

EPA ENERGY STAR Comments Matrix: Summary of Comments on the Enhanced Testing and Verification Conference Calls, March 26 to April 6, 2010

Index	Key Issue	Theme	Comment	Response
1	Certification Bodies	Accreditation	NSF recommends that the EPA require any certification body participating in the ENERGY STAR program be accredited by a recognized accreditation body, such as SCC (Standards Council of Canada).	EPA is developing requirements for certification bodies and will likely require accreditation to ISO/IEC 65.
2	Certification Bodies	Applicability	EPA should confirm that third-party certification is not appropriate and should not be required as an ENERGY STAR requirement for qualification of electronic products.	While EPA is not planning to propose the same verification requirements for electronics products as for products such as appliances, upfront certification by a third-party will be required in order to validate the energy efficiency of these products prior to qualification.
3	Certification Bodies	Challenge Testing	Challenge testing could lead to abuse without strict guidelines. Challenges should be handled by a third-party and the costs should be borne by the losing party. EPA will need to develop an arbitration process.	EPA is planning to develop general guidelines for challenge testing; however, each third-party certification and verification program will need to develop an acceptable detailed challenge testing plan appropriate for the products covered by their program.
4	Certification Bodies	Challenge Testing	Challenge testing should be included in the ENERGY STAR standard in place of mandatory verification every three years.	While it is important to provide a forum for one manufacturer to challenge the testing results of another manufacturer, it is important at this stage in the program to go beyond this.
5	Certification Bodies	Cost	As costs rise for ENERGY STAR products due to increased certification and maintenance costs, end users may opt to purchase non-ENERGY STAR listed units as the energy savings will not offset the additional cost, defeating the purpose of ENERGY STAR's mission to conserve energy and water.	The increased testing requirements are being introduced in order to preserve the integrity of the ENERGY STAR label and provide end-users with confidence that products are providing actual savings.
6	Certification Bodies	Existing Programs	EPA should not mandate requirements that go beyond those already in place with existing programs. Requiring all models to be tested in a third-party accredited laboratory is not appropriate and not necessary for all products.	EPA is open to allowing in-house testing for initial qualification; however, requiring testing in accredited laboratories is important in ensuring the validity of that test data.
7	Certification Bodies	Existing Programs	The EPA proposed audit and challenge processes would utilize physical validation testing of custom-built production windows. This is out of alignment with the NFRC process which utilizes computer-based thermal simulations on standard sizes to derive thermal properties for labeling and is validated with a physical unit to a gateway size. Reconciling lab results from physical tests with the thermally-simulated values would represent a challenge.	EPA is working with NFRC to determine an appropriate audit and challenge process that would verify the energy ratings for windows.

8	Certification Bodies	Existing Programs	Several organizations and companies support the use of certification bodies. The most effective and reasonable method to conduct verification testing is to utilize existing third-party auditors such as UL, ETL, NSF International, etc.	EPA is planning to work with existing third-party auditors to conduct verification testing.
9	Certification Bodies	Existing Programs	Manufacturers can save money by bundling the third-party certification services currently provided. Conducting energy efficiency testing concurrently with the testing we are already doing on a product will result in time and cost savings. This testing can be performed in our laboratory or at the manufacturer's facility during witness testing.	It is EPA's intent to leverage existing programs for certification and testing.
10	Certification Bodies	Requirements	EPA should have more than one "non" membership reporting organization serve as a certification body. Any EPA recognized ENERGY STAR certification/verification program must be open to non-members on a non-discriminatory basis.	EPA is planning to call for certification bodies to not require membership as a prerequisite for product certification. In addition, EPA is developing an open approach that would allow more than one certification body per product category.
11	Certification Bodies	Requirements	Existing ENERGY STAR qualified equipment should remain in the program until the verification program has been fully implemented. At that time, these products will be placed into the verification program and reviewed as part of the five year audit cycle.	EPA is working to establish certification and verification program requirements for existing ENERGY STAR products that take into account, on a category-by-category basis, any pending specification changes.
12	Certification Bodies	Requirements	Units that have been submitted to ENERGY STAR by manufacturers while participating in an existing verification program should not have to be retested. This data has already been validated by the program administrator.	Manufacturers who are participating in existing verification programs that are recognized under the enhanced testing and verification requirements will not need to be retested. However, EPA may require updated submissions that include certification documentation from those programs.
13	Certification Bodies	Third-Party	We strongly believe product certification should be administered by reputable third-party entities to ensure the integrity and credibility of the various industry programs.	EPA is developing requirements for third-parties administering certification programs.
14	Certification Bodies	Third-Party Administrator	By specifying ISO/IEC 17025 accreditation the EPA has established clear and consistent criteria for the laboratories performing the ENERGY STAR qualification tests. The same clarity and consistency is conspicuously missing in EPA's establishment of criteria for the certification and verification program administrators. In most cases, the accreditation bodies recognized to offer laboratory 17025 accreditation also offer ISO/IEC 17020 and ISO/IEC Guide 65 accreditation programs for inspection and certification agencies (respectively). Reference to these standards and accreditation programs is essential to the establishment of clear and consistent administration of the EPA's Verification Program. The qualifications for Program Administrators indicated in the EPA's 3/29 presentation are a small subset of the qualifications established by 17020 and Guide 65.	EPA is considering the appropriate requirements for certification and verification programs, including accreditation to ISO/IEC 65.

