Digital product passport – rules for service providers

Fields marked with * are mandatory.

Introduction

This consultation relates to the digital product passport (DPP) as set out in the Ecodesign for Sustainable Products Regulation[1] (ESPR). The ESPR sets out a framework to improve the environmental sustainability of products and to ensure free movement in the single market by setting ecodesign requirements that products must fulfil to be placed on the market or put into service.

The DPP will electronically register, process and share product information among supply-chain businesses, authorities and consumers, including on a product's sustainability and circularity. This information will improve the understanding and monitoring of supply chains and enable consumers to make well-informed choices based on sustainability criteria. DPPs will gradually be introduced for product groups placed on the EU market based on ESPR delegated acts and other applicable sectoral legislation. As a start, from 18 February 2027, DPPs will become mandatory for certain types of batteries.

To prepare for these first product groups to be covered, the Commission is working on a delegated act setting out the requirements for DPP service providers, in areas such as:
- information security and (information) services of DPP data that responsible economic operators entrust to DPP service providers;
- the financial viability of the DPP service providers to guarantee long-term access to DPP information; and
- assurance for businesses that DPP service providers comply with the requirements.

DPP service providers[2] will store and process DPP data on behalf of responsible economic operators (e. g. producers, importers, etc.) that decide not to provide these services themselves. For responsible economic operators that decide to host the DPPs themselves, the DPP service providers will store the DPP' s mandatory backup copy. The Commission will carry out an impact assessment to assess potential options for the requirements, their possible effects, and the viability of putting in place a certification scheme to ensure compliance with the requirements. In setting out this framework, the Commission aims to help responsible economic operators comply with the ESPR requirements.

[1] Regulation (EU) 2024/1781 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 June 2024 establishing a framework for the setting of ecodesign requirements for sustainable products, amending Directive (EU) 2020/1828 and Regulation (EU) 2023/1542 and repealing Directive 2009/125/EC. ELI: http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg/2024/1781/oj.

[2] According to Article 2(32) of the ESPR, a digital product passport service provider is a 'natural or legal person that is an independent third-party authorised by the economic operator which places the product on the market or puts it into service and that processes the digital product passport data for that product for the purpose of making such data available to economic operators and other relevant actors with a right to access those data under this Regulation or other Union law'.

About you

* Language of my contribution
  - ○ Bulgarian
  - ○ Croatian
  - ○ Czech
  - ○ Danish
  - ○ Dutch
  - ◉ English
  - ○ Estonian
  - ○ Finnish
  - ○ French
  - ○ German
  - ○ Greek
  - ○ Hungarian
  - ○ Irish
  - ○ Italian
  - ○ Latvian
  - ○ Lithuanian
  - ○ Maltese
  - ○ Polish
  - ○ Portuguese
  - ○ Romanian
  - ○ Slovak
  - ○ Slovenian
  - ○ Spanish
  - ○ Swedish

* I am giving my contribution as
  - ○ Academic/research institution
  - ◉ Business association
  - ○ Company/business

- ( ) Consumer organisation
- ( ) EU citizen
- ( ) Environmental organisation
- ( ) Non-EU citizen
- ( ) Non-governmental organisation (NGO)
- ( ) Public authority
- ( ) Trade union
- ( ) Other

* First name

Justin

* Surname

Loup

* Email (this won't be published)

justin.loup@glassforeurope.com

* Organisation name

255 character(s) maximum

Glass for Europe

* Organisation size

- (•) Micro (1 to 9 employees)
- ( ) Small (10 to 49 employees)
- ( ) Medium (50 to 249 employees)
- ( ) Large (250 or more)

Transparency register number

Check if your organisation is on the transparency register. It's a voluntary database for organisations seeking to influence EU decision-making.

15997912445-80

Please state whether you will be replying to the questionnaire as:

[*] Regulation (EU) 2024/1781 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 June 2024 establishing a framework for the setting of ecodesign requirements for sustainable products, amending Directive (EU) 2020/1828 and Regulation (EU) 2023/1542 and repealing Directive 2009/125/EC. ELI: http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg/2024/1781/oj.

