

## **REQUEST FOR SERVICES**

*European Commission,  
DG Internal Market, Industry,  
Entrepreneurship and SMEs  
Directorate C, Unit C3*

*Brussels, 6.07.2020*

### **REQUEST FOR SERVICES FOR IMPACT ASSESSMENT STUDY**

**TO ASSESS UNBUNDLING OF THE SELLING OF MOBILE PHONES AND OTHER PORTABLE  
DEVICES FROM THEIR CHARGERS (DE-COUPLING)  
IMPLEMENTING FRAMEWORK CONTRACT 575/PP/2016/FC**

#### **1. BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY**

##### **1.1. Overall purpose and justification**

According to a precedent study carried out on behalf of the Commission<sup>1</sup> (IA study), the benefits of mandating a common charging interface in smartphones and other portable devices, would be enhanced if complementary measures aimed at the re-use of existing chargers and in particular unbundling the chargers from phone sales (de-coupling), were adopted.

The EP resolution of 14 January 2020<sup>2</sup> that called on the Commission to take regulatory action to implement a common charging solution while also looking at the environmental impacts in line with the circular economy action plan, and in particular at the de-coupling aspects.

The Commission Work Programme foresees adoption of an initiative on common charger in Q1 2021. In this context, the main objective of the study is to integrate those new aspects.

Specifically, the study's purpose is to assess the economic and environmental impacts deriving from the unbundling of chargers from phone sales (also mentioned as 'de-coupling'). The study shall look at possible different options to achieve de-coupling and notably compare voluntary vs. mandatory options. The study shall extend analysis by defining other classes of products that could technically fall under the initiative, such as tablets, cameras, e-readers, notebooks, etc., therefore defining technical requirements and chargers types.

##### **1.2. Policy context of the initiative**

---

<sup>1</sup> Impact assessment study on common chargers of portable devices <https://op.europa.eu/en/web/eu-law-and-publications/publication-detail/-/publication/c6fadfea-4641-11ea-b81b-01aa75ed71a1>

<sup>2</sup> [https://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/document/RC-9-2020-0070\\_EN.html](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/document/RC-9-2020-0070_EN.html)

## **The common charger<sup>3</sup> initiative**

In June 2009, following a request from the European Commission, major producers of mobile telephones agreed to sign a Memorandum of Understanding (“MoU”) to harmonise chargers for data-enabled mobile telephones sold in the EU.

The MoU provided partial interoperability between chargers and new mobile phones on the market, therefore reducing the need to buy or continuously exchange chargers and cables and consequently limiting the amount generated e-waste in line with the Circular economy and Energy Union strategies<sup>4</sup>. The MoU ensured that citizens could benefit from reliable, energy-efficient and safe chargers, whether the smartphones’ manufacturers provided them or they were sold as standalone products. The MoU, however, did not address the aspect of de-coupling. At this point of time, de-coupling has not been achieved to a significant extent, with only a handful of companies offering such a possibility to consumers.

The MoU expired after two letters of renewal in 2014, and the Commission started fostering the adoption of a new voluntary agreement. In 2018 the Commission received from the mobile manufacturers a new voluntary agreement<sup>5</sup>, but there was no endorsement from the Commission as the proposal was considered not to fulfil the request of the co-legislators in Article 3(3)(a) of the Radio Equipment Directive (RED)<sup>6</sup>, as it would still allow for different charging solutions and therefore not guarantee full interoperability between mobile phones.

The IA study<sup>7</sup> provided an assessment of the likely impacts of a set of policy options for a possible new initiative and assessed qualitatively a number of impacts. The focus of the study was on chargers interfaces for mobile phones, and specifically on technical options to work towards a “common” charger and their likely social, environmental and economic impacts. Although other related issues, and de-coupling, were also considered, the renewed political attention to environmental aspects requires further evidence and support.

## **Legal context of the initiative**

Given the new dimension of the ‘common charger’ initiative, that extends aspects previously limited to the charging interfaces, the safety of the chargers as a whole and other aspects related to electromagnetic compatibility risks, there is now need to integrate environmental and energy efficiency related aspects.

At this point of time, two main legislative options exist:

- 1) A new legal act regulating both aspects (adopted in ordinary legislative procedure);
- 2) A multi-step strategy that might comprehend (i) the amendment of certain provisions of RED 2014/53/EU for regulating the aspects of interoperability (co-decision); (ii) implementing Ecodesign Regulations at product specific level foreseeing requirements with bonus/allowances for products sold without charger and iii) further regulatory actions on decoupling.