15	Certification Bodies	Third-Party Administrator	It is important that the third-party administrator not be permitted to: 1) require a partner to put additional markings on their product; 2) require a partner to obtain other services beyond that required to fulfill the ENERGY STAR specification; 3) require a partner to obtain ENERGY STAR testing services when contracting for other services the administrator may offer.	In order to leverage existing certification programs that are filling other needs of manufacturers, EPA does not plan to restrict programs that introduce requirements beyond those stipulated by the ENERGY STAR program.
16	General	Enforcement	Money seems to be the driving factor in deterring abuse of the ENERGY STAR label. Falsification of data for purposes of obtaining ENERGY STAR certification should be considered a finable offense.	Intentionally submitting false information to the U.S. government is a criminal violation of the False Statements Act, Title 18 U.S.C. section 1001. This Federal law authorizes both fines and imprisonment for knowingly submitting falsified information to the Federal Government.
17	General	Specification Requirements	Department of Energy (DOE) Rules provide for the use of DOE approved alternative rating methods based on computer simulation for determining the energy consumption of central air conditioners and heat pumps, in lieu of laboratory testing. The enhanced testing and verification procedures should not in any way alter or limit the Rules established by DOE relating to the use of alternative rating methods.	The purpose of the enhanced testing and verification requirements is not to change the specification requirements. Rather, it is to ensure that the products are being tested properly when qualified and that there is ongoing verification of these products to ensure that they continue to meet the ENERGY STAR specification requirements.
18	General	Specification Requirements	Producers of roof coatings have a vast number of raw materials from which to choose. Changes in raw materials that do not change performance are acceptable to remain "labeled" without new testing. Correct?	
19	General	Specification Requirements	Commercial warewashing equipment is tested for water consumption by NSF and the additional testing for idle energy usage becomes an overbearing cost. Developing data logging requirements and submission of these computer generated results along with a calibration certification should suffice for verification of idle energy usage.	
20	Labs	Accreditation	Create a test laboratory qualification process that will ensure consistent and verifiable results from any qualified test laboratory. Accreditation should mean accreditation to ISO/IEC 17025 by an approved Accreditation Body. It is critical that the accreditation to ISO 17025 include the specific standards or test procedures in the ENERGY STAR requirements that the lab would be testing to.	To ensure consistent and verifiable results, EPA is planning to require all testing in labs that have been accredited to ISO/IEC 17025 and to require that the specific test procedures in the ENERGY STAR requirements be included in the scope of accreditation.
21	Labs	Accreditation	Although the expense associated with accreditation is accepted as a cost of doing business in our industry, there is the possibility of endless audits by accreditors and ever increasing accreditation costs, related to the publication of revised requirements, especially when revisions may have no bearing on the actual testing requirements or product performance.	The goal of including the specific test procedures in the accreditation requirements is to ensure that the laboratories are technically competent at conducting the tests based on the current ENERGY STAR requirements. EPA is only planning to require labs to update their scopes of accreditation to the extent that the existing scopes do not adequately reflect their ability to carry out testing based on the current ENERGY STAR requirements.

