

To: Mr. Richard Karney – [richard.karney@ee.doe.gov](mailto:richard.karney@ee.doe.gov)  
Ms. Susan Garner Zartman – [sgardner@drintl.com](mailto:sgardner@drintl.com)

From: Dale Work, Philips Lighting Company – [dale.work@philips.com](mailto:dale.work@philips.com)  
1300I St. NW, Suite 1070 East  
Washington, D.C. 20005

Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the draft 4.0 Energy Star CFL specification. We write to add our comments to others made at your Sept. 20, 2005 Criteria Meeting in Washington. It is normal for us to make our comments through NEMA, and we will continue to do this for the vast majority of our concerns that we share with other NEMA member companies. This note is to highlight a potential criterion on which no NEMA comments were offered at the meeting, and for which we do not believe a consensus NEMA position exists.

In the afternoon part of the September 20 Criteria Meeting, Noah Horowitz of the NRDC suggested that mercury content of the CFL lamps could be a useful criterion to add to the Energy Star specification. At least one NEMA manufacturer spoke strongly against this suggestion, and at least one non-NEMA manufacturer spoke in favor of it. The chief purpose of this written comment is to give the clear Philips position in support of adding “maximum mercury content” to the Energy Star CFL criteria.

The arguments made from the floor on Sept. 20 in opposition to adding this criterion centered on two points: (1) mercury content has nothing to do with lamp efficacy, and thus is inappropriate for inclusion in Energy Star; and (2) lamps contribute only a small part of the global mercury emissions problem, and there is very little “big picture” benefit from specifying a maximum mercury content.

We think both of these arguments are weak and miss the bigger picture:

1. We agree that mercury content is not related to lamp efficacy, but surely the Energy Star program, supported by both the DOE and the EPA, has an environmental aspect as well. Purely higher efficacies, regardless of environmental implications, cannot and should not be the sole focus of the Energy Star CFL program. At Philips, we strongly believe that any environmentally responsible approach to saving energy must include “source reduction” of controllable hazardous materials (such as mercury), where possible and feasible, in addition to other good practices (such as recycling).

Additionally, we note that other current Energy Star criteria (such as CRI, run-up time) have no direct bearing on lamp efficacy. So, the introduction of “maximum mercury content” would not be breaking new ground. While criteria such as CRI and run-up time can affect market penetration and user satisfaction, it is also true that “maximum mercury content” can add to the commercial appeal of more environmentally conscious consumers.

2. We agree that mercury form lamps are only a small part of the global mercury emissions problem. That does not make it unimportant. At Philips, we believe that manufacturers have a responsibility to do what they can to reduce the mercury put into commerce, and this includes source reduction. The adoption of a “maximum mercury content” is in line with this “do what you can” approach. That there are other much larger sources of mercury emissions into the environment is irrelevant. As an analogy, an individual’s random discarding of chewing gum wrappers, paper cups and soda cans is a miniscule part of the global solid waste emissions problem, but we still consider such littering to be irresponsible and it is, in fact, illegal. Similarly, controlling the environmental release of small amounts of mercury should be avoided, and even more so because the environmental consequences of mercury in the environment are much more serious than those of paper cups.

You have told us in the past that you would like the Energy Star CFL criteria to be more discriminating than today’s. With such parity among many manufacturers on the physics of light emission, it is difficult to discriminate based on efficacy considerations alone. It is our belief that “maximum mercury content” can be such a discriminating factor. Without affecting the energy savings criteria at all, you can discriminate between the more responsible manufacturers and others. We think the introduction of such a discriminating criterion is appropriate. We would welcome it, and we believe many consumers would, as well.

Again, thank you for soliciting and seriously considering our input.