---

<sup>3</sup> More information relevant to the common charger is available at

[http://ec.europa.eu/growth/sectors/electrical-engineering/red-directive/common-charger\\_en](http://ec.europa.eu/growth/sectors/electrical-engineering/red-directive/common-charger_en)

<sup>4</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/environment/circular-economy/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/environment/circular-economy/index_en.htm)

<sup>5</sup> <http://www.digitaleurope.org/Press-Room/Latest-News/News-Story/newsID/717>

<sup>6</sup> Radio Equipment Directive (RED) 2014/53/EU - <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:32014L0053&locale=en>

<sup>7</sup> <https://op.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/c6fadfea-4641-11ea-b81b-01aa75ed71a1>

## ***2.1 Tasks of the study***

### **Task 1: collection of market data related to charging solutions<sup>8</sup>:**

The contractor shall in particular analyse the following issues:

Smartphones:

- an updated analysis of the market (main figures and trends) of chargers being actually sold with mobile phones sold in Europe;
- an updated analysis of the market for chargers sold alone in Europe including the illicit market for counterfeit chargers.

Other small portable electronic devices:

- an updated technical analysis of the market (main figure and trends, charging solution used) of other small portable electronic devices requiring similar charging capacity (defined up to a specific wattage), such as tablets, laptops, GPS receivers, radio controlled toys, smartwatches, any chargers for removable and rechargeable batteries (cameras, Bluetooth speakers and other portable electronic equipment using either AA or AAA batteries or custom batteries), etc.<sup>9</sup> that could profit of de-coupling actions:
  - main figure in terms of sales volume and trends;
  - charging solutions used;
  - whether they are sold without or with charger (with cable or with both cable and EPS).

The technical analysis of the other domestic electric and electronic products that could profit from de-coupling initiatives will be arranged by wattage categories (e.g. up to 15W, 20W, 50W, 100W, etc.).

Based on the technical analysis, the contractor will propose a list of products that could fall under the initiative, and will provide an analysis of market data and environmental impacts (e.g. e-waste generated and e-waste recycled).

### **Task 2: Mapping of environmental schemes for electronic devices**

The contractor shall map existing and foreseen environmental schemes for electronic devices which aim to increase energy efficiency or reduce e-waste and could be potentially implemented for decoupling of mobile phones and other electronic devices.

### **Task 3: Analysis on technical requirements and chargers types.**

---

<sup>8</sup> In most cases, this exercise should update data already provided by the Impact assessment study on common chargers of portable devices.

<sup>9</sup> As an indication of the magnitude and type of devices to be taken as reference, the contractor may refer to the outcomes of the *'Study on the impact of the MOU on harmonisation of chargers for mobile telephones'*

The study, in its technical part, should include updated technical analysis of the ‘charger’ products, intended as composed by the ‘external power supply’ (EPS) and the cord/cable. Their physical and software/firmware features must be defined.

#### **Task 4: Assessment of impacts of policy options**

The study is intended to analyse the impacts of the following policy options, their cost-effectiveness, their impact on consumers, e-waste and industry:

##### **1. Policy options**

The policy options can be identified on different levels. The following policy options concern only the environmental aspect of the problem. It should be noted that they could be combined with the options for harmonising the interface of the charge analysed in the IA study.

At least the following scenarios will be taken into account as basis to assess the policy options

Type of intervention:

- No action (baseline scenario)
- Voluntary approach (potentially accompanied by soft measure to incentivize decoupling);
- Regulatory options (Mandatory decoupling);
- Standardisation.

Scope of decoupling:

- EPS only
- Cable and EPS

Product scope:

- mobile phones only
- mobile phones and other small portable electronic devices (see task 1 above)

##### **2. Analysis of impacts and comparison of options**

The contractor shall analyse the impacts of options. In his assessment, the contractor shall reflect on the advantages/disadvantages, costs-benefits as well as on the feasibility and/or complexity of each of the options considered. These conclusions shall be substantiated by an analysis of the technological, practical, and economic limitations associated with each policy option, as well as by the conclusions regarding consumer needs and those of companies identified throughout the study.

