

Question for written answer E-003133/2026
to the Commission
Rule 144
Mathilde Androuët (PfE)

Subject: Substantiated misgivings about the effectiveness of EU spending on housing energy efficiency upgrades

In a special report published on 7 July 2026, ‘Energy efficiency in residential buildings – Recovery funding has delivered only moderate energy savings’, the European Court of Auditors found that the EUR 43 billion released under the Recovery and Resilience Facility were frequently used for one-off interventions producing limited energy savings rather than truly effective global refurbishment.

These findings add to criticism expressed in the European Parliament, particularly by PfE Members, of a policy that is based on uniform targets, growing regulatory obligations and massive spending, but does not sufficiently take account of differences between building stocks, energy mixes and households’ financial resources.

In France, EU renovation standards risk putting further burdens on owners, tenants and public finances with no guarantee of commensurate results.

Can the Commission clarify:

1. Given the results observed, what is the Commission’s justification for maintaining costly obligations?
2. Does it intend to prioritise voluntary measures that target the most energy-intensive homes and provide the best value for money?
3. Does it acknowledge that the priorities for energy efficiency upgrades and choice of energy mix are primarily matters for Member States?

Submitted: 27.7.2026