22	Labs	Accreditation	<p>All testing done in these programs shall be done by accredited test laboratories with the appropriate test method standards in their scope of accreditation. Retain the practice that allows either independent or manufacturer's accredited test laboratories to conduct qualification testing. This has worked well for the lighting programs while limiting cost to manufacturers.</p> <p>Accreditation should use Accreditation Bodies (ABs) who are full member signatories of the International Laboratory Accreditation Council Mutual Recognition Agreement (ILAC-MRA) in order to be qualified to submit ENERGY STAR qualification data to the EPA and DOE. A product Verification Program could be responsible for initial test reports analysis, certification of the product to ENERGY STAR, and ongoing market surveillance.</p>	<p>The draft requirements for Accreditation Bodies and the draft requirements for Laboratories are consistent with these recommendations.</p>
23	Labs	Accreditation	<p>Three labs are EPA-recognized to perform ENERGY STAR testing on ceiling fans. Therefore, third-party accreditation is unnecessary, especially if the three labs conduct annual round robin testing to ensure correlation between the labs.</p>	<p>The current approach for recognizing laboratories under the ceiling fan program is not appropriate to expand across the suite of ENERGY STAR products. Relying on accreditation bodies combined with round robin testing for all labs conducting ENERGY STAR testing will provide a consistent approach for ensuring that labs are capable of conducting testing.</p>
24	Labs	Capacity	<p>Our experience tells us that there are not enough accredited laboratories to handle energy performance testing of all new products.</p>	<p>EPA recognizes that there are few labs now that are accredited for purposes of energy efficiency testing. However, there are many labs that have recently expressed interest to EPA in obtaining accreditation or adding ENERGY STAR testing to their scopes of accreditation. Also, the ability to build on the existing infrastructure of labs that conduct safety testing will largely address this concern.</p>
25	Labs	Capacity	<p>ISO 17025 accredited Certification testing should be phased in over a minimum 1 year period to prepare new lab accreditation. EPA should consider third-party programs (such as AHAM) to conduct verification testing. Additional guidance on the implementation of this program and how it will dovetail with existing DOE and FTC reporting requirements is needed.</p>	<p>EPA recognizes the need to allow time for labs to obtain accreditation and is balancing that consideration with the need to provide assurance that testing is being conducted in accredited labs. EPA is planning to require all testing in accredited labs by the end of 2010. If labs are not able to secure their accreditations in a timely manner, EPA may develop interim measures for recognizing labs. The lab requirements being proposed are for ENERGY STAR qualification and are currently not linked to the DOE or FTC reporting requirements.</p>

26	Labs	In-house Labs	Existing product certification programs allow manufacturers to develop performance ratings on the basis of internal testing, but include random audit testing by an ISO 17025 accredited third-party lab to ensure compliance. These labs are described as supervised manufacturers test facilities by the Standards Council of Canada. For example, UL, CSA and ETL have data acceptance and lab testing verification programs for energy efficiency verification and data submittal to regulatory bodies. These agencies have a long history in the use of these programs for safety standards, and the same rigor and quality control can be expected to be applied in the case of energy ratings. Witness testing at the manufacturer's lab facilities involves the use of an accredited third-party to oversee the testing and provide for independent verification of performance and the proper use of the applicable test and performance standards.	EPA believes it is important to work directly with accredited laboratories to ensure that testing is being conducted properly and consistently across all labs. Further, the data provided by manufacturers should come from an impartial source. Accreditation to ISO 17025 can provide both of these assurances. It is EPA's understanding that the data acceptance programs administered by third-party independent labs do not serve as an actual accreditation of these labs, as the third-party labs are not accreditation bodies. EPA will consider the appropriate use of witness testing for verification testing purposes to the extent that the lab is accredited to ISO 17025.
27	Labs	In-house Labs	EPA should allow for the use of independent, in-house laboratories for qualification and verification testing. Consumer confidence in the ENERGY STAR label can be achieved through a more cost efficient process that involves the use of existing accredited manufacturer labs, coupled with a robust verification process.  Testing can be performed in in-house labs with witnesses. Manufacturers not participating in a Test Data Acceptance Program, of which there are many, should be allowed to utilize their "in-house" laboratory if the evaluation is witnessed by a qualified engineer.	EPA is planning to allow for the use of accredited in-house labs for purposes of qualification testing to the extent that they meet the lab requirements for testing ENERGY STAR products. EPA does not believe it is appropriate to use an in-house lab for verification testing, but will consider the option of witness testing for select product categories.
28	Labs	International	Testing outside of the United States should be considered / enabled. This gives manufacturers the chance to design for ENERGY STAR compliance without the extra burden of inter-continental sample shipment for testing.	The draft lab requirements make use of an international accreditation scheme and do not require testing in the United States.
29	Labs	Third-Party	Testing must be done by an approved Independent Third-Party Laboratory to insure the integrity and defensibility of the program. Verification testing must include testing at competent third-party laboratories familiar with the nuances of the products being tested. Accredited Verification Labs should be trained and accredited only for specific product segments to allow for a better understanding of the products they are verifying. ENERGY STAR should create a verification committee for each Industry Segment to create guidelines for third-party accredited verification labs.	EPA is planning to require testing by recognized third-party accredited labs for the purposes of verification testing. Specific lab requirements are being proposed that address the issues noted. For initial qualification of products, EPA is planning to allow for the use of in-house labs, but only to the extent that they are accredited and recognized by EPA to conduct testing for specific ENERGY STAR products.
30	Qualification Testing	Data Confidentiality	ENERGY STAR must negotiate and establish robust processes to ensure that the EPA and its contractors protect the confidential information that the EPA is now mandating from OEMs prior to product announcement is kept confidential.	EPA is considering the appropriate way to address manufacturers concerns about confidential information. Third party certification may be the most appropriate approach for both protecting confidential information and validating the performance of ENERGY STAR products.