The contractor shall in particular analyse:

1. Environmental impacts:

- An analysis of the environmental advantages (such as CO2 mitigation, resource use, e-waste prevention) deriving from the implementation of de-coupling schemes.
2. Consumer impact:
    - An analysis of consumers' role to implement de-coupling schemes for smartphones. The impact that lack of knowledge/ trust to use "non-original" chargers could have on its effectiveness, the consumers' perception on the economic convenience;
    - An analysis of any expected impacts on product prices, following the introduction of potential measures on de-coupling (isn't there a risk, e.g. if compulsory decoupling would be imposed, that the price of chargers would explode? Would the price of a smartphone decrease?);
    - An analysis of expected benefits for consumers e.g. consumer convenience. The analysis should built on the findings of the IA study.
  3. Impact on safety:
    - An analysis of safety impacts related to chargers mostly related to non-original replacement chargers and re-use of existing chargers.
  4. Impacts of durability aspects:
    - An analysis of durability of EPS and cords and minimum technical requirements so to extend their lifetime.
  5. Impact on EU industry (including Cost-effectiveness, cost-benefit analysis for different sectors of the industry)
  6. and employment in the EU.
  7. Indirect impacts such as: analysis of the impacts on innovation (at design/industrial level - e.g. is there any risk that mandatory policy options could hamper innovation at product level?) and impact on harmonisation of chargers for other devices (i.e. to what extent harmonisation of chargers for smartphones will impact on voluntary harmonisation of chargers for other devices?).
  8. Technical assessment of possible impacts on quality/speed of charging and on the performance of devices in terms of battery life.

The contractor will analyse whether similar evolutions of the market already exist in other fields and report on the possible impacts based on similar experiences made in the EU and third countries.

The contractor is expected to compare the policy options against baseline (no change of the status quo). It should be also noted that the analysed options could be combined with the policy options for harmonising the interface of the charge analysed in the IA study. It is important that the contractor builds on the findings of the IA study and clearly distinguish between direct and indirect impacts of policy options.

The contractor shall further develop a comparison of policy options against effectiveness and efficiency (cost - benefits analysis), relevance (including how future proof they are), coherence and EU added value criteria.

## **2. APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY**

The contractor shall ensure robustness of information by trying to acquire it from more than one source. In particular findings from consultations should be complemented when possible by official statistics and studies.

The contractor must support findings and conclusions by explaining the degree to which these are based on opinions, analysis and objectively verifiable evidence. Where opinions are the main source, the degree of consensus and the steps taken to test the opinions should be given.

The contractor will have a free choice as to the methods used to gather and analyse information and for making the assessment, but must take account of the following tools for data collection and data analysis.

The study should built on the IA study and supplement its findings but elaborating the analysis related to environmental aspects.

This study is also to complement a parallel feasibility study actually being performed by DG GROW C1<sup>10</sup>, whose main aim is to assess the feasibility of Eco-design and/or Energy Labelling requirements for mobile phones, smartphones and tablets, and to assess inter alia, material efficiency requirements for these products.

The tasks to be delivered shall be fully in accordance with the Commission Better Regulation Guidelines and Better Regulation Toolbox<sup>11</sup>. The choice and a detailed description of the methodology must form part of the offer submitted. Advantages, limitations and risks involved in using the proposed tools and techniques should be explained.

### **2.3 DATA COLLECTION TOOLS**

#### **2.3.1 *Desk research/ literature review***

The contractor should collect data and information from a wide range of publicly available sources, including, among other:

- Studies and other reports;
- Relevant academic research;
- Other relevant consultations reports/studies on the fields;
- National/international official statistics;
- Qualitative and quantitative analysis of existing data (e.g. market data);
- Structured analysis of the provisions of the legislation and of its implementation;
- Analysis of existing documents;

#### **2.3.2 *Stakeholder consultation***

On the basis of the consultation strategy agreed by the Inter-service Steering Group, the contractor shall implement the plan that will allow all stakeholders to be duly consulted. Stakeholders will be consulted either to collect evidence or to test/validate already existing analysis or evidence coming from different sources.

---

<sup>10</sup> Ecodesign preparatory study on mobile phones, smartphones and tablets

<sup>11</sup> <https://ec.europa.eu/info/sites/info/files/better-regulation-guidelines.pdf> and [http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/guidelines/docs/br\\_toolbox\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/guidelines/docs/br_toolbox_en.pdf)

The relevant parts of the Commission [Better regulation guidelines](#) and [Toolbox concerning stakeholder consultation](#) shall be followed.

The consultation strategy will be complemented by other approaches and tools in order to engage all relevant stakeholders and to target potential information gaps.

Given the extended scope, stakeholders to be consulted will include other sectors going beyond mobile phone/electronics industries.

For each proposed consultation tool and for each category of stakeholder the contractor shall analyse the potential gaps and propose a mitigation strategy. An analysis of possible overlap between the different tools shall also be put forward (in particular between the public and targeted consultation).

### **2.3.3 Targeted consultation**

The targeted consultations will collect the specialist view of the different categories of stakeholders. It can take place at any time point during the study. There is no minimum mandatory period for target consultation, but sufficient time should be given in order to collect as many replies as possible.

Questionnaires shall be customised to different stakeholder categories such as industry associations, companies (including SMEs), consumers, enforcement authorities, etc. taking into account their different level of engagement and potential impacts of the options. The contractor shall propose mitigation strategies in case of low number of replies.

