



**RIGHT TO  
REPAIR**



# Right to Repair Feedback on the Preparatory Study for the Setting of Horizontal Ecodesign Requirements on Repairability

Brussels, December 2025

The [Right to Repair Europe](#) coalition represents over 180 organisations from 30 European countries. It includes environmental NGOs and repair actors such as community repair groups, social economy actors, spare parts distributors, self-repairers, repair and refurbishing businesses, and any citizen who would like to advocate for their right to repair. This is a rapidly growing movement, with the objective to make repair affordable, accessible and mainstream. Browse all our member organisations by country [here](#).

## Introduction

The recent Ecodesign for Sustainable Products Regulation (ESPR)<sup>1</sup> and Directive on Common Rules Promoting the Repair of Goods (Right to repair Directive)<sup>2</sup> have paved the way for so-called horizontal requirements (i.e. applying across a wide range of products) regulating the repairability of products. As a first step in this direction, the European Commission's Joint Research Center has published a draft study report<sup>3</sup> describing a potential approach for establishing such measures. The first report mainly focuses on the scope of potential measures, offering a step-by-step approach for limiting the scope by excluding or deprioritising certain products.

<sup>1</sup> 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 (<https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2024/1781/oj>).

<sup>2</sup> Directive (EU) 2024/1799 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 June 2024 on common rules promoting the repair of goods and amending Regulation (EU) 2017/2394 and Directives (EU) 2019/771 and (EU) 2020/1828 (<https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/dir/2024/1799/oj>).

<sup>3</sup> Preparatory Study for the Setting of Horizontal Ecodesign Requirements on Repairability (<https://susproc.jrc.ec.europa.eu/product-bureau/sites/default/files/2025-10/ESPR%20Repairability%20-%20PrepStudy%20-%20Phase%20I%20%281%29.pdf>)

## Right to Repair Europe Feedback

Our feedback on the Preparatory Study for the Setting of Horizontal Ecodesign Requirements on Repairability can be found on the following pages, in the table format requested by the Joint Research Center.

Scope	Comment description	Rationale/Supporting data
General	Editorial improvements: An editorial review is recommended to correct internal inconsistencies, copy-paste errors and typos.	For example, in the smartwatches section (6.3), the paragraph under “Repair-related aspects” begins “With regards to types of failure encountered during coffee machine use...”. There are also spelling errors in technical terms (“accelometers” instead of “accelerometers”, “hear rate” instead of “heart rate”, “technical obsolence” instead of “technical obsolescence”, “caspules coffee machines” instead of “capsules coffee machines”, “non-slip feets” instead of “non-slip feet”, etc.
General	Part vs component terminology corrections: Review terms to ensure consistent use of ‘parts’ and ‘components’ in accordance with EN 4555X definitions.	TR 45550 containing definitions to support the EN 4555X series standards defines ‘part’ as a hardware, firmware or software constituent of a product (e.g. synonymous with the concept of a spare part), while the the term ‘component’ refers to hardware constituents of a product that cannot be taken apart without destruction or impairment of its intended use (e.g. the lower level elements that may form a part like capacitors or resistors). The report sometimes conflates spare parts and components (for example in Table 1 the terms ‘component-neutral’ and ‘component-specific’ when it should actually refer to parts) - this should be avoided to prevent confusion and to align with established standards and legislation.