31	Reporting	Data Access	Once final, all data should be made publicly available in order to demonstrate the rigorous testing and rebuild credibility in the program.	With respect to verification testing, EPA intends to make information available publicly on the total number of products tested and information on any products that failed to meet ENERGY STAR requirements. However, EPA does not think it is appropriate to make information public on specific units that pass ENERGY STAR testing in order to avoid providing products an unfair competitive advantage in the market due to incentives solely specifying products tested and passing verification tests.
32	Testing	Cost	For SSL bulbs, the cost is onerous and definitely slanted towards large companies, esp. legacy light bulb companies which can do their own certification once their in-house testing labs have been "certified." It will cost at least \$4500 per bulb to get it certified for ENERGY STAR from one of the prescribed labs in the US. On top of that it requires submission of 28 samples which can add an additional \$170 to \$8000 (at our cost) to the cost of the testing charge. This \$4500 plus 28 samples is for each bulb, and where a "family" has 3 different beam patterns and two different colors (CCT) this is multiplied by 6.	While EPA is sensitive to the costs associated with testing, it is also important that products are tested properly and provide the performance and energy savings associated with the ENERGY STAR label.
33	Testing	Cost	We are concerned that the associated fees, not the product performance requirements of the ENERGY STAR program, will force out long-standing, current partners, or keep new manufacturers from participating. Due to increased costs of third-party testing and annual re-verification, manufacturers may limit the models included in ENERGY STAR.	
34	Testing	Cost	Increased burden on cost of product due to freight, exportation, importation taxes for ENERGY STAR qualification – Additional testing fees for certifications will need to be amortized over the lifetime of product, leading to increased costs to OEM.	
35	Testing	Cost	A majority of our currently accredited laboratories, which would likely be considered third-party laboratories under the presented program ideas, would suffer little to no cost increases for the expansion to their scope of accreditation. Manufacturers who seek to have their "in-house" labs accredited will likely see an offset in costs between the costs associated with the accreditation process and sending their products to a third-party lab for testing	