Targeted stakeholders' consultations should use the Commission tool EUSurvey or any other tool proposed by the contractor and agreed upon by the Steering Group.

Any other operational works related to the survey itself will be the responsibility of the contractor. The contractor remains the sole responsible for the analysis. The contractor shall respect the European Commission standards for data protection when analysing responses.

### **2.3.4 Interviews**

The contractor shall carry out a number of structured/semi-structured interviews. Whereas most interviews could be done via phone or video conference, face to face interviews will be needed at an early stage to get a better understanding of the sector. Further interviews may be needed when analysing the information received via the targeted and public consultation.

The Commission may issue a Recommendation Letter that the Contractor will be able to present to approached stakeholders.

In conducting the interviews the Contractor shall respect data protection and privacy standards of the Commission. The responses and transcripts of interviews shall be given to the Commission.

The selection of interviewees should be based on their knowledge of the subject and should be agreed with the Commission service.

Interviews should be conducted with

- Representatives from EU institutions

- Relevant National Administration, Notified Bodies, Standardisation Authorities
- Selected representatives from organisation of stakeholder's categories (Industry and SMEs, consumers, retailers of electronic devices, etc.)
- Selected number of Enterprises
- NGOs, civil society, taking into account those active in environmental protection matters.

The approximate overall number of interviews that the contractor is expected to conduct is around 30, either as face-to-face or as remote interviews.

### 2.3.5 *Purchase of commercial data/statistics*

For the purpose of conducting the study the contractor may create or purchase access to external databases. The contractor should be able to assess the quality and completeness of data in such database.

Any database purchased for the purpose of this study will become property of the European Commission, together with all documentation and access rights.

Any database created for the purpose of this study will become property of the European Commission; the datasets should be accompanied by a clear documentation explaining all the variables and be presented in the format specified in the inception phase.

All source-codes and/or spreadsheets used for the statistical/econometric analysis have to be shared and will become property of the European Commission.

### 2.3.6 *Quality of the collected data*

The data collection process as well as all data and statistics that are part of the study should be clearly and exhaustively described so that the users are able to (a) assess the quality of these data/statistics, (b) interpret them in a consistent way and (c) replicate their methodology in the future. For that purpose each data collection process carried out by the contractor should include the following information as a minimum:

- Objective of the exercise
- Target population and sampled population
- Data (variables) to be collected
- Degree of precision i.e. are there some missing data or breaks in time series?
- Collection mode, i.e. how will the data be collected (by email, web platforms, dedicated application)
- Periodicity/frequency of a process i.e. is it a one-off exercise or a regular one?
- Validation
- Publication format (i.e. in plain text, CSV files or Excel)
- Metadata i.e. what background information about the data I need to disclose to the public:
  - Data collection methodology;



- Target population;
- Sampled population;
- Glossary and definitions of indicators/variables and their respective measurement units;
- Codes, acronyms, flags used (those should normally be harmonised with Eurostat codes, e.g. two-letter country codes);
- The timing and frequency of data collection;
- The publication date;
- Limitations, confidentiality issues, disruptions of methodology etc.
- Contact point for potential questions and comments from the public.

## **2.4 DATA ANALYSIS**

Considerable emphasis should be placed on the analysis of the information/data collected. The contractor will have a free choice as to the methods used to analyse information and for making the assessment, but must, at least, take account of the following:

### ***2.4.1 Identification of the most relevant impacts (intended and unintended)***

The contractor shall establish an initial comprehensive list of all potential direct and indirect impacts that the various options may cause: economic impacts on manufacturers and on users, including on small and micro-enterprises specifically and including administrative burden/simplification; impacts on public administration; impacts on consumers; impacts on competitiveness and innovation; safety impacts; environmental impacts.

The selection of the most significant likely impacts shall be based on clear criteria, including their expected magnitude, relevance to the stakeholders and importance for the EU general objectives.

### ***2.4.2 Cost-effectiveness, cost-benefit analysis***

The contractor is asked to map regulatory and administrative costs and benefits stemming from different policy options. Costs should be disaggregated to specific options under the assessment and specific categories of stakeholders. The assessment should also look at potential savings (specifically for customers who would not need to buy a standalone charger) and compare them with the estimated costs. For the quantifications the contractor should follow as much as possible the logic of the cost-benefits analysis and more generally the methods described in the Better Regulation Toolbox<sup>12</sup>. This shall include the identification of the stakeholders' groups impacted and how they would be affected (this will include the SME test).