General	<p>Improve quality of data sources: The study team should request full disaggregated data from FNAC Darty and for any other datasets used, e.g. including separate metrics for repair success rate, spare-part price ratios, parts availability and repair time. They should also improve data transparency and ensure sufficient links are provided to references and detailed documentation (e.g. for ORA, Big Repair, IPSOS, ADEME, Fnac Darty etc.)</p>	<p>The FNAC Darty barometer combines success rate, parts price and delivery time. Without transparent data, the scoring may be interpreted in a way that misrepresents actual repair potential. There is insufficient insight provided on data regarding survey questionnaires, sampling frames and data quality. Providing clearer references /links to the detailed documentation for each dataset and summarising known limitations would enable a better understanding of the robustness criterion.</p> <p>In addition to assessing repair potential and advising consumers, retailers and repairers have statutory obligations under EU consumer law and the Right to Repair Directive to prioritise repair where feasible, to provide accurate information on repair options and lead times, and to justify decisions to consumers and market surveillance authorities.</p> <p>These responsibilities cannot be fulfilled reliably without clear data on spare-part availability, repair success rates, costs and repair duration. High-quality repair data directly supports both the effectiveness of repair policies and legal compliance in the sector.</p>
General	<p>Integrate cost-of-repair considerations into the methodology: Cost-of-repair should be integrated more explicitly into the assessment (for example through better use of the spare parts price component of the FNAC Darty reparability score in the product assessment criteria and design options) and it should be indicated that Phase II will address repair cost directly through measures.</p>	<p>It was highlighted during the stakeholder meeting that the cost of spare parts and the cost of labour are major barriers to repair, yet there is no dedicated criterion on repair cost included in the methodology. Although criterion 8 references the spare part price bonus within the Fnac Darty score, the cost dimension is not systematically integrated into the prioritisation or the design options. Aggregating price and success rate masks key economic barriers.</p>

<p>Sections 1 and 2.2 (pages 7–11)</p>	<p>Clearer policy linkages: Clarify more directly the main policy objectives of the horizontal repairability requirements and directly explain at a high level how the criteria in Tasks 1 and 2 link to these objectives. Also, clarify the interaction between horizontal repairability requirements, the Directive on the Repair of Goods and existing national initiatives e.g. repair scores.</p>	<p>Although the initial part of the report provides background, it is lacking details of a clear policy objective, specifically for horizontal repairability measures that each criterion could be linked to for a stronger rationale. Further, the report does not explain which aspects of repairability will be addressed through ESPR versus the Directive on the Repair of Goods, nor how EU-level repairability scores will interact with national schemes (e.g. France). A clearer explanation would avoid confusion over potential regulatory fragmentation, particularly for retailers who must implement all legislative rules simultaneously, including other obligations under consumer sales law.</p>
<p>Section 2.1 and Table 1 (pages 9–10)</p>	<p>Clearer high level method description: ECOS broadly supports the proposed regulatory approach to combine in a single act both overarching baseline horizontal requirements and (for selected high priority products) more stringent product-specific measures. However, we believe that the proposal can go further towards a genuinely horizontal baseline covering all electronic products (mains powered or battery), consisting of: i) prohibition of parts pairing ii) access to a list of common spare parts (cables, power adapters, connectors, displays, printed circuit boards, buttons, plastic casings, etc.) iii) mandatory provision of disassembly instructions and repair manuals iv) transparent spare-part pricing and v) security updates for at least ten years. In addition, it is recommended that the methodology combining overarching and product-specific approaches is more clearly explained up front in the report,</p>	<p>Section 2.1 introduces three levels of repair provisions (overarching, general and specific) and provides examples in Table 1 but does not indicate the preferred combination of approaches. Clarifying the proposed approach and explaining why this would lead to higher ambition than purely vertical or horizontal measures would better address stakeholder concerns about ‘mini-verticals’.</p>

	and that it be justified from the viewpoint that such an approach enables greater ambition whilst ensuring optimum product coverage.	
Section 2.1, Table 1 (Page 10)	Avoid introducing non-assessable parameters: Replace the references to repair parameters/provisions that cannot be consistently assessed and are not supported by established methodologies such as "Use of component coding standards", "Compatibility with commonly available spare parts" and "modular design". References should be focused upon concrete, verifiable proxies such as those referenced in EN 45554 (e.g. type of tools, disassembly depth, types of fasteners etc) and the Indice de réparabilité (e.g. price of spare parts).	The references to non-assessable parameters are not appropriate for use as repair criterion for product-specific or horizontal measures. For example, in the case of modular design, objective assessment methods would have to be provided similar to those that exist in EN45554 for other criteria , in order to ensure a consistent, product-agnostic assessment. Reintroducing the concept of “modular design” as a notion is a backward move in scientific terms, risking subjective interpretation and inconsistent implementation, whereas referring explicitly to EN 45554 and Indice de réparabilité parameters would give the measure a clearer methodological anchor and ensure that requirements are verifiable by market surveillance authorities.
Section 2 Table 1 (Page 10)	Expand on restricting part pairing as an option to support repair: Explicitly include the prevention of part-pairing practices as a fully horizontal requirement, applicable across all products.	Part-pairing is a horizontal obstacle to repair that is increasingly present in many product groups and does not depend on the specific functionality of the product. Even where spare parts are technically available, and products are otherwise repairable, part pairing can prevent repairers from successfully installing replacement parts, or can degrade performance after repair, affecting the ability of retailers and repairers to fulfil statutory repair duties and handle warranty cases. This distorts competition between authorised and independent repairers, and leads to premature replacement. Because the underlying practice is similar across product types, a horizontal rule would be both technically feasible and high impact.