36	Testing	Cost	In general, we believe that ENERGY STAR Partners have been exemplary in their conduct and do not require the oversight and attendant expense associated with the proposed enhanced testing and verification program. We believe this fundamentally alters the “partner” status of the participating manufacturers and, for our members’ products, adds no value to the ENERGY STAR mark. Continuing with the established practice of product qualification in manufacturers’ or third-party facility – per manufacturer preference and with or without accreditation and/or witness – provides the best opportunity for the industry to continue to help the agencies achieve both purposes.	
37	Testing	Qualification Testing	Manufacturers are already burdened by extensive product labeling requirements in the partnership agreement. It is not possible to satisfy these requirements and wait on ENERGY STAR approval to start labeling products, literature, and packaging. To avoid delays, third parties that perform testing should have authority to allow manufacturers to apply the ENERGY STAR logo based on their own assessment.	EPA is considering the use of third-parties to certify products for ENERGY STAR, addressing the concerns around time-to-market.
38	Testing	Qualification Testing	ENERGY STAR needs to quickly identify what will happen to existing products which are rated. Will they need to be re-rated? By the same procedure as new products? What about 3 year aging for roofing products, especially if manufacturers can no longer supply material of that age? This will be a more pressing issue than registering new products with the new program.	EPA is developing a timeline for requiring retesting of products. Once all the enhanced testing and verification requirements are finalized, EPA will need to ensure they are implemented as quickly as possible to provide consistent testing across all ENERGY STAR qualified products.
39	Testing	Qualification Testing	There is no objective evidence that the current system of self-certification for food service equipment or consumer electronics is being compromised. The GAO report that was cited as the reason for the recent suspension did not provide any objective evidence of a manufacturer fraudulently approving a product. It merely confirmed the obvious – that the system can be defeated with willful intent. When problem-solving methods are used to evaluate the non-conformances cited in the report, the root cause analysis would point squarely to the EPA enforced qualification process. In order to prevent a reoccurrence of the non-conformance, the burden of responsibility should fall on EPA and the qualification process rather than manufacturers.	EPA is introducing a number of new requirements to prevent fraud and raise consumer confidence by ensuring that testing for ENERGY STAR is conducted in recognized, accredited labs. In addition, EPA is modifying the qualification process to prevent the qualification of products that do not meet ENERGY STAR requirements.
40	Verification Programs	Data Confidentiality	The submission of distribution channels and vendors is considered “Confidential Business Information” and potentially interferes with free trade and contracting practices.	The purpose of submitting distribution channels and vendors is to provide access to models for purposes of conducting verification testing. EPA will consider the issue of confidentiality when proposing this specific requirement.
41	Verification Programs	Data Confidentiality	As a part of the verification program the partner should have an agreement with the program administrator that will provide for the confidentiality of information. The program administrator shall not be allowed to provide details of its client’s design other than that required by the ENERGY STAR specification.	EPA is not planning to collect information from third-party administrators beyond what is required through the ENERGY STAR specification.

42	Verification Programs	Dispute Resolution	Any CE Standard Operating Procedure for Product Failure and Dispute Resolution must consider the issue of "outlier" products.	EPA is planning to have one process for dispute resolution across all product categories. The issue of "outlier" products should be addressed through the product specifications rather than through the dispute resolution process.
43	Verification Programs	Third-Party Administrator	The third-party administrator should not be itself a testing laboratory. There have been instances in earlier government programs where the administrative company has been a provider of testing services. This has resulted in stifled competition and the effective elimination of other laboratories from the program, even though this may have been unintentional. This can be counter-productive to the government efforts for numerous reasons.	There are a number of considerations EPA will follow when selecting a third-party certifier. EPA intends to allow for multiple third-party certifiers for each product category and does not believe that organizations with testing labs should necessarily be excluded from performing the role of third-party certifier so long as they meet the other requirements stipulated by EPA.
44	Verification Programs	Verification Testing	Verification testing must include procurement on the open market.	EPA will include a requirement that products be obtained from the open market as a first option for verification testing.
45	Verification Programs	Verification Testing	It is strongly urged that ENERGY STAR consider a spot checking effort when it comes to conducting follow-up evaluation on ENERGY STAR approved chargers. Spot check follow-up inspections have been used for years with NRTL approved testing houses and this technique has proven to be very successful in ensuring public safety.	The approach for verifying the energy performance of products will consider the appropriate frequency of testing based on product-specific issues.
46	Verification Programs	Verification Testing	The requirement for testing of listed models as part of the verification process is of concern. The cost of verification of certain custom-built products to the current test methods is very expensive and since these pieces of equipment are not off-the-shelf type items a special unit would be required for this type of testing. Once the testing is complete the unit may not be sold because the unit will no longer be considered new. As currently proposed, each unit would be defined as its own model necessitating its own verification testing. This will only multiply the cost burden to the manufacturer which in the long term has to be passed on to the consumer.	EPA will consider the cost of testing for verification testing purposes on a product-specific basis, including the appropriate role of witness testing.
47	Verification Programs	Verification Testing	Selection of model for verification should be based on a five-year cyclical rotation method when the model has not undergone any significant design revisions that may affect its performance. The administrator of verification testing should be authorized to waive a verification test if no unit changes were made impacting energy efficiency from the time of the original ENERGY STAR program approval. Current verification programs consists of periodic, detailed audits of the manufacturer's production line using a documentation report with details of the components critical to the initial performance test results.	EPA will consider the appropriateness of verification testing that monitors the design and construction of a product rather than retesting the energy consumption of a product.
48	Verification Programs	Verification Testing	The requirement for verification testing of all certified products within a three-year cycle would add to the ongoing financial burden to manufacturers and overload of recognized labs. This testing frequency may not be feasible for all product types.	EPA will consider the amount of testing that is appropriate for each product category and plans to build in requirements for additional testing either for a manufacturer or for a product category in the case of product failures.