The contractor shall provide quantitative estimation of the environmental benefits of the initiative. The contractor shall try to indicate any other possible benefits of the options that might emerge during the course of analysis.

<sup>12</sup> <sup>12</sup> [https://ec.europa.eu/info/better-regulation-guidelines-and-toolbox\\_en](https://ec.europa.eu/info/better-regulation-guidelines-and-toolbox_en)

### **2.4.3 Analysis of other impacts and comparison of options**

Based on identification of possible impacts, the contractor shall quantify the most significant impacts in particular impacts on waste and impacts on consumers.

The contractor shall assess the options against the baseline scenario. The assessment will be quantitative, clearly describing the methodology, any assumptions and their robustness, any limitations of the approach and carrying out sensitivity analysis. For impacts that cannot be quantified, the contractor shall explain in details why quantification is not possible and provide a thorough qualitative assessment.

The contractor shall prepare a comparison of the options which will be based on the assessment of the various impacts and their distribution across affected stakeholders' groups. The comparison shall consider effectiveness (the extent to which each option would achieve the objectives), efficiency (the cost benefit analysis of each option), synergies and trade-offs in the case of combined options and sub-options.

The contractor shall draw conclusion on the proportionality of the costs associated with the intervention to the benefits it is supposed to generate.

## **3. AVAILABLE INFORMATION AND DATA SOURCES**

The following documentation and information is an input for the contractor to develop the work:

- The Commission website on the Electrical and Electronic Engineering Industries<sup>13</sup>
- The Commission websites on Eco-design<sup>14</sup>
- The Commission website on Waste Electrical & Electronic Equipment (WEEE)<sup>15</sup>
- Legal text of the Radio Equipment Directive 2014/53/EU: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:32014L0053>
- The Commission website on the Radio Equipment Directive website<sup>16</sup> including, the RED Guide,<sup>17</sup> documents adopted or endorsed by the Telecommunication Conformity Assessment and Market Surveillance Committee (TCAM)<sup>18</sup>, FAQs,

---

<sup>13</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/growth/sectors/electrical-engineering/ec-support\\_en](http://ec.europa.eu/growth/sectors/electrical-engineering/ec-support_en)

<sup>14</sup> [https://ec.europa.eu/growth/industry/sustainability/ecodesign\\_en](https://ec.europa.eu/growth/industry/sustainability/ecodesign_en) and [https://ec.europa.eu/info/energy-climate-change-environment/standards-tools-and-labels/products-labelling-rules-and-requirements/energy-label-and-ecodesign\\_en](https://ec.europa.eu/info/energy-climate-change-environment/standards-tools-and-labels/products-labelling-rules-and-requirements/energy-label-and-ecodesign_en)

<sup>15</sup> [https://ec.europa.eu/environment/waste/weee/index\\_en.htm](https://ec.europa.eu/environment/waste/weee/index_en.htm)

<sup>16</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/growth/sectors/electrical-engineering/red-directive\\_en](http://ec.europa.eu/growth/sectors/electrical-engineering/red-directive_en)

<sup>17</sup> <http://ec.europa.eu/docsroom/documents/2332>

<sup>18</sup> TCAM public documents are also available on

[https://circabc.europa.eu/faces/jsp/extension/wai/navigation/container.jsp?FormBanner:\\_idcl=navigationTitle&FormBanner\\_SUBMIT=1&org.apache.myfaces.trinidad.faces.STATE=DUMMY&id=75ddbd4d-d635-4fb8-93cd-571f720964e4&javax.faces.ViewState=alk923rFtijsXYBzv52NJxj1FTIcD%2Fz7maFaTJO4OkA3ynYZPKE4jA8A6wpOwkyBXvKWLOzC%2FchLERx9Qbivqb8QFh%2FBj4EdchZdS7pRBhvdnn6F1frGPeCRoS8YGY9w1VbbJdPafgGh95gr5qc1LvdsOAY%3D](https://circabc.europa.eu/faces/jsp/extension/wai/navigation/container.jsp?FormBanner:_idcl=navigationTitle&FormBanner_SUBMIT=1&org.apache.myfaces.trinidad.faces.STATE=DUMMY&id=75ddbd4d-d635-4fb8-93cd-571f720964e4&javax.faces.ViewState=alk923rFtijsXYBzv52NJxj1FTIcD%2Fz7maFaTJO4OkA3ynYZPKE4jA8A6wpOwkyBXvKWLOzC%2FchLERx9Qbivqb8QFh%2FBj4EdchZdS7pRBhvdnn6F1frGPeCRoS8YGY9w1VbbJdPafgGh95gr5qc1LvdsOAY%3D)

reports, information documents, and Commission's opinions under the framework of RED: [http://ec.europa.eu/growth/sectors/electrical-engineering/red-directive\\_en](http://ec.europa.eu/growth/sectors/electrical-engineering/red-directive_en)