- ○ a possible responsible economic operator *(i.e. manufacturer, authorised representative, importer, distributor, dealer or fulfilment service provider)*
- ○ a possible digital product passport service provider *(i.e. a natural or legal person that is an independent third party authorised by the economic operator which places the product on the market or puts it into service and that processes the digital product passport data for that product for the purpose of making such data available to economic operators and other relevant actors with a right to access those data under the Ecodesign for Sustainable Products Regulation [*] or other EU law)*
- ◉ any other value chain actor, such as a possible customer, professional repairer, independent operator, refurbisher, remanufacturer, recycler, market surveillance and customs authority, civil society organisation, researcher, trade union, the Commission, or any organisation acting on their behalf.

* Country of origin

Please add your country of origin, or that of your organisation.

This list does not represent the official position of the European institutions with regard to the legal status or policy of the entities mentioned. It is a harmonisation of often divergent lists and practices.

○ Afghanistan	○ Djibouti	○ Libya	○ Saint Martin
○ Åland Islands	○ Dominica	○ Liechtenstein	○ Saint Pierre and Miquelon
○ Albania	○ Dominican Republic	○ Lithuania	○ Saint Vincent and the Grenadines
○ Algeria	○ Ecuador	○ Luxembourg	○ Samoa
○ American Samoa	○ Egypt	○ Macau	○ San Marino
○ Andorra	○ El Salvador	○ Madagascar	○ São Tomé and Príncipe
○ Angola	○ Equatorial Guinea	○ Malawi	○ Saudi Arabia
○ Anguilla	○ Eritrea	○ Malaysia	○ Senegal
○ Antarctica	○ Estonia	○ Maldives	○ Serbia
○ Antigua and Barbuda	○ Eswatini	○ Mali	○ Seychelles
○ Argentina	○ Ethiopia	○ Malta	○ Sierra Leone

- Armenia
- Aruba
- Australia
- Austria
- Azerbaijan
- Bahamas
- Bahrain
- Bangladesh
- Barbados
- Belarus
- Belgium
- Belize
- Benin
- Bermuda
- Bhutan
- Bolivia
- Bonaire Saint Eustatius and Saba
- Bosnia and Herzegovina
- Botswana
- Bouvet Island
- Brazil
- British Indian Ocean Territory
- British Virgin Islands
- Brunei
- Bulgaria
- Falkland Islands
- Faroe Islands
- Fiji
- Finland
- France
- French Guiana
- French Polynesia
- French Southern and Antarctic Lands
- Gabon
- Georgia
- Germany
- Ghana
- Gibraltar
- Greece
- Greenland
- Grenada
- Guadeloupe
- Guam
- Guatemala
- Guernsey
- Guinea
- Guinea-Bissau
- Guyana
- Haiti
- Heard Island and McDonald Islands
- Marshall Islands
- Martinique
- Mauritania
- Mauritius
- Mayotte
- Mexico
- Micronesia
- Moldova
- Monaco
- Mongolia
- Montenegro
- Montserrat
- Morocco
- Mozambique
- Myanmar/Burma
- Namibia
- Nauru
- Nepal
- Netherlands
- New Caledonia
- New Zealand
- Nicaragua
- Niger
- Nigeria
- Niue
- Singapore
- Sint Maarten
- Slovakia
- Slovenia
- Solomon Islands
- Somalia
- South Africa
- South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands
- South Korea
- South Sudan
- Spain
- Sri Lanka
- Sudan
- Suriname
- Svalbard and Jan Mayen
- Sweden
- Switzerland
- Syria
- Taiwan
- Tajikistan
- Tanzania
- Thailand
- The Gambia
- Timor-Leste
- Togo

