

PART A: TO BE FILLED IN BY THE APPLICANT

Title Proposed work item (Max 5 keywords) Effective classification/borderline resolution procedure								
CMC-Board History (list of references of all relevant communication to/from CMC-Board concerning this work item)								
Letter from A.Perez (Commission/ Member of the Borderline-Classification Group) of April 5, 2011 suggesting a willingness to amend the system used for the resolution of classification and borderline issues.								
Applicant								
> Applica	nt member	of CMC						
☐ AT	ВЕ	BG	СН	CY	☐ CZ	☐ DE	DK	□ EE
☐ ES	☐ FI	FR	GR	HR	HU	☐ IE	□IS	□IT
LI	LT	LU	LV	MT	□NL	□NO	☐ PL	☐ PT
RO	☐ SE	□ SI	SK	☐ TR	⊠ UK	☐ EC		
> Applicant not within CMC-members								
☐ Working Group Name WG:								
Other: Name Organisat		Organisati	on:					
Address:								
Contact 1	person:							
Telephone No:		F	Fax No:					
E-mail: Date: 30 May 2011								

Proposed work item

Given the length of time currently taken to resolve classification and borderline issues, it is proposed to review each stage of the current system to identify areas that could be rationalised, or subjected to greater discipline, in order to streamline the entire process. Any suggestions accepted by the CMC will then need to be negotiated and agreed with the Classification and Borderline Working Group

Rationale for application

The current system is unreasonably lengthy and does not always arrive at agreed positions leaving both Member States and industry uncertain of the correct designation of specific products. This undermines the operation of the single market and confidence in the devices regulatory system.

Arguments pro and against NWI

Supporting information (Working Groups, CAMD, etc.)

Is there a consensus among Member States?

What are the main reasons of lack of consensus?

In favour of the proposal is the widespread belief that the current system is unwieldy, slow and frequently fails to find an acceptable answer to a specific question. Against the proposal are the facts that any revised scheme could only be introduced with the agreement of the Commission and the Classification and Borderline Working Group and that, that group itself, is supposed to be looking at changing its procedures at its September meeting.

Action/Decision proposed by applicant

To review the current system for determining classification and borderline issues and make recommendations to improve it.

Proposal for the lead official:

Steve Owen, UK

Supporting information (Working Groups, CAMD, etc.)

+ History of discussion: provide here the list of hyperlinks to relevant documents (eg. CIRCA)

•

PART B: TO BE FILLED IN BY THE CMC-BOARD

Proposed work item	Within scope of CMC? Is Proposal mature for CMC? Recommendations:	Yes Yes Yes ✓ Xes ✓ Xes X	☐ No
Rationale for application	Description complete? Recommendations:	⊠ Yes	No
Arguments pro and against NWI Supporting information (Working Groups, CAMD, etc.) Is there a consensus among MS? What are the main reasons of lack of consensus?	Description complete? Recommendations:	⊠ Yes	No
Proposal for the lead official	Accepted? Proposed alternative candidate:	⊠ Yes	No
Supporting information (Working Groups, CAMD, etc.) + History: provide here the list of links to relevant documents (eg. CIRCA)	Documentation complete? Recommendations:	⊠ Yes	□ No

PART C: RECOMMENDATION FROM CMC-BOARD TO CMC

CMC meeting date	7 June 2011	
CMC meeting agenda item	9a	
Transfer to CMC meeting	□ For consideration	
	☐ For appointment of the lead official	
	☐ For allocation of work	
	☐ For decision	
Action/Decision proposed		
Acceptance of NWI		
Proposal for the lead official:		
Steve Owen		
Proposal for the allocation of potentially necessary additional preparatory work:		
Small working group CMC an	d MDEG WG Borderline and classification	
Proposed work planning and	I timing to output:	
CMC meeting Spring 2012		
Conclusion of the CMC-Board CMC should accept the NWI		
Date:		

PART D: OUTCOME OF THE CMC MEETING

Agreed next steps (if applicab	ole)				
Date:					
Voting by the CMC					
Voting system	simple majority				
	qualified majority				
Vote taken on proposed decision:	copy in this box the full wording of the proposed decision				
Outcome of the voting:	cast votes:				
	minimum number of cast votes required: 18				
	voting results: YES				
	ABSTENTION				
	NO				
	proposed decision accepted YES				
	□ NO				
Action to implement the deci	ision				
Date:					

PART E: FOLLOW-UP OF THE CMC DECISION

Status of the action of the implementation					
Date:					