

June 25, 2010

Seiko-Epson comments on:

**Conditions and Criteria for Recognition of Certification Bodies for the
ENERGY STAR® Program**

DRAFT

1. Please consider not using Certification Bodies for the proposed Enhanced Verification process. Or, if necessary, implement Certification Bodies selectively as a punitive measure against companies that use duplicity to certify nonqualified products.

<Reasons>

- Certification Bodies (CBs) would add significantly to the cost of the qualification and verification system.
- CBs would be an extra layer separating manufacturers, verification labs and the EPA.
- The important processes the CBs will undertake, i.e.: verifying partnership agreements, reviewing label plans, administering verification requests, etc., should continue to be handled by the EPA. Using a third-party for these critical tasks could have a negative effect on the public's view of Energy Star brand credibility. Other proposed CB responsibilities could best be undertaken by manufacturer partners, lab accreditation bodies and labs.

2. Please consider removing all of item g) "Ensure each manufacturing facility has adequate controls in place..." under 1) General Requirements and Responsibilities

<Reasons>

- A Certification Body (CB) with an ISO/IEC 65 accreditation is qualified to administer certifications, not assess quality controls and manufacturing consistency.
- Manufacturer partners should be responsible for their own manufacturing processes and controls. They are better able to judge when retesting becomes necessary.
- Guarding trade and manufacturing secrets under such a system would be difficult. Accidental disclosures could result in partners seeking compensation from the EPA or CBs for damages.

3. Please consider removing “...conduct random inspections at the manufacturing location...” from item (1) under 3) Energy Star Verification, b) Product Specification Audit, i) Have procedures to re-evaluate product performance...

Also please consider removing “... provided that qualified CB personnel witness the test...” from item (b) under 3) Energy Star Verification, a) Verification Testing, i) Operate a verification testing procedure that fulfills the verification testing requirements enumerated as follows:, (5) Location of verification testing

<Reasons>

- This is invasive and unnecessary. Products are qualified based on their performance and energy requirements not on their components or assembly processes.
- Global manufacturing uses factories in multiple countries. The expense of a CB’s travel could be high. Would the manufacturing partner, the EPA or the CB cover this cost?
- This constitutes a risk to trade secrets required for competitiveness.

4. Remove MSRP from the CBs’ possible report to the EPA. Under 2) Energy Star Qualification, a) Determination of qualification, iii) Report information on certified products to EPA..., Note: As an Example of the type of information...:

http://www.energystar.gov/ia/partners/product_specs/qpi/av_qpi_form.xls

<Reasons>

- MSRP can change during the life of the product. Getting this changed on the Energy Star Site takes a significant amount of time.
- Releasing the MSRP before product launch can cause a competitive disadvantage. So it is better kept confidential.