49	Verification Programs	Verification Testing	Products to be tested should be procured on the open market for verification and challenge testing. Independently procuring the products ensures that the consumer can expect the purchased performance with any product selected.	Independent procurement of models for verification testing will be the preferred approach to ensure that the products consumers are buying off the shelf are continuing to deliver the expected energy savings.
50	Verification Programs	Verification Testing	Verification should be able to be completed through a combination of random spot checking and review of the manufacturer's facility by a third-party technical agent using design and construction documents of the original qualification.	EPA will consider the appropriateness of verification testing that monitors the design and construction of a product rather than retesting the energy consumption of a product.
51	Verification Programs	Verification Testing	A number of our products are large, expensive and may not be readily available "off-the-shelf," and are built to order. It will be difficult to obtain these products on the market, as they are generally not tracked to their final destination; rather, they are shipped to Third Party Distributors, such as Contractors, Dealers and Design Consultants. Commercial food service equipment manufacturers rarely sell directly to the end user.	EPA plans to build in alternate ways for verification programs to obtain samples for products that are not readily available on the open market.
52	Verification Programs	Verification Testing	EPA needs to anticipate the best way to collect a verification sample from any company that offers their products directly to customers. Products are sold direct to owners and/or contractors. Consequently, contractors do not carry inventory of any additional product. The Cool Roof Rating Council had the same issue when in trying to conduct verification testing on Roof Coating products in the CRRC Random Sampling Program. The CRRC resolved the verification issue by working with Underwriters Laboratories to collect certified product from inventory of the manufacturer, rather than from distributors or retail.	
53	Verification Programs	Verification Testing	Verification testing is unnecessary, and does not justify the expense and efforts.	There are a number of factors that indicate verification testing is necessary and important to maintain the integrity of the ENERGY STAR program. These factors are articulated in the March 26th EPA presentation on enhanced testing and verification.
54	Verification Programs	Verification Testing	Drawing on retail sampling for enhanced validation would be inefficient and wasteful of resources, including energy, and may harm consumer confidence in the ENERGY STAR brand itself. Instead, enhanced validation should occur as early as possible in the manufacture/distribution process and should follow the well-formed path now used by safety certification agencies such as UL.	EPA agrees that it is important to test products early in the manufacture/distribution process for purposes of qualifying products; however, it is also important to ensure that the products consumers are buying off the shelf are continuing to deliver the same energy savings.

55	Verification Programs	Verification Testing	<p>EPA ENERGY STAR's requirement for three year aged data for roofing products before having a product listed must be addressed immediately within the current set of revisions. The continuous retesting of all certified products at least every three years is unreasonable for roofing products.</p> <p>For Solid State Lighting verification, lifetime testing should be test/verified by option 2, rather than option 1, regardless of which method was used to qualify the product. Option 2 is closer to real world performance, option 1 exists to enable reasonable deployment of LEDs into multiple fixtures without having to design the fixture and THEN test it for 9 months. This also works out from a cost/effort standpoint - 1 sample tested at ambient T rather than 30 LED Arrays or 75 single chip LEDs running at 3 different temperatures.</p>	EPA will consider the best way to retest and verify the energy performance of products where long test durations are a concern.
56	Verification Programs	Verification Testing	For product models (STBs) where there is no new manufacturing for that model, it will continue to receive software upgrades that could impact its energy consumption. How will on-going software updates for such a product factor in to on-going periodic verification given that the hardware is no longer being manufactured?	In the case of set-top boxes, products must continue to meet the ENERGY STAR performance requirements in place when the product was manufactured regardless of software updates. EPA will give special consideration to the appropriate verification approach for products, such as STBs, which are covered under a service provider agreement.
57	Verification Programs	Verification Testing - Number of Units	Verification shall be limited to the lesser of a) 5 products per manufacturer per year per product category (i.e., 5 imaging equipment models, 5 TVs, etc.) b) A verification cost cap negotiated between the Industry Segment and the EPA.	EPA will consider the appropriate frequency for testing at a product category level, weighing considerations such as cost and compliance.