



CALL REPORT

1300 NORTH 17TH STREET, SUITE 1752, ROSSLYN, VA 22209

FROM: ALEX BOESENBERG

DATE: MARCH 27, 2014

CONFERENCE CALL: ENERGY STAR LIGHTING ROADMAPPING VERIFICATION TESTING DISCUSSIONS

The following persons met via telephone conference call from 1:30 to 3:00 pm Eastern:

- Alex Boesenberg, NEMA Staff
- Taylor Jantz-Sell, EPA staff
- Jackie Swiernik, Intertek
- Jeff Lockner, UL
- Marci Sanders, D&R Intl
- Jim Dakin, Seoul Semiconductor (consultant)
- Austin Gelder, ICF
- Joel Jacobson, Feit Electric
- Claire Miziolek, NEEP
- Howard Wolfman, Lumispec Consulting
- Jenn Dolin, OSRAM Sylvania
- Jennifer Burns, Philips
- Lucy deButts, DOE
- Wensheng Xu, CSA Group
- Arni Siti, GE
- Joe Howley, GE
- S. Cockerham, affiliation not recorded
- Mariana Somogyi, GE
- Anthony Serres, Lucidity Lights
- Patty Sandoval, Feit Electric
- Matthew Walker, Navigant
- Mike Buzard, A2LA
- Shivani Vyas, UL
- Tanya Hernandez, Acuity Brand Lighting
- Anthony Fryer, ASAP

NEMA staff welcomed participants and reminded them to conduct the call in accordance with NEMA guidelines.

NEMA staff made some administrative announcements regarding the future communications of the working group and the group's timeline.

The purpose of the call was to begin discussions about ES Verification Testing and whether it can be accelerated and streamlined.

Per the agenda, the goal of the webinar was to begin a lasting discussion about ~~“[s]electing the right, more efficient lighting products – working together to assist consumers~~

~~Possible areas for further discussion/research:~~

- ~~a. What are the critical challenges facing consumers in making a lighting selection that meets their needs?
b. What are the most effective avenues/tools for addressing those challenges?”~~

~~Correction: “Balancing quality assurance/meeting consumer quality expectations with time to market, testing cost, and expected rise in consumer cost.~~

~~Possible areas for further discussion:~~

- ~~a. What are the core performance criteria for various product types or technologies that are important to consumer acceptance and lend themselves to a prescribed basic level of acceptable performance?
b. Are there alternatives to lengthy life testing?”~~

A presentation was made by EPA and NEMA reviewing various topics related to the ENERGY STAR Lamp and Luminaire programs and to the application of verification testing in them.

Ms. Jantz-Sell reviewed several verification testing practices, to include marginal failure testing policies.

Mr. Boesenberg reviewed the Stakeholder survey and its results. [Secretary’s note: a participant noted that there was a later version of the survey, with more participants. Mr. Boesenberg has located that report and will supply a revised, updated presentation.] Participants reviewed some suggestions from industry regarding whether some test parameters in application today might be relaxed or done away with for verification testing as a means of saving time and cost.

Participants discussed if there is merit in separating out core VT tests by technology. For example, CFL lumen maintenance testing has several test points that may be indicative of passing or failing later on 100 hrs, 1,000 hours, 40% of rated life, while LED lamps have fewer which may not be indicative of long term performance (there is a note on that comment about catastrophic failure) initial 0 hour stabilized, 3,000 hour, 6,000 hour.

Towards the end of the call, it was noted that EPA/ICF have performed some initial cost/time analysis of the parameters of verification testing. This was presented online, and will be shared for further discussion.

Discussions findings and action items:

- 1) Participants will review the [revised] interest survey and provide feedback on whether any additional surveys or analysis of existing survey responses might be useful.
- 2) A participant noted his uncertainty that the current Rapid Cycle Stress test is effectively assessing LED performance, citing a recent study. This topic may be more likely for the Specifications working group, Mr. Boesenberg will investigate this and act accordingly.
- 3) It was suggested that some sort of chart of cost and time burdens might be developed for each test for evaluation. (See note above about the EPA/ICF chart.)

- 4) It was suggested a map of test time and duration might be useful. (See note above about the EPA/ICF chart.)
- 5) Per the above two items and the EPA/ICF chart, all participants are invited to review it and Mr. Boesenberg will circulate it to CBs and ask them to comment on its accuracy.
- 6) It was noted that there are three cycles of CFL verification testing available, perhaps enough to perform some analysis on now.
- 7) There is VT underway for LED products, but not enough for analysis, although Lumen Maintenance appears to stand out in terms of cost due to its duration.
- 8) Relevant to discussions as to whether some tests might serve as bellwethers of good overall performance over time, a participant CB noted that early failures in the LED/SSL testing arena tend to be fatalities, not degradations.
- 9) A participant asked if there are any other (ANSI) tests that might be done to verify good construction/performance. EPA noted that only the tests referenced for Certification may be used for Verification. Any follow on items in this trail of discussion will be shared with the track 1 Specifications working group (Boesenberg action).

Participants were asked to review the above and share feedback and observations/suggestions with EPA (Jantz-Sell) and NEMA (Boesenberg) or directly with the working group for discussion using the new email reflectors (for which an introductory email will be sent shortly).

Next Meeting: the group scheduled a follow-on teleconference on April 28th at 1:30-3:00pm Eastern Time. Invitations and additional administrative materials will be sent by NEMA staff.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:50pm

Reviewed by Counsel
CRS 4/4/14

Alex Boesenberg
Regulatory Affairs Manager
March 28, 2014