- Burkina Faso
- Burundi
- Cambodia
- Cameroon
- Canada
- Cape Verde
- Cayman Islands
- Central African Republic
- Chad
- Chile
- China
- Christmas Island
- Clipperton
- Cocos (Keeling) Islands
- Colombia
- Comoros
- Congo
- Cook Islands
- Costa Rica
- Côte d’Ivoire
- Croatia
- Cuba
- Curaçao
- Cyprus
- Czechia
- Honduras
- Hong Kong
- Hungary
- Iceland
- India
- Indonesia
- Iran
- Iraq
- Ireland
- Isle of Man
- Israel
- Italy
- Jamaica
- Japan
- Jersey
- Jordan
- Kazakhstan
- Kenya
- Kiribati
- Kosovo
- Kuwait
- Kyrgyzstan
- Laos
- Latvia
- Lebanon
- Norfolk Island
- Northern Mariana Islands
- North Korea
- North Macedonia
- Norway
- Oman
- Pakistan
- Palau
- Palestine
- Panama
- Papua New Guinea
- Paraguay
- Peru
- Philippines
- Pitcairn Islands
- Poland
- Portugal
- Puerto Rico
- Qatar
- Réunion
- Romania
- Russia
- Rwanda
- Saint Barthélemy
- Saint Helena Ascension and Tristan da Cunha
- Tokelau
- Tonga
- Trinidad and Tobago
- Tunisia
- Türkiye
- Turkmenistan
- Turks and Caicos Islands
- Tuvalu
- Uganda
- Ukraine
- United Arab Emirates
- United Kingdom
- United States
- United States Minor Outlying Islands
- Uruguay
- US Virgin Islands
- Uzbekistan
- Vanuatu
- Vatican City
- Venezuela
- Vietnam
- Wallis and Futuna
- Western Sahara
- Yemen
- Zambia

Democratic Republic of the Congo	Lesotho	Saint Kitts and Nevis	Zimbabwe
Denmark	Liberia	Saint Lucia	

The Commission will publish all contributions to this public consultation. You can choose whether you would prefer to have your details published or to remain anonymous when your contribution is published. **Fo r the purpose of transparency, the type of respondent (for example, 'business association, 'consumer association', 'EU citizen') country of origin, organisation name and size, and its transparency register number, are always published. Your e-mail address will never be published.** Opt in to select the privacy option that best suits you. Privacy options default based on the type of respondent selected

* **Contribution publication privacy settings**

The Commission will publish the responses to this public consultation. You can choose whether you would like your details to be made public or to remain anonymous.

- **Anonymous**
  Only organisation details are published: The type of respondent that you responded to this consultation as, the name of the organisation on whose behalf you reply as well as its transparency number, its size, its country of origin and your contribution will be published as received. Your name will not be published. Please do not include any personal data in the contribution itself if you want to remain anonymous.
- **Public**
  Organisation details and respondent details are published: The type of respondent that you responded to this consultation as, the name of the organisation on whose behalf you reply as well as its transparency number, its size, its country of origin and your contribution will be published. Your name will also be published.

☑ I agree with the personal data protection provisions

Specific questions to all remaining actors

* If you as a service provider are hosting the original DPP, what kind of measures would you need to put in place to ensure the availability of the DPP?

[1] Regulation (EU) 2024/1781 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 June 2024 establishing a framework for the setting of ecodesign requirements for sustainable products, amending Directive (EU) 2020/1828 and Regulation (EU) 2023/1542 and repealing Directive 2009/125/EC. ELI: http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg/2024/1781/oj.

- ☑ Redundant servers (if one fails, the others take over)

- [x] Failover clustering (automatic switch to a backup system when a primary system fails)
- [x] Load balancers (distributed traffic across multiple servers)
- [x] Scalable infrastructure (auto-scaling for cloud environments to ensure enough resources to cope with the demand)
- [x] Distributed-denial-of-service protection (to prevent service from going down in the event of a large-scale attack)
- [x] Monitoring and alerts (to enable proactive issue resolution)
- [x] Other (please explain)

* If you chose "Other", please explain.