<p>Section 2.1 and Table 1 (pages 9–10) and Section 7 (Design options)</p>	<p>Ensure overarching horizontal measures do more than info: It should be stated clearly in the report that information-only measures, such as scoring and labels, must be complemented by performance-type repairability requirements as information in isolation (e.g. without spare part availability) will not be sufficient to achieve improvements in repairability.</p>	<p>Table 1 lists examples of provisions at different horizontality levels, including information requirements and performance-type requirements, but the accompanying text does not explicitly state that information-only measures are unlikely to drive repair if e.g. spare parts and ease of disassembly are not addressed. Clarifying that information measures must be accompanied by binding requirements on spare-part availability, part-pairing and disassembly would help to ensure that improvements in repairability materialise.</p>
<p>Section 1 (pages 7), Section 3 (page 14–16), Table 6, Section 4.3.6 (page 32–33) etc.</p>	<p>Clarity and consistency on B2B vs B2C product scope: We do not support the fragmented way in which B2B products are tackled within the current study. These should remain in scope of the study as this may be the only opportunity for them to be addressed by a horizontal repair initiative. Yet if the study is to include B2B products it is essential that it is done via a much more comprehensive and consistent approach than the current framing. For example, including various products mentioned in the EEB report (<a href="https://eeb.org/en/library/ict-a-to-p-horizontal-priority-in-sustainable-product-policy/">https://eeb.org/en/library/ict-a-to-p-horizontal-priority-in-sustainable-product-policy/</a>) such as network equipment (routers and switches, mobile network infrastructure and public WLAN hotspots), automated transaction &amp; service machines [ATSMs](including kiosks, ticket machines, POS, toll-related ICT and ATMs) and smart security and sensor systems, including building automation and control. If it is not possible to regulate B2B products in the same way as B2C products, their particularity should be clarified by i)</p>	<p>In the stakeholder meeting it was stated that B2B products were excluded from the scope of the analysis, yet several B2B groups are still taken through the screening and prioritisation process, which suggests that they were indeed being considered as part of scope - this supports the continued and widened inclusion of B2B products. However, if they are determined to be outside the current scope, important actions are necessary to bring the report in line with this intention. For example, in the initial product family table in Section 3, ‘Home/office network equipment’ includes office network equipment (servers, routers, switches) and ‘Other energy-related products’ includes industrial fans and professional refrigeration. This is inconsistent with the stated intention to focus on consumer products and risks giving the impression that horizontal repairability for these B2B categories is being dealt with under this initiative. It is important that if the decision is made that these are not included in scope, it is made very clear that B2B product groups are explicitly excluded from the scope, that this study only addresses the topic or repair of consumer products, and that B2B products will be</p>

