

## ENERGY STAR Residential Ceiling Fans Draft 2 Version 4.0 Comment Matrix

Topic	Stakeholder Comment Summary	EPA Response
<b><u>Certification Requirements</u></b>		
<b>Support for Ceiling Fan Criteria</b>	Several stakeholders support the Draft 2 ceiling fan performance criteria, citing that the proposed efficiency and high-speed airflow requirements seem appropriate. One stakeholder did reiterate a concern that the stringency of the proposed levels will limit manufacturer participation and therefore consumer choice.	Thank you for your comments. EPA has chosen this level in light of upcoming DOE standards which will fundamentally alter the ceiling fan market before a chance arises to revise this specification again. Along with changes in light kit and fan performance requirements, EPA expects these market changes to lead to a robust selection of ENERGY STAR fans.
<b>Warranty</b>	One stakeholder commented that the minimum warranty requirement should be increased to 5 years, instead of the proposed 3 years. Another reiterated Draft 1 comments that the warranty is unnecessary.	Thank you for your comments. The three year warranty proposed will both provide value to consumers, and (in combination with similar warranties for other ENERGY STAR products using similar motor drivers) encourage the electronics industry to deliver more reliable drivers. As these are important ends, EPA will not eliminate the requirement. However, EPA believes that requiring a 5 year warranty will push up the price of ENERGY STAR fans without delivering significantly more for either of these respects. Thus, EPA is maintaining the 3 year warranty requirement proposed in Draft 2.
<b><u>General / Miscellaneous</u></b>		
<b>Clarifying the Definition of Ceiling Fan Efficiency</b>	One stakeholder commented that EPA should clarify their definition of Ceiling Fan Efficiency to specify that it is a weighted efficiency rather than an efficiency at a distinct speed.	EPA agrees that clarifying the definition of Ceiling Fan Efficiency would be helpful, and has done so. Because this is not part of the CFR, EPA has also updated the reference to make clear that in case of any conflict, the CFR definition shall take precedence.

<p><b>Modifying Use of the Word "Protocol"</b></p>	<p>One stakeholder commented that EPA should clarify its use of the word "protocol" when defining the backup requirement for Wi-Fi-controlled ceiling fans. The stakeholder states that if EPA aims at recognizing controls such as pull chains, IR remotes, hard-wired wall controls, etc. as appropriate backups, then the word protocol may lead to future misinterpretation.</p>	<p>EPA appreciates the comment as its intention was not to limit the backup controls for a Wi-Fi-controlled ceiling fan with the word "protocol". EPA has reworded the requirement to explicitly include backup controls such as pull chains, IR remotes, hard-wired wall controls, etc.</p>
<p><b>Reconsider Draft 1 Comments</b></p>	<p>One stakeholder reiterated Draft 1 comments, including that the title of the specification should include ceiling fan light kits.</p>	<p>EPA re-analyzed the stakeholders' Draft 1 comments and determined that all comments were addressed elsewhere except for adding "Ceiling Fan Light Kit" to the title of the specification. EPA agrees that since ceiling fan light kits can now certify only through this specification that they should be added to the title. This is reflected in the Final Draft.</p>