



**mouvement
écologique**

Further strengthening the right to repair – an essential lever for a more sustainable economy

Opinion on bill 8762 amending the Consumer Code and aiming to promote the repair of goods

The right to repair is an essential principle for combating the “throwaway” trend and planned obsolescence. It avoids the need to buy new items for every minor breakdown or defect, and it contributes to valuing the repair trades and to developing a more sustainable economy.

The bill submitted to the Chamber of Deputies on 8 June, i.e. a little under two months before the date of entry into force of 31 July 2026 imposed by the European Commission, is broadly a faithful transposition of Directive 2024/1799.

This transposition – although its implementation comes very late, and despite the fact that there are only a very limited number of changes compared with the directive itself – aims to promote the repair of consumer goods in a more structural way.

This text represents an important step for the right to repair. Certain consumer rights are thereby strengthened, and measures aimed at facilitating access to repair are introduced.

But it is above all very positive that manufacturers are now obliged **not to impede the repairability of devices by technical or IT means**. This highly commendable point will have to be assessed in practice: manufacturers can, through the choice of closure systems for devices, through the arrangement or design of parts, or through the use of very special screw shapes, make repair more complicated.

Yet this is precisely the point that is defined rather vaguely, both in the directive and in the bill – quote: “*Unless justified by legitimate and objective factors, the manufacturer shall not use any a) contractual clause, b) hardware or software technique that impedes the repair of goods*”. It is therefore necessary to follow very closely how this obligation is actually implemented by the manufacturer.

However, these requirements would remain without effect if, at the same time, the arrangements making repair more attractive (lead times, prices...) were not ensured.

The fact of **extending the period for establishing defects and the guarantee period** strengthens consumer rights and aligns Luxembourg with neighbouring countries, which already had longer guarantee periods. By aligning with Belgium and France in this way, the Ministry wishes to avoid creating disadvantages for local businesses, which would otherwise be less attractive to consumers compared with players in the Greater Region.

The Mouvement Ecologique considers that these various measures should be put in place as quickly as possible, in particular in combination with an incentive scheme for repair.

This bill brings a real strengthening of repair possibilities for consumers. It must be acknowledged, however, that this culture still needs to be developed in Luxembourg, while strengthening the highly commendable momentum that has developed in the 50 municipalities that have introduced a municipal repair bonus (“Reparaturbonus”) – see in this context the dedicated listing of this information on www.oekotopten.lu) and around the “repair cafés”.

Concrete measures are needed to remove existing obstacles, support the emerging momentum and encourage repair more strongly. In this context, the Mouvement Ecologique puts forward the following suggestions within the framework of this bill:

1. Luxembourg: a commitment to improving the directive is called for

The Mouvement Ecologique, like other players at European level, welcomes the directive in substance.

It does, however, have clear weaknesses that should be remedied:

- One flaw of the directive is undoubtedly the way in which online “marketplace”-type sales sites (“Marketplace”) located outside the European Union (e.g. Temu) are addressed. On these platforms, more and more products are sold at often ridiculous prices and of minor quality, barely meeting any ecological criteria. They nevertheless attract the interest of a large number of consumers. Under the provisions of the directive, importers must designate an authorised representative on the territory of the European Union. However, the text does not specify the qualifications and criteria for these representatives, which risks limiting their real usefulness.

In the commentary on the articles of this bill, the authors do refer to this problem and acknowledge that the European directive imposes no

requirement of quality, registration or transparency on the authorised representative.

For products sold via platforms by players established outside the EU, the right to repair therefore risks remaining theoretical.

The Luxembourg government should commit at European level to a revision of the directive in this respect, by requiring the designation of a local authorised representative with the capacity to fulfil the same obligations as European manufacturers.

- For the moment, the directive essentially targets large household appliances and communication devices. It is essential that the Luxembourg government commit to extending the scheme to other product categories, above all small household appliances, which can often benefit from relatively simple repairs.

2. Valuing volunteer repairers and enabling them to access repair information and spare parts

The culture of repair must not be built solely around the professional offering. Non-professional approaches – “repair cafés”, participatory workshops, mutual-aid initiatives – can play an important complementary role, both for repair itself and for the transmission of skills and the local awareness-raising that they make possible.

These approaches and initiatives, carried by civil society, therefore deserve to be supported. Analyses in various countries moreover show that such initiatives do not constitute competition for the professional sector – quite the contrary.

On the one hand, this sector cannot handle all existing requests, and on the other hand, these initiatives promote the principle of repair, which is also an advantage for the economic players concerned.

Furthermore, cooperation with repair businesses can be an interesting avenue for strengthening this awareness-raising and sharing know-how. Raising awareness of good maintenance practices, which extend the lifespan of products, is also part of the information these players pass on to their “customers”.