- Specific web page on common chargers campaign, with links to main activities and previous study: [http://ec.europa.eu/growth/sectors/electrical-engineering/red-directive/common-charger\\_en](http://ec.europa.eu/growth/sectors/electrical-engineering/red-directive/common-charger_en).
- Website on Administrative Cooperation Groups (AdCos)<sup>19</sup>, including reports from the ADCO RED.
- ICSMS (Information and Communication System for Market Surveillance) – an internet-supported information and communication system for the pan-European market surveillance: <https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/icsms>

Background documents:

- Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) 2009 (Annex 1)
- Annex I: List of Signatories (Annex 2)
- Annex III: Guide on Implementation of Requirements of the Common external power supply (Annex 3)
- Mandate M/455 on a common charging capability for mobile phones (Annex 4)

## **Previous evaluations and other reports**

### **On common charger:**

The Commission recently performed a study to consider an appropriate legislative approach on common chargers. The study analysed the impact of a common charger solution on consumers, the industry and the environment with assessment and guidance for possible implementation of different policy options. Nevertheless, specific aspects linked to de-coupling were suggested but not assessed in detail.

- Impact assessment study on common chargers of portable devices ((Ipsos and Trinomics, with support from Fraunhofer FOKUS - on behalf of a consortium led by Economisti Associati)<sup>20</sup>

A '*Study on the impact of the MOU on harmonisation of chargers for mobile telephones*' was performed in 2014. The main objective of that study was to evaluate the results achieved with the MoU in the 2009-2013 period, to analyse how the stated objectives to delivering benefits for consumers and for industry and to reducing electronic waste were achieved, and to provide elements in view of considering options for follow-up.

---

<sup>19</sup> [https://ec.europa.eu/growth/single-market/goods/building-blocks/market-surveillance/organisation/administrative-cooperation-groups\\_en](https://ec.europa.eu/growth/single-market/goods/building-blocks/market-surveillance/organisation/administrative-cooperation-groups_en)

<sup>20</sup> Impact assessment study on common chargers of portable devices <https://op.europa.eu/en/web/eu-law-and-publications/publication-detail/-/publication/c6fadfea-4641-11ea-b81b-01aa75ed71a1>

- Study on the impact of the MOU on harmonisation of chargers for mobile telephones and to assess possible future options (RPA Risk & Policy Analysts - 22 August 2014)<sup>21,22</sup>
- Study on the common charger 2.0 (RPA, December 2019)
- 

#### **On Eco-design:**

Ecodesign preparatory study on mobile phones and tablets (managed by GROW C1) is being performed. The main aim of the study is to assess the feasibility of Eco-design and/or Energy Labelling requirements for mobile phones, smartphones and tablets. The study is intended to assess the potentiality of the promotion of incentive schemes to industry, therefore under a voluntary approach rather than a mandatory requirement. In that context, the environmental and economic impacts of ‘unbundling’ the smartphone and the charger will only be part of the analysis.

The review of the computer Regulations is ongoing and possible requirements for a universal power adapter for both portable and desktop computers are being proposed. Unbundling would be an option as well (i.e. possibility for the customer to choose).

#### **On WEEE related aspects:**

A study that will focus on the analysis of the scale of uncollected or unaccounted small EEE (electrical and electronic equipment), the potential schemes and incentives for returning small used EEE, and the recovery potential is being performed.

## **4. COMMISSIONING BODY AND PUBLICATION**

The present Impact Assessment study is commissioned by Unit C3 of DG Internal Market, Industry, Entrepreneurship and SMEs.

The steering group contributes to the development of the evaluation project and is part of its management structure. The steering Committee for the present evaluation is composed by representative of DG GROW (C3, C1 and A1), SG, DG CNECT, DG COMP, DG ENER, DG ENV, DG JRC, DG JUST, DG TRADE.

The results may be shared with other interested bodies inside and outside the European Commission.

## **5. REPORTING AND DELIVERABLES**

### **5.3.1 General reporting requirements**

The contractor shall provide the required reports and documents in accordance with the timetable below.

---

<sup>21</sup> Executive summary <http://ec.europa.eu/DocsRoom/documents/7431/attachments/1/translations>

<sup>22</sup> Final report <http://ec.europa.eu/DocsRoom/documents/7432/attachments/1/translations>

The contractor must ensure that all deliverables under this contract are clear, concise and focused on their purpose. All deliverables shall be written in English, reviewed and corrected by a native speaker before submission.