	<p>establishing a clear typology for B2C, B2B and mixed-use product groups ii) explaining how mixed-use groups (such as fitness equipment and ICT) are treated and iii) clarifying how B2B products should be addressed.</p>	<p>addressed in future ESPR work. Without such clarification, policy-makers may assume that reparability for all products has been addressed, potentially leaving high-impact B2B groups unregulated.</p>
<p>Section 3 and Table 3 (pages 14-16)</p>	<p>Expand consumer product scope: The consumer product scope should be expanded and rationalised. The following scope expansions are proposed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) ovens, mini ovens etc. (see comment on Criterion 4)</li> <li>ii) electric knives (see comments on Criterion 2)</li> <li>iii) electric toothbrushes and other personal care products e.g. hair dryers (see comments on Criterion 2)</li> <li>iv) complex set-top boxes (see comments on Criterion 5)</li> <li>v) raclette makers, waffle makers, toasters, sandwich makers and electric grills should be merged</li> <li>vi) electronic sports equipment (e.g. treadmills, rowing machines)</li> <li>vii) coffee/milk frothers (included under blenders, mixers, juice makers and food processors)</li> <li>viii) robot and battery-operated vacuum cleaners, cordless hand-held and stick vacuum cleaners</li> <li>ix) smart home devices (e.g. smart speakers, thermostats, video doorbells, security cameras, smart plugs)</li> <li>x) sewing machines</li> <li>xi) portable humidifiers and dehumidifiers</li> <li>xii) portable household fans and space heaters (table/pedestal/tower fans, convector/fan heaters)</li> <li>xiii) electric blankets and heating pads</li> <li>xiv) consumer 3D printers</li> <li>xv) smart garden equipment (e.g. robot lawn-mowers, smart</li> </ul>	<p>These products are typically powered by a plug or a battery, contain significant electronic and mechanical parts, and are frequently discarded when relatively minor faults occur, often due to lack of spare parts, repair information or reasonable repair costs. Explicitly listing them would ensure that the horizontal reparability measure captures a much larger share of small consumer electronics, in line with the objective to address products that are currently not or only weakly covered by product-specific regulations, and would avoid a piecemeal scope that leaves major everyday product groups out.</p>

	<p>irrigation controllers) xvi)          consumer drones and          remote-controlled electronic toys          xvii) electric foot/body massagers          and similar personal spa devices          xviii) and other products that          were scoped out of current ESPR /          Ecodesign regulations but are still          relevant for repair          xix) musical instruments (electric          guitars and bass guitars,          keyboards, synthesisers,          electronic pedals, etc.)</p>	
<p>Section          2.2          (Assum          ptions          and          limitatio          ns,          pages          11–12)</p>	<p>Clarify the lack of trade-offs          between reliability and repair:          Bring the text of section 2.2          ("trade offs are inevitably          present") in line with the          presentation made in the          Stakeholder meeting that showed          that analysis had not identified          trade-offs. Avoid overstating          hypothetical trade-offs as a          reason to weaken repairability          requirements.</p>	<p>Section 2.2 states that “trade-offs are          inevitably present,” in particular          between reliability and repairability,          and refers to possible trade-offs with          environmental impact and energy          efficiency. However, the analysis          presented in the stakeholder meeting          did not identify concrete, quantified          trade-offs between reliability and          repairability for the product groups          assessed. Any trade-offs remain          largely qualitative and hypothetical,          often ignoring that reliability and          repairability do work together for          many manufacturers who accept to          compromise on the form factor of the          products (such as Crosscall          smartphones that are both reliable          and repairable through slightly          thicker designs).</p> <p>It should also be noted that          repairability can also contribute          positively to reliability. A          comprehensive repair support system          helps to identify real-life failure          modes that cannot always be          identified in lab tests. Manufacturers          who do not offer an actual repair          solution and rely on replacements          instead, may know failure rates but          not failure modes. On the other hand,          manufacturers who are very          repair-oriented, can use information          gained through direct repair activities          and/or repair support to improve          product reliability. For instance, an</p>

		<p>internal repair department can feed very detailed information on recurring failure modes back to R&amp;D, and spare part sales are a reliable source of information regarding parts failures only if all parts are available as spares for a price that makes repair economically feasible. In that sense, repairability directly informs reliability.</p> <p>Further, the supposed trade-off between reliability and environmental impact (e.g. using more or “heavier” material) is likely limited, because longer product lifetimes generally save material overall. We therefore recommend that Section 2.2 be brought into line with the presentation to stakeholders by (i) stating explicitly that no robust empirical trade-offs between reliability and repairability were found in this study, and (ii) clarifying that potential trade-offs with environmental impact or energy efficiency should not be assumed to outweigh the benefits of stronger repairability requirements for the products in scope.</p>
<p>Section 4.2 (Criterion 1: Product group reparability already covered by EU regulations, page 21)</p>	<p>Remove Criterion 1: As the horizontal repairability requirements should be the baseline requirements that all products should respect, it would not be fair that certain products, many of them being actually the most impactful ones, be excluded from the scope. Products already covered by ecodesign requirements should therefore remain in the scope of at least the high horizontality potential repairability requirements.</p>	<p>The fact that certain products are already covered by repairability requirements, or that they were considered for repairability requirements, is not a good enough excuse to exclude them from the scope. Eventually, the horizontal repairability requirements might end up being, at times, more stringent than certain product-specific ecodesign repairability requirements. It would be unfair, and in contradiction with sustainability objectives, to allow for derogations and less stringent rules for these product categories. For example, certain potential repairability requirements, such as those related to part-pairing, are currently only present in the regulation on mobile</p>