The Mouvement Ecologique sees, among others, the following levers for making the implementation of the bill even more effective:

- A large number of damaged electronic devices are deposited at the resource centres (centres de ressources). Some of them could still be repaired, while

other devices could potentially be a source of spare parts for repair. If consumers do not indicate that these devices are intended for reuse, they are considered waste and can no longer be reused. This should be remedied at several levels:

- On the one hand, the resource centres should be able to assume a more important role in the classification of objects as “waste” or “reusable”,
 - Collaborations with social actors should be promoted in this context;
 - And it would be worthwhile to develop links with volunteer repairers in order to recover spare parts from damaged devices that cannot be repaired, before they are classified as waste. The legal and insurance conditions for this use remain to be clarified.
 - The links between the “repair cafés” and professional repairers and craftspeople must be strengthened.
- In Germany, these initiatives were recently recognised within the framework of the transposition of the European directive. They thus have access to spare parts and repair information (which they cannot enjoy without this recognition – an aspect which, according to a study by the “Runder Tisch Reparatur”¹, could even improve the quality of repairs). It would be appropriate to study in Luxembourg the possibilities enabling “repair cafés” to access this information and spare parts, and to provide for such a possibility right now in the bill.
- As part of the awareness-raising campaigns provided for by this law, it would be worthwhile to involve the resource centres, as well as the “repair cafés”, more in raising consumer awareness. They can play a role as local relays, given their anchoring in the municipalities.

3. Investing in maintaining and developing know-how

The newly enshrined right to repair will only be able to produce its effects if the repair offering is able to meet it. However, the sector faces a succession challenge: it is necessary to value the repairer’s trade, to support initial and continuing training, and to guarantee local professionals conditions that allow them to grow rather than disappear for lack of successors or qualified labour.

It is essential to continue developing repair know-how, to support the upskilling needed for devices whose complexity is increasing with the integration of software and IT components, and to promote the production of spare parts by means of 3D printing, to cite just a few examples.

- In this sense, it would be advisable to study the possibilities for strengthening the learning of repair, both within school pathways and in adult continuing

¹ Zahlen & Fakten zur Eigenreparatur Zahlreich, aber politisch kaum beachtet: Menschen, die selbst reparieren. Runder Tisch Reparatur e.V., Open Knowledge Foundation e.V., July 2026

education. This could, for example, take the form of specific modules dedicated to repair within the vocational training of electricians. Examples already exist, e.g. bicycle repair courses within technical secondary schools.

4. Study measures to promote repair right now and introduce a national repair bonus

Article 13 of the directive requires Member States to adopt at least one measure to promote repair, which must be notified to the Commission no later than 31 July 2029.

The correlation table annexed to the bill confirms that Luxembourg intends to comply with this deadline. On this point, several examples exist among our European neighbours: Austria and France have introduced repair bonuses at national level, the latter even opting for a system financed by manufacturers through an eco-organisation as part of their extended producer responsibility.

These financial aids play a decisive role in the decision to have something repaired: by lowering the consumer's out-of-pocket cost, they act directly on the main obstacle identified, namely its cost compared with buying a new good. Such a scheme is a central lever for anchoring a genuine "culture of repair", so that low-income consumers can take full advantage of the new rights introduced by this law.

The current coexistence of municipal bonuses, welcome as it is, has limits: it represents a non-negligible administrative burden for the municipalities, which do not all have the same resources to bear it, and it produces unequal levels of aid depending on the municipality of residence – some offering no support at all.

- The Mouvement Ecologique consequently advocates the introduction of a **national repair bonus**. Centralised management would harmonise the level of aid across the territory, guarantee equal access for all residents and relieve the municipalities of this administrative burden. And commercial players would have a clear message to give to consumers, whereas at the moment they have to know the consumer's municipality of residence and the specific aid granted in that municipality. This scheme could draw on the experience already gained at municipal level in order to calibrate its arrangements. In France, a repair aid scheme financed by manufacturers has been put in place – such a model could be studied in Luxembourg to ease the burden on public finances.

Our organisation invites the government not to treat the 2029 deadline set by the directive as a floor to wait for, but to seize it as an opportunity to anticipate a measure whose usefulness is today widely demonstrated in the field.

5. Extending the super-reduced VAT rate to the repair of products

Likewise, in addition to the repair bonus, the Mouvement Ecologique argues for the application of the super-reduced rate of 3% value added tax (VAT) to repair services for certain product categories, including household appliances. This reduction would thus be another lever for strengthening the attractiveness of repair compared with buying new. The government should study the possibilities for this adaptation and commit at European level to allowing the extension of the super-reduced rate, without putting the entirety of VAT rates up for debate.

6. Clarifying certain provisions through an interpretation guide that facilitates the implementation of often vague provisions

The text of the bill is accompanied by a series of comments providing clarifications or important contextual elements to enable the understanding of the provisions it contains.