Electronic files must be provided in (*specify, e.g. Microsoft ® Word*) format. Additionally, besides Word, the Final Report must be delivered in pdf format and in 3 hard copies.

All deliverables are presented as draft documents to be discussed with the Steering group and finalised based on the comments received from Commission services.

The Commission shall have 30 days to approve or reject the report. The contractor shall have 30 days in which submit additional information or a new report.

### 5.3.2 Deliverables

#### PHASE I

For the purpose of this specific contract, the following deliverables will need to be produced:

<b>Deliverable 1 (D1)</b>	<b>At the latest 1 month after signature of the contract by the last contracting party</b>
An <b>inception report</b> (around 10 pages) will specify the detailed work programme and planning for the study and describe the methodological approaches and working assumptions to be used for the tasks defined. The report will also identify any additional needs.	
<b>Deliverable 2 (D2)</b>	<b>At the latest 3 months after signature of the contract by the last contracting party</b>
An <b>interim report</b> will summarise results reached until that moment and raise any problems encountered with sufficient information to permit reorientation if appropriate and required. It will demonstrate what preliminary conclusions have been drawn and give clear indications and detailed planning of the work to be carried out during the rest of the period of completion of the tasks. This report will also include the proposed structure of the final report.	
<b>Deliverable 3 (D3)</b>	<b>At the latest 6 months after signature of the contract by the last contracting party</b>
A <b>draft final report</b> will be delivered to the Commission, taking account of the comments made earlier on in the process. It will cover all points of the work plan and shall include sound analysis of findings and factually based conclusions and recommendations, in line with the purpose and objectives described above.	

The Commission will accept the draft final report in the definitive form or comment on it within 20 days of its reception. If the Commission does not react within this period, the final study shall be deemed to have been approved.

Should the Commission still not consider the final report acceptable, the Contractor will be invited to amend until the Commission is satisfied within 30 days. In cases of late delivery, the Commission reserves its right to apply the corresponding liquidated damages according to the provisions of Article II.15 of the Framework Contract. The Interservice Steering Group reserves the right to carry out a quality assessment of the final report and publish it along with the study.

<b>Deliverable 4 (D4)</b>	<b>At the latest 8 months after signature of the contract by the last contracting party</b>
The <b>final report</b> (Annexes to the final report will include any graphical material, the main bibliographic and information sources, verbatim of interviews.	

The Commission shall have 30 days to approve or reject the reports. The contractor shall have 30 days to submit additional information or a new report.

<b>Deliverable 5 (D5)</b>	At the latest 8 months after signature of the contract by the last contracting party (submitted as annex to D5)
All the data collected under this contract, as well as all the summaries, analyses, underlying calculations and findings, which will be the property of the Commission and must be handed over in the agreed format.	

## 6. PUBLICATIONS

The study (including executive summary, abstract, annexes) will be published on the DG Internal Market, Industry, Entrepreneurship and SMEs internet site, on the [EU Bookshop website](#) and on other web-sites in relation to the study.

In view of its publication, the final report must be of high editorial quality. In cases where the contractor does not manage to produce a final report of high editorial quality within the timeframe defined by the contract, the contracting authority can decide to have the final report professionally edited at the expense of the contractor (e.g. deduction of these costs from the final payment) according two Article II.16 of the framework contract.

## 7. WORK ORGANISATION

### 7.1 Meetings with the Commission

The contractor is expected to take part in maximum 4 meetings with the Commission services which will take place on Commission premises in Brussels<sup>23</sup>.

- a kick-off meeting at the beginning of the study;
- one interim meeting;
- a draft-final meeting;
- a final meeting to present the results of the study.

The 'kick-off' meeting will allow for the discussion of the draft outline approach and work programme elaborated by the contractor for the execution of the contract.

The 'interim' meetings will allow an in-depth discussion of the progress/interim draft reports.

The 'final' meeting will allow an in-depth discussion of the draft final report and requirements for the completion of the Final report.

### 7.2 Work Plan

The contract shall enter into force on the date on which it is signed by the last contracting party.

It is expected to be signed by July 2020. The provision of the services shall not exceed 9 months.

**Given the time constraints, a correct project planning and men allocation will be considered crucial for the successful completion of the project.**

<b>Deliverables (D), Meetings (M), and Payments (P)</b>	<b>Deadline (Month)</b>
M1: Kick-off meeting with the Commission in Brussels D1: Inception report	1
D2: First interim report M2: Interim meeting with the Commission in Brussels P1: Interim payment	3
D3: Draft final report M3: Draft-final meeting with the Commission in Brussels	6

---

<sup>23</sup> During the COVID crisis period, rules on gatherings meetings will be in line with the rules adopted by the host Member State, taking into account the recommendations of the relevant health authorities and of the Medical Service.