Glass for Europe has no expertise in this domain. All points mentioned seem relevant and should be assessed in terms of their cost-benefit.
The type of measures needed likely depends on the specific needs and means of individual companies. The flat glass value chain is composed of companies of all sizes (multinational, SMEs, microenterprise).
Upstream flat glass manufacturers operate float plants equipped with furnaces that run continuously, 24/7, for up to 20 years. This continuous process requires highly reliable IT systems that can, e.g., absorb a large influx of information and redistribute it efficiently.
Downtream flat glass processors can be smaller manufacturers and will likely have different needs and IT resources. A single downstream glass processor may offer tens of thousands of product references, sometimes involving intermediate processing steps by other manufacturers.

* In your opinion, what should be the minimum level of DPP availability (within 365 days) that the service provider should offer?

- ( ) Available (reachable) 99% of the time
- ( ) Available (reachable) 98% of the time
- ( ) Available (reachable) 95% of the time
- (•) Available (reachable) 90% of the time

* Please explain your opinion about minimum level of availability

The system must be reliable, efficient, and cost-effective; an availability of 90% of the time should be sufficient to enable a functioning DPP system while reducing risks of creating overly costly requirements.

* What kind of data exchange mechanisms (e.g. manual, as email or manual operations in excel, or automated) would you find most relevant/best for sharing the DPP data between an economic operator and a service provider or a service provider and third parties, and why?

- ○ Manual
- ○ Automated
- ◉ Both manual and automated

You can provide more details for your answer on manual/automated solution if you wish

Whereas upstream flat glass manufacturers are multinational companies, each operating several sites in the EU, the downstream flat glass processors, which transform the glass panes produced by manufacturers, can be much smaller actors (SMEs, microenterprises). All these actors have different strategies and habits regarding digitalisation. While some will need fully automated systems, others require the ability to manually share and access input.

How would you rate the importance of the following elements for DPP services?

	1 - Not important at all	2 - Less important	3 - Somewhat important	4 - Important	5 - Very important
* User-friendliness	○	○	○	○	◉
* Data security	○	○	○	○	◉
* Cyber resilience	○	○	○	○	◉
* Access rights	○	○	○	○	◉
* Support services	○	○	○	○	◉
* A wide(r) range of services (automisation, interconnections with other relevant tools, etc.)	○	◉	○	○	○
* Certifications	○	○	◉	○	○

You can give additional explanation to the previous question if you wish.

If the DPP aims to render the industry more efficient and competitive, it must enable smooth use at an affordable cost. Many of the elements mentioned above, if well implemented, can allow this by ensuring usability, safety, IP protection, efficiency, and trust.
Glass for Europe considers that the focus should not be on implementing a wide range of side services; this risks creating costs and complexity, and should not be the main priority. Besides, certification rules, if any, should be as simple as possible to decrease their costs. Preferably, market surveillance should oversee DPP service providers instead of implementing a certification system, which would increase costs, slow down the process, and could discourage smaller operators.

* When using the DPP, what kind of standards do you consider necessary for ensuring data security?

This could include securing the data integrity using a hashing mechanism like SHA-256, securing data authenticity using qualified digital signatures, or using encryption techniques when securing restricted data.Data security is

generally understood as a process of safeguarding digital information throughout its entire life cycle to protect it against corruption, theft or unauthorised access. It covers all: (i)hardware, software, storage devices, and user devices; (ii)access and administrative controls; and (iii)organisations' policies and procedures.
You can consider any standards that you find relevant, whether international, EU or national.
Please name the standards and explain

Glass for Europe is not competent to address this question.

* Do you have any specific concerns regarding DPP data that will be processed by downstream users such as repairers and recyclers?

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No
- ( ) I don't know

* Please tell us about those concerns and how you would mitigate them.

There is a risk that the data will be misused, for example, if someone reuses an old product and declares the original DPP performance data for the reused product without considering the degradation that occurs over time. Stakeholders could be informed about the rules and responsibilities regarding the use and reuse of data when they access it.