This makes it possible to give concrete form to rather vague or ambiguous wording, including the notion of the “reasonable” duration and price of repair. The commentary on the articles certainly endeavours to delimit this notion, e.g. by appealing to proportionality to the value of the good; to reference to the average market price; to the separation between the costs of parts, labour and ancillary costs; or to a requirement that the price not discourage the consumer from repairing. But these criteria remain qualitative and are left to case-by-case assessment. The commentary itself notes, citing French legal doctrine, that the interplay between free of charge and reasonable price “serves as an interpretation guide for national judges”, which amounts to admitting that the clarification of the standard is, as things stand, left to litigation.

Yet in the past, an ILRES survey showed that consumers were mainly discouraged from repairing by the price and by the fear that spare parts would not remain available over time.

For the consumer, the rather vague stipulations of the bill make it difficult to anticipate the cost of a repair and to make an informed challenge to a price deemed excessive. For professionals, it creates legal uncertainty as to the conformity of their pricing practice, with the risk, in the absence of common benchmarks, of heterogeneous prices that are difficult to justify in the eyes of consumers.

In its opinion, the Union Luxembourgeoise des Consommateurs proposed accompanying the law with an **interpretation guide**. Such a document, drawn up by the authority responsible for consumer protection in consultation with stakeholders (professional chambers, consumer associations), would make it possible to explain in a very practical and concrete way the choices made by the legislator and to offer

concrete benchmarks – for example an indicative ratio between the price of the repair and the price of the equivalent new good, along the lines of the logic used in the French repairability index. Such a guide does not need to be binding to fulfil its function: it is enough that it guides practice and reduces the number of situations requiring judicial arbitration.

This type of document would also make it possible, through its updating, to make visible the changes linked to the integration of new product categories. The current scheme in fact provides for an “automatic transposition”, by referring to the annexes of the directive.

7. Anchoring the monitoring and evaluation of the scheme in the law to allow for adjustments

Given the novelty of the approach and the persistent vagueness regarding reasonable prices, the transposition must be directly accompanied by a **monitoring and evaluation mechanism**, provided for in the law. This guide is indeed of capital importance for ensuring efficient implementation of this law, and its preparation should not cause any problem (it should be recalled that the implementation of this law should have taken place in July of this year).

It would involve collecting, in cooperation with the Luxembourg Institute of Standardisation, Accreditation, Safety and Quality of Products and Services (ILNAS), on a regular basis, data on the prices actually charged for repairs and spare parts falling within the scope of the law, as well as on consumer behaviour in the face of these prices – actual recourse to repair, reasons for giving up, possible differences between regions or categories of goods. Such monitoring is of twofold interest: in the short term, it makes it possible to verify whether the notion of reasonable price in fact produces the incentive effect sought by the directive, and in the medium term, it provides a solid factual basis for considering, where appropriate, a legal or regulatory revision or clarification of the notion – rather than having to rely, in the absence of such a basis, on scattered case law that comes after the facts.

- We therefore recommend that the law, or at the very least the preparatory work accompanying its adoption, explicitly provide for the establishment of these two mechanisms, rather than leaving their possible creation to a future and uncertain initiative.

8. Strengthening awareness-raising among consumers and repair stakeholders over the long term

The change of reflex targeted by the directive – substituting repair for systematic replacement – cannot be achieved by the regulatory route alone. It requires sustained awareness-raising work over time.

- In this regard, the Mouvement Ecologique welcomes the awareness-raising action planned for the autumn of this year, but it cannot be an end point: to produce a lasting effect on consumption habits, it should form part of a repeated and continuous approach, driven by regular communication, and above all rely on concrete levers that make repair tangibly more accessible – first and foremost the national repair bonus mentioned above.

One axis of awareness-raising also concerns consumers' proper understanding of the information available to them on labels.

For example, the European energy label applicable since 2025 to smartphones and tablets (ecodesign regulation (EU) 2023/1670) gives, beyond energy efficiency, indications on the repairability class (from A to E), battery endurance, resistance to drops and protection against ingress, thereby enabling consumers to favour more durable products. The EU plans to gradually extend these new indicators to other product categories. This information is often “drowned” in the mass of information with which consumers are confronted – an awareness-raising campaign should therefore draw attention to these elements and help ensure they are properly understood.

- To this end, the Mouvement Ecologique invites the Government to integrate this information into its awareness-raising campaign and to rely on the “Oekotopten.lu” portal to support consumers.

Conclusion

This bill constitutes a faithful and, on certain points, solid transposition of the directive. But a legal framework is not enough on its own to change consumption habits: its effectiveness will depend on the tools that accompany it, which are currently still largely absent from the text.

The Mouvement Ecologique therefore calls on the government not to limit itself to the compliance exercise imposed by the European Commission, but to anticipate right now the measures that will make it a text that brings about real change: the introduction of a national repair bonus without waiting for the 2029 deadline, support for citizen initiatives, and the valuing of the know-how of local repairers. Continued investment in awareness-raising and the publication of an interpretation guide represent a useful complement aimed at supporting stakeholders in achieving compliance with the legal framework. It is also essential to anchor the monitoring and evaluation of impacts in the law. It is on these conditions that the right to repair will be able to truly take root in consumers' everyday lives.

06.10.2026