		<p>phones and tablets. Also, the experience of the interaction between the battery regulation (article 11 on replaceability) and the regulation on mobile phones and tablets shows that product specific requirements can soften the horizontal repairability rules in an unjustified way, as demonstrated by the data shared during the meeting showing that the energy label of smartphones demonstrated no identifiable trade-off between their repairability on one side vs their free fall reliability class and IP rating on the other side. Also, as certain products were eventually not retained for resource efficiency requirements, high-level horizontal repairability requirements might still make sense.</p>
<p>Section 4.3 (Criterion 2: Market relevance, pages 18)</p>	<p>Rethink Criterion 2 sales threshold and recognise B2C specificity of it: The 2 million-unit threshold for Criterion 2 is arbitrary depending on the way that products are defined / grouped, and could risk cutting out products that have significant impacts, such as electric running or rowing machines. If the 2 million-unit threshold for Criterion 2 is retained, to ensure the methodology is correctly applied in future work on B2B products, it should at least be clarified that i) it is specific to the B2C products analysed, ii) it should not be generalised to B2B products iii) any future work on B2B or mixed-use products would need different metrics and thresholds. It should also be based on a multi-factor model, adding weight and material intensity.</p>	<p>With a single sales cut-off threshold, low-volume but high-impact products would be unfairly excluded as the average weight of products and the varying impacts of different materials are not considered. Focusing on the number of units in a specific class also neglects the aggregated impact of the total number of appliances across different classes. For example, if the product category was "small grilling and baking appliances", instead of having "raclette makers", "waffle makers" and "sandwich makers" separate, there would be very different results. Further, such an approach goes against one of the main goals of a horizontal measure, which is to use the economy of the horizontal scale to cover multiple products that it would not otherwise be possible to address through a separate product regulation (e.g. due to low sales figures not justifying the policy cost).</p> <p>Further, such a threshold would be inappropriate if later taken as a generic scoping threshold for B2B products. Many B2B product groups</p>

		<p>have relatively low unit sales yet very high per-unit material and energy impacts and long intended lifetimes, so repairability is critical even well below 2 million units, e.g. commercial refrigeration, industrial laundry equipment, and HVAC plant.</p>
<p>Section 4.3 (Criterion 4, pages 18)</p>	<p>Abandon use-phase % impact threshold of criterion 4: Abandon the 90% “use-phase impact share” cut-off of Criterion 4 and treat use-phase-dominated products on the basis of absolute impacts and realistic repair potential instead.</p>	<p>Criterion 4 currently proposes excluding product groups for which more than 90% of life-cycle impacts occur in the use phase. This risks systematically discarding exactly those household appliances for which repairability and lifetime extension are highly relevant (for example, ovens, other cooking appliances and irons). Even if 90% of life-cycle impacts are in use, the remaining 10% can still have very high absolute material and manufacturing impacts, given the size, weight and complexity of these products. Relying only on a percentage share can mask large absolute embodied impacts and the significant savings achievable by improving repairability and lifetime extension for these products. In addition, a 90% share is not robustly comparable across different LCAs and product groups. For some products, there may be little scope for further energy-efficiency improvements, but substantial untapped potential to address repairability and durability. The 90% cut-off should therefore be abandoned and the absolute production and material-related impacts should instead be considered. Finally, the assumption that products with greater energy-use impacts than resource-use impacts do not need repairability requirements would only be defensible if it could be demonstrated that replacement with a more energy-efficient product is environmentally preferable to repair over the long term. As no energy-efficiency requirements are foreseen for the majority of these</p>