The DPP provisions in the CPR demand the sharing of a very wide range of data in the future DPPs. Numerous data points are sensitive and should only be accessible to certain specific stakeholders (e.g. market surveillance). To limit the risks, the system should enable the determination of who can access what type of data. Besides, sensitive data must be protected from data breaches. Another way to mitigate risks would be to have certain pieces of data accessible only on demand and not automatically accessible through the DPP system by external users.

* What benefits and costs would you see for consumers and other stakeholder groups deriving from the use of a digital product passport?

Benefits:
- Enabling a standard way to receive/distribute product information within the industry and to clients.
- Facilitate access to and transfer of BIM-compatible data and environmental characteristics within the value chain.
Costs:
- Considering the large number of flat glass product types, millions of DPPs will need to be created and managed for our sector alone; systems to manage this data will likely be complex and costly;
- Using the system and engaging with service providers to comply with the DPP rules will require resources from all companies in the flat glass value chain;
- These costs will be reflected in construction products, thereby impacting consumers (e.g. construction costs) and the competitiveness of the construction products sector;
- This will also be critical for repairers, recyclers, and reusers since complying with the new CPR will be more costly than under the current CPR.

* Do you see yourself becoming a DPP service provider in the future?

- ○ Yes
- ◉ No
- ○ I don’t know

Questions linked to possible certification of DPP service providers

* How important would it be for you that the DPP service providers are certified service providers?

- ○ Extremely important
- ○ Rather important
- ◉ Neutral
- ○ Rather unimportant
- ○ Not important at all
- ○ I don’t know

* What do you see as the added value of using a certified service provider rather than an uncertified one, or why do you think a certificate is not important?

For users without specialised knowledge, assessing the reliability and suitability (e.g. with DPP secondary legislation) of a DPP service provider can be particularly difficult. Certifications can be a means of establishing trust. On the one hand, certifications can be a means of establishing trust. On the other hand, certification is often burdensome and costly, while the DPP system should be as accessible and affordable as possible. Simple and clear rules that make both technical and economic sense should be established, and their enforcement should be conducted through market surveillance.

* In your opinion, what would be the most appropriate certification process for DPP service providers?

[1] DPP service providers would sign a self-declaration.
[2] DPP service providers would be certified by a combination of self-declaration and certification by an accredited third party based on already-existing accreditation schemes.
[3] The European Commission would be in charge of certifying DPP service providers.
[4] The European Commission would oversee the accreditation of conformity assessment bodies, which will certify DPP service providers.
[5] The certification would take the form of an accreditation – as the last level of public control in the European conformity assessment system. This would imply that the accreditation of conformity assessment bodies is overseen by national accreditation bodies.

- ◉ Self-declaration[1]
- ○ Hybrid certification process based on self-declaration and certification by an accredited third party[2]
- ○ Certification of service providers by the European Commission[3]

- ○ Certification by conformity assessment bodies + accreditation of these bodies by the European Commission[4]
- ○ Certification by conformity assessment bodies + accreditation of these bodies by Member States (national accreditation bodies)[5]
- ○ Other (please explain)

* Please explain why you consider the option you selected at the previous question to be the most appropriate.

Using a certification system similar to the Assessment and Verification System 4 (AVS 4, see CPR Annexe IX) would permit a simple certification process. Market surveillance could then exercise control over self-declared service providers to ensure trust. Such a process could offer the right balance between quality and costs of the future DPP system.

Final remarks

* Please provide any further comments or additional information here:

Glass for Europe answered this survey considering the Digital Product Passport of the EU Construction Products Regulation (which will apply ESPR principles to building glass products).

* Would you be interested in participating in a targeted consultation?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No

* Please leave your contact email

justin.loup@glassforeurope.com

Please upload any additional documents (e.g. position papers) to support your contribution to the consultation.

Only files of the type pdf,txt,doc,docx,odt,rtf are allowed

Contact

GROW-DIGITAL-PRODUCT-PASSPORT@ec.europa.eu