being cited as effective at identifying / removing non-compliant products

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minimal bureaucracy (CH) Centralised system (CH) Well established / embedded systems (DE, FR, UK, IT) Well organised system (DE) Proactive targeting (DE, AT, UK) Scale of activity / resource (DE, DK, FR) Strictness / thoroughness (DE, NL, UK, FR) Collaboration / dialogue with industry (AT, DE, PL, UK, SE, IT, DK) Experience with relevant machinery (DE) High level of competence and experience of staff (DE) Clarity over compliance / non-compliance of product (DE) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Well represented within European working groups / ADCO (FR, DE, IT, UK, SE, PL) Involvement in standardisation (DE, DK) Good use of ICSMS database (DE) Good use of RAPEX system (UK) Use of customs to effectively enforce market surveillance (FR) Strong, independent bodies responsible (UK, DE, FR, CH) Well-equipped for in-house testing of products (UK, IT, DE) Reactivity to non-compliance alerts (UK) Information and advice provided (UK)
---	--

Source: Summary of open responses to Machinery Directive Public Consultation.

Enablers and barriers to effectiveness

a) Effectiveness of European Coordination of Notified Bodies for the Machinery Directive (NB-M)

	Not at all effective	Not very effective	Effective	Very effective	n
Harmonising practice	0%	11%	44%	44%	9
Discussing issues and problems arising	0%	10%	50%	40%	10
Exchanging and sharing practices	0%	20%	30%	50%	10
Reaching common positions (Recommendations for Use)	0%	0%	40%	60%	10

Source: Machinery Directive Targeted Consultation. Excludes 'don't knows' and non-respondents

b) Types of activities undertaken to support knowledge and understanding of the Machinery Directive

National Authorities	Industry Associations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Translated version of Directive and Guide Development of guidelines and information Information dissemination Workshops / presentations Consultations Help / Question Answer service Dedicated website Liaison with industry associations Liaison with Notified Bodies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analysis of the Directive Guidelines / Explanatory notes / Fact sheets Articles / Newsletters / Position papers Website information Training / seminars / presentations / workshops / meetings / discussions / forums / information sessions Help / Question Answer service Participation in Machinery Working Group Exchange with other associations Discussion with Notified Bodies Participation in standards development

Source: Machinery Directive Targeted Consultation.

○ Findings in relation to the Efficiency of the Directive

The costs involved as a result of the Directive

a) Average industry estimate of effort and cost of undertaking each conformity assessment option

Average response per company	i) Assessment of conformity with internal checks (non-Annex IV)	iii) EC-type examination (Annex IV)	iv) Approval by NB of a full quality assurance system (Annex IV)
FTE Effort (days)			
Undertaking risk assessment (to determine applicability of the Directive's requirements)	115	3	1
Conformity assessment work internally	350	12	1
Conformity assessment work by third party	370	4	-
Development of technical file	484	13	1
Declaration of conformity/affixing of CE mark	73	2	1
Total FTE effort	1,393	33	4
Other costs (€)			
Undertaking risk assessment (to determine applicability of the Directive's requirements)	€17,758	€ 100,000	No data
Conformity assessment work internally	€63,800	€ -	No data
Conformity assessment work by third party	€9,167	€ 150,000	No data
Development of technical file	€11,856	€ 25,000	No data
Declaration of conformity/affixing of CE mark	€2,478	€ -	No data
Total other Costs (€)	€ 105,059	€ 275,000	No data
n	25	2	2

Source: Machinery Directive Targeted Consultation. Excludes 'don't knows' and non-respondents.

b) Calculating average cost per company of annual conformity assessment activities

Per individual (respondent) company	i) Assessment of conformity with internal checks (non-Annex IV)	iii) EC-type examination (Annex IV)	iv) Approval by NB of a full quality assurance system (Annex IV)
Average no. times undertaken in year	14.5	1.3	0.4
Average FTE effort per assessment	1,393	33	4
Average other Costs per assessment	€ 105,059	€ 275,000	No data
Average FTE effort per year (days)	20,199	43	2
Average other costs per year	€ 1,523,356	€ 357,500	No data

Machinery Directive Targeted Consultation. Excludes 'don't knows' and non-respondents.

The benefits realised as a result of the Directive

a) The extent to which the Machinery Directive has added value in terms of reducing costs to industry

	Not at all	To a small extent	To a moderate extent	To a large extent	n
Reducing costs	8%	28%	43%	21%	72

Source: Machinery Directive Targeted Consultation. Excludes 'don't knows' and non-respondents

b) The benefits of the Machinery Directive for industry

	Not at all	To a small extent	To a large extent	n
The CE mark is a recognised quality certificate also outside of the EU	6%	21%	73%	33
One standardisation procedure instead of 28 individual standards saves time and money	0%	6%	94%	35
The existence of European Harmonised Standards saves time in finding appropriate technical specifications	0%	13%	88%	32
Self-certification cuts certification costs significantly	0%	16%	84%	32

Source: Machinery Directive Targeted Consultation. Excludes 'don't knows' and non-respondents.

