UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

OFFICE OF
AIR AND RADIATION

February 20, 2015

Dear Large Network Equipment Stakeholder:

On January 30th, 2015, the U.S. Environment Protection Agency (EPA) and the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) hosted a meeting to discuss the ENERGY STAR® Large Network Equipment (LNE) program. During this meeting with stakeholders, two test method issues were discussed: the use of the snaked traffic topology, and the ambient temperature requirement. Although the discussion yielded helpful feedback, DOE requests written comments and proposals for these issues in advance of the next follow-up meeting.

1. Snaked Traffic Topology
   In order to reduce test burden, DOE is considering allowing the snaked traffic topology to be used for products with many data ports, such as large modular equipment. For this reason, DOE requests written feedback from stakeholders on the following:

   a. If the snaked traffic topology were to be permitted, what requirements would need to be included in the test method in order to ensure that the results would be comparable to a test run in the full-mesh configuration?

   b. One option is to only allow snaked traffic for products with a high number of ports where it would be infeasible to test with full mesh. If snaked traffic were only to be used for products with a large number of ports, what is an appropriate port-count threshold to distinguish between products to be tested with snaked traffic, and those to be tested with full-mesh?

2. Ambient Temperature Requirement
   The test method's ambient temperature requirement can potentially reduce test reproducibility if the allowable range is too wide, due to the power used by the cooling fans. However, DOE recognizes that a very narrow ambient temperature range requirement may require a thermally controlled chamber, which could introduce significant test burden. For this reason DOE requests written feedback from stakeholders on the following:

   a. In Computer Servers, the inlet air temperature has a different tolerance than the ambient temperature. Are there concerns with using a similar approach here?

   b. Are there other options to maintain test repeatability without the burden of an expensive test chamber?

Stakeholders are encouraged to provide written comments via email to largenetwork@energystar.gov **no later than March 13, 2015**. All comments will be posted to the ENERGY STAR Product Development website unless the submitter requests otherwise. Questions may be directed to Bryan Berringer, DOE, at bryan.berringer@ee.doe.gov or (202) 586-0371.

Thank you for your continued support of ENERGY STAR.