D4: Final report	8
M4: Final meeting with the Commission in Brussels	
D5: Executive Summary of the final report	
D6: All data collected	
P2: Final payment	

### 7.3 Proposed team

Total days	
------------	--

Task	Name	Role in the team	Staff Category	Expertise	Languages	Unit price	Man days
			Cat. I - Team Leader				
			Cat. II - Senior Consultant				
			Cat. III - Junior Consultant				
			Cat. IV				

The tender must include a description of the proposed team, its composition, its expertise and the work effort planned for each member in terms of man/days for each task of the project.

### 8.PRICE

The maximum budget available for this project is €200,000

**The offer must include a detailed proposed budget.** The tenderer should provide a quote of the total cost of the services to be provided (fixed price) in its financial tender following the table below:

<i>Price component</i>	<i>Staff category</i>	<i>Unit price</i> (= daily rate for Human Resources including the travel and subsistence expenses linked to the five meetings with the Commission on its premises in Brussels)	<i>Quantity</i> (= number of man days devoted to the project by person XY for Human Resources)	<i>Total</i>
Human resources				
Person X (name and a role)				



Person Y (name and a role)				
.....				
Subtotal (1)				
Other				
Item X				
Item Y				
.....				
Subtotal (2)				
<b>TOTAL (1+2)</b>				

## 9. PAYMENTS

The payment scheme will consist of

- **one interim payment**, corresponding to **a maximum of 30 %** (each) of the price specified in article 3.1 of the specific contract;
- **a balance payment** corresponding to **70 %** of the amount specified in article 3.1 of the specific contract;

The schedule and the procedure for the approval of payments and the documents to be submitted are described in Articles I.6, II.21, II.22 and II.23 of the framework contract.

## 10. AWARD OF THE SPECIFIC CONTRACT

As specified in the tender specification for this FWC, the offers submitted within the re-opening of competition must contain:

- a) **A technical part**, detailing the methodology, the composition and skills of the team and the responsible team leader for the specific agreement;
- b) **A financial part** detailing the number of man-days to be multiplied by the man-day price as defined in the Framework Contract, and other cost items.

The Specific Contract will be awarded according:

- to the qualitative award criteria given below,

AND

- to the price of the financial tenders.

The formula used to rank tenders and to calculate which tender is the most economically advantageous tender is displayed in section b) below.

A) TECHNICAL QUALITATIVE AWARD CRITERIA

No	Qualitative award criteria	Weighting (maximum points)
1	<b>Clarity, relevance and coherence</b> <i>This criterion will assess whether the offer is written in a clear language, whether it is well and logically structured, whether all the information requested in the specific contract is duly covered.</i>	0-5
2	<b>Quality of the proposed mechanisms for project management, including quality control, risk management and reporting</b> <i>This criterion will assess the quality control system proposed for the services foreseen in the offer concerning the quality of deliverables, the language quality check, continuity of the service in case of absence of a member of the team, as well as the overall project management (organisation of work, contacts with the contracting party etc.). This quality control system should be detailed. A generic quality control system will result in a low score.</i>	0-15
3	<b>Balance of profiles and breakdown of tasks</b> <i>This criterion will assess how the roles and responsibilities of the proposed team and of the different economic operators (in case of joint tenders, including subcontracting if applicable) are distributed for tasks specified in individual Terms of Reference for specific contracts. The tender should provide details on the rationale behind the choice of this allocation.</i>	0-20
4	<b>Relevance and quality of the methodologies to carry out data collection</b> <i>This criterion will assess how the tenderer will collect data.</i>	0-25
5	<b>Quality of the proposed methodology to carry out data analysis</b> <i>This criterion will assess how the tenderer will analyse the available and collected data.</i>	0-35
<b>Total number of points</b>		<b>100</b>

The award criteria cannot be further supplemented during the evaluation procedure.

Only tenders that have reached a total score of a minimum of 60% and a minimum score of 50% for each criterion will be taken into consideration for awarding the specific contract.

## B) AWARD METHOD

The contract will be awarded to the tender which is the most cost-effective (offers the best value for money) on the basis of the ratio between the total points scored and the price using the following formula:

Score for tender X	=	$\frac{\text{Lowest price}^*}{\text{Price of tender X}}$	*	100	*	Price weighting (30%)	+	Total quality score (out of 100) for all award criteria of tender X	*	Quality criteria weighting (70%)
-----------------------------	---	--	---	-----	---	-----------------------------	---	---	---	---

\* Only tenders passing minimum quality levels are ranked. The lowest price refers to the lowest price among the tenders that have passed the minimum quality levels.