		products, there is no basis for expecting improved energy efficiency in future models.
Section 5.2 (Criterion 5) and Table 11 (pages 66–69)	Refine Criterion 5: Refine Criterion 5 as a screening criterion so that consumer and mixed-use ICT network products (set-top boxes, home network equipment, home NAS) remain in scope for horizontal repair provisions.	<p>Criterion 5 is currently used to exclude product groups where independent or end-user repair is judged “less relevant”. For consumer streaming and set-top boxes, this diagnosis largely reflects current business-model and design barriers (locked-down firmware, lack of documentation, restricted access to spare parts, strong part-pairing and data-erasure constraints) rather than any inherent unsuitability for repair. Low observed levels of independent repair are therefore not a reliable proxy for low repair potential.</p> <p>LCA evidence for consumer streaming boxes indicates that a substantial share of impacts comes from materials and production, not only from energy use. For example, an LCA for the Apple TV 4K reports approximately 62 % of impacts in production and 37 % in use. This indicates that lifetime extension for these products is relevant in its own right, and that excluding them from horizontal repair provisions would leave notable embodied impacts unaddressed.</p> <p>In practice, devices in this category are frequently replaced for commercial or software/protocol reasons (contract changes, platform migrations, loss of software support, etc.) rather than because of hardware failure. Horizontal requirements on software and firmware updates, security and compatibility support periods, and access to repair information, diagnostics and spare parts would therefore directly target these dominant drivers of premature replacement and could significantly extend service life, even where physical repair is carried out mainly by professional or OEM networks</p>

		<p>rather than by end-users themselves.</p> <p>From a system perspective, these products form part of the same home ICT ecosystem as routers, network-attached storage and similar equipment. Treating them differently at the screening stage would create arbitrary inconsistencies: consumers experience them as a single connected system, and from a technical point of view they share many of the same components, failure modes and repair barriers. Keeping all of these ICT network products in scope for overarching horizontal repair requirements would therefore improve coherence of the measure and avoid loopholes where environmental impacts are simply shifted to an unregulated device in the same chain.</p> <p>For these reasons, Criterion 5 should not operate as a hard exclusion step in the product-selection logic and consumer and mixed-use ICT network products and consumer streaming/set-top boxes should remain in scope for the horizontal repair provisions.</p>
<p>Section 5.1 (Criterion 7, page 67)</p>	<p>Rethink low purchase price as a proxy for willingness to repair: Remove references that imply that low purchase price could be used as a proxy for willingness to repair and/or to deprioritise a product group for repairability measures.</p>	<p>The report suggests that a low purchase price can serve as a proxy for willingness to repair due to low lifetime expectations (and vice versa). However, such an assumption supports a throw-away status quo that is unacceptable. The methodology should avoid assuming that low price justifies short lifetimes and instead focus on horizontal requirements that ensure durable, repairable designs overcoming current barriers (e.g. consumer repairable with affordable spare parts for low-cost segments).</p>

<p>Section 5.1 and 5.4 (Criterion 7, page 67, pages 75-76)</p>	<p>Rethink criterion 7 link to lifetime expectations: Base criterion 7 only off willingness to repair data. If lifetime expectations are to be taken into account in addition, it should be in terms of the disparity between actual product lifetime and the technically possible lifetime or consumer desired lifetime but not the expected lifetime.</p>	<p>The study uses the disparity between expected and actual lifetime as an additional proxy for willingness to repair. IPSOS and other surveys indicate that consumers expect longer product lifetimes than they experience. Table 13 shows that even product groups with low disparity - for example digital cameras (12% disparity), game consoles (16%) or electric toothbrushes (21.5%) - still show willingness-to-repair rates in the 30 to 77% range. But the correlation between the two is unclear, suggesting that this particular disparity is not a reliable or useful indicator. Since direct willingness-to-repair data exist for all the product groups concerned, it is recommended that product prioritisation is based on those figures only. If lifetime data are used, the comparison should be between the actual lifetime and either the technically achievable lifetime or consumer desired lifetime, but not the expected lifetime, which blends consumer aspirations with their acceptance of current market realities (e.g. capturing consumer resignation that a smartphone will only last 2 to 3 years rather than their desire that it can be more easily repaired to last longer).</p>
----------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Contact

Right to Repair Europe

Email: [info@repair.eu](mailto:info@repair.eu)