



Advocacy and Marketing Committee Meeting Notes.

Date: 25 November 2025

Time: 09:00 CET

Format: Hybrid meeting (in-person and online)

Location: Aparthotel Atenea, Barcelona.

Attendance

In-Person Attendees: Markus Gantenbein (Geberit), Fiona Felix (Hansgrohe), Lee Cartwright (UWLA), Timo Kopka (Laufen), Daphne Doody-Green (Bathroom Association), Mike Fox (Ikea), Anne-Claire Brunat (FECS), Judit Almunia Ruano (Roca).

Online Attendees: Paul Skinner (UWLA), Jonathan Weigand (Globus), Thomas Kempf (Oras Group), Tim Robertson (Save Water, Save Money), Martin Fries (TUV), Carly Hunt (Shower Cap), Tom Roberts (ICC), Francesca Ebaldi (Conf Industria Ceramica), Amy Kirk (Bathroom Association), Jennifer Mainwaring (Save Water, Save Money)

Welcome and Meeting Opening:

LC opened the meeting, confirmed recording for accuracy of minutes, and issued a competition compliance reminder. **LC** outlined the agenda and objectives for the session, with the priority being the new label design. **LC** reminded the group of the competition law requirements.

Purpose and Priority of Redesign:

LC emphasised that the primary objective was to gather structured feedback to develop a clear brief for the label designer. **LC** reiterated that the redesign of the Unified Water Label is the Association's most important strategic priority.

MG reinforced that the group should avoid designing the label themselves and instead define the design challenges clearly for the professional designer.

Target Audience Discussion:

JM suggested that the primary target audience should be consumers.

PS highlighted that different audiences interpret labels differently, noting the distinction between end users and professional specifiers such as architects.



FF stated that the label must serve both consumers and professional stakeholders including investors and architects referencing regulatory requirements.

Label Naming and Identity:

PS commented that “Unified Water Label” may not clearly communicate meaning to consumers and suggested referencing ISO 31600 and learning from other schemes.

LC questioned whether wording such as “Unified Water Label” should be simplified to focus more clearly on “Water Efficiency”.

FF and **MG** stressed that brand identification must remain visible, and the droplet motif should be retained in some form to preserve recognition.

Energy Reference and Regulatory Context:

TK stated that energy must remain referenced in the scheme because the original objective was to avoid a mandatory European energy label and to maintain relevance in policy discussions.

MG explained that the Energy Performance of Buildings Directive and EU taxonomy requirements require reference to energy efficiency contributions, meaning energy cannot be removed entirely from the label.

FF supported retaining energy reference but potentially with less prominence than water consumption.

Banding, Scale and Comparability:

TK expressed a preference for retaining the full performance band to show comparative positioning.

PS noted that the Australian Wells scheme shows the full range of ratings and emphasises litres per minute clearly.

TR agreed that Wells shows the full scale but observed that online listings often omit the visual label and instead reference rating in text only.



Litres per Minute Metric

FF argued that litres-per-minute values must remain on the label due to EU taxonomy and regulatory recognition requirements. This was agreed by the group that quantitative flow rate is critical for consumers comparing products.

JW noted that retail customers primarily focus on water consumption values when making quick purchasing decisions.

Droplet and Visual Icons:

PS proposed exploring droplet-based visual scaling rather than traditional coloured bars.

FF cautioned that the committee should avoid moving prematurely into design solutions and instead define requirements for the designer.

JM suggested reviewing mood board options incorporating the droplet motif directly into rating graphics.

AK confirmed that the original droplet graphic was sourced via licensed artwork and that licensing records should exist.

MG led the group discussion to produce a number of items that need to be considered by the designer and what needs to be avoided.

Avoiding Similarity to Other Labels:

FF highlighted the need to avoid resemblance to the EU Energy Label and other schemes.

Members agreed that colours must differ sufficiently while retaining intuitive red-to-green logic.

Process and Timeline:

LC proposed consolidating feedback into a structured design brief.

TR advised that the designer likely require approximately two weeks to develop refined concepts. It was agreed that draft concepts should be reviewed internally before year-end where possible.



FF confirmed the need to confirm a label launch timeline with European Commission.

Advocacy Considerations:

FF noted the importance of monitoring national labelling developments in France, the Netherlands and Malta.

LC cautioned that technical criteria intellectual property must be protected. However, **FF** reiterated the need for alignment with the UK proposed scheme to ensure reduced burden on manufacturers.

LC concluded that the redesign of the Unified Water Label remains the Association's primary strategic priority. Meeting closed.