The extent to which costs are reasonable and proportionate

a) The impact of the Machinery Directive on costs and burdens

	Substantial decrease	Some decrease	No change	Some increase	Substantial increase	n
The costs and burdens on businesses	3%	4%	10%	54%	29%	235
The prices for users (workers/consumers)	2%	5%	22%	57%	14%	221
The costs and burdens on authorities	6%	4%	35%	40%	14%	119

Source: Machinery Directive Public Consultation. Excludes 'don't knows' and non-respondents.

b) How do the costs and benefits of the Machinery Directive for industry compare

	Costs significantly outweigh benefits	Costs slightly outweigh benefits	Benefits and costs are equal	Benefits slightly outweigh costs	Benefits significantly outweigh costs	n
Industry view	0%	27%	18%	45%	9%	11
Industry association view	0%	17%	17%	42%	25%	12

Source: Machinery Directive Targeted Consultation. Excludes 'don't knows' and non-respondents.

c) How do the costs and benefits of the Machinery Directive compare overall

	Costs significantly outweigh benefits	Costs slightly outweigh benefits	Benefits and costs are equal	Benefits slightly outweigh costs	Benefits significantly outweigh costs	n
National authority view	0%	13%	0%	25%	63%	8
Notified Body view	0%	0%	20%	40%	40%	5
Industry association view	0%	10%	10%	40%	40%	10
Industry view	0%	40%	20%	30%	10%	10
View across all groups	0%	18%	12%	33%	36%	33

Source: Machinery Directive Targeted Consultation. Excludes 'don't knows' and non-respondents.

○ *Findings in relation to the Coherence of the Directive*

Coherence and complementarity of the Directive

a) Extent to which the Machinery Directive fits with other legislation

	Not at all	To a small extent	To a moderate extent	To a large extent	n
With national legislation	0%	1%	22%	77%	79
With other EU legislation	0%	5%	34%	61%	79
With international (non-EU) legislation	2%	20%	72%	6%	64

Source: Machinery Directive Targeted Consultation. Excludes 'don't knows' and non-respondents.

b) Overlaps or inconsistencies with other EU legislation

Directive / Regulation which is seen to overlap with the Machinery Directive	% ¹ of respondents who gave answer (Total)
Low Voltage Directive (LVD) 2014/35/EU	35% (35)
Electromagnetic Compatibility Directive (EMC) (EMV) 2014/30/EU	30% (30)
Pressure Equipment Directive (PED) 2014/68/EU	22% (22)
Radio Equipment Directive (RED) 2014/53/EU	22% (22)
Outdoor Noise Directive (OND) 2000/14/EC	14% (14)
Directive on equipment for use in explosive atmospheres (ATEX) 2014/34/EU	14% (14)
Restriction of Hazardous Substances (RoSH) 2011/65/EU	9% (9)
Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment Directive (WEEE) 2012/19/EU	8% (8)
Medical Devices Directive [93/42/EC]	6
IVD Directive	1
Minimum safety and health requirements for the use of work equipment	4
Occupational Health & Safety Directives	3
Personal protective equipment. Directive 89/686/EEC	1
Registration, Evaluation, Authorisation and Restriction of Chemicals (REACH)	3
Lifts Directive	3
Elevator guidelines	1
Construction Product Directive (CPD) / CPR	3
Other European Directives / Regulations: Eco Design; Agricultural machinery; Combustion engines emissions [Regulation (EU) 2016/1628]; General Product Safety (GPSD) [2001/95/EC]; Roadworthiness tests [Directive 2014/45/EU]; Gas Appliances Regulation (GAR) [2016/426]; F-Gas Regulation; Regulation on materials and articles intended to come into contact with food - provisions on food contact materials [No 1935/2004]; Tractor Directive; Toy directive	Mentioned by just 1 respondent in each case.

Source: Machinery Directive Public Consultation. Excludes 'don't knows' and non-respondents.

○ *Findings in relation to the European Added Value of the Directive*

Extent to which the Machinery Directive has added value in the achievement of objectives

	Not at all	To a small extent	To a moderate extent	To a large extent	n
Facilitating the free circulation of machinery within the internal market	0%	4%	14%	83%	80
Ensuring a high degree of health and safety of machinery	0%	1%	20%	79%	80
Ensuring environmental protection in relation to machinery used in pesticide applications	6%	14%	53%	28%	36

Source: Machinery Directive Targeted Consultation. Excludes 'don't knows' and non-respondents.

¹ As noted above, 70% of respondents mentioned more than one directive or regulation, therefore the percentages do not add up to 100%.

4. Next steps

The Commission is analysing the various contributions to the online consultation, which will feed into a full synopsis report, planned to be published on Europa website for machinery by the end of 2017.

This online consultation is part of a broader dialogue process in which the Commission is consulting stakeholders. It will proceed to a wrap-up of the entire structured dialogue and draw conclusions on these issues, notably if a revision is necessary or not.