
From: Jonathan Melman [JMelman@intematix.com]
Sent: Tuesday, April 06, 2010 2:42 PM
To: Baker, Alex; ENERGYSTARVerificationProgram@energystar.gov
Cc: Bruce Hilman
Subject: ENERGY STAR Enhanced Testing and Verification – Market-Based Testing Program

Hi Alex and Kathleen,

I'm listening to the call right now. I just want to chime in regarding the question on verification testing of lifetime of SSL.

Since Energy Star deals really with full product performance, it seems to make sense in my mind, that if lifetime testing will be done as part of the verification process, it should be test/verified by option 2, rather than option 1, regardless of which method the product was qualified by. 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.

I think 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.

Best regards,
Jonathan

~~~~~

Jonathan Melman, Ph.D., Program Mgmt. & Tech. Mkting.  
Intematix Corporation  
46410 Fremont Blvd., Fremont, CA 94538  
tel. +1-510-933-3313, fax +1-510-668-0793 skype jonathan.melman1 [jmelman@intematix.com](mailto:jmelman@intematix.com)