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MINUTES

Participants: See the annexed "Attendance List"

1. WELCOME

The Chair welcomed the participants to the Ecodesign Consultation Forum (CF) and indicated that the purpose of this meeting was to discuss the preliminary draft regulation on ecodesign and energy labelling requirements for lighting products.

2. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted without changes.

The UK requested an update of the ongoing work. The Chair agreed to provide an overview under the AOB point of the agenda.

3. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

The Chair asked whether there were any additional comments on the minutes of the CF of 25 June 2015 not yet received in writing. As no further comments were made, the minutes were adopted.

4. STUDY ON LIGHTING PRODUCTS

a. PRESENTATION BY VHK

VHK presented the review study on lighting products which the Commission used as a basis for the two preliminary draft regulations. The study concluded that although the underlying modelling is relatively complicated, the evidence suggests that a significant potential for further energy efficiency gains remains untapped, which would accumulate to 578TWh by 2030 with the proposed policy option compared to a business-as-usual scenario.

b. DISCUSSION

The Chair opened the floor for comments and questions on the study and the presentation.
ECOS asked whether one could still comment on task 7. The Chair noted that minor comments are still possible. But since the task was already based on data and views collected from stakeholders and has been closed, it could only be re-opened if substantive new evidence would be proposed.

IT requested the purpose of this meeting to be clarified, and whether it will focus on the study by VHK or the proposal by the EC. The Chair explained that the meeting will focus on the proposal.

DE remarked that the period between the publication of the study and the working documents was rather short. The Chair took note of the timing, and explained that the study had already run for almost two years, and the members of the CF received all materials as usual four weeks before the meeting.

CLASP put forward two questions: first, is there a danger that energy standards may "backslide" given that many lighting products are manufactured outside of Europe, and second, is a more recent version of the MELISSA model available? VHK referred to its presentation and replied that there might be a small risk of certain product standards to "backslide", but that it seems unlikely that industry at large would reduce its energy efficiency standards, for example of fluorescent lights. The Chair indicated that the EC would publish the latest version of the MELISSA model the following day.

BE voiced both support to the general approach to simplify the regulations, and concern for the timing of the labelling proposal. Due to lacking data it would be very difficult to accurately model labelling efforts. VHK explained that its model assumes a normal distribution of energy efficiency classes, and that the two top-classes should be empty, resulting in the proposed classes. VHK also re-emphasised that one main reason why the lamp label has been less successful is because consumer do not properly see the labels in shops. The key information of an energy label would have to be presented at the front-side of the lamp.

IT voiced its concern that there may be a conflict with the ongoing discussions on the revision of the Energy Labelling Directive.

IALD explained that the crux of the issue would not lie in consumers not properly seeing the labels, but rather in the way that products are sorted according to their price in retail stores. IALD also warned that the potential use of two energy labels may confuse consumers, and devalue energy labels in general.

ECEEE voiced its support for the simplification of the regulations, but also noted that the proposal may be too ambitious if it results in allowing previously phase-out products to appear on the market again.

The Chair noted that the EC was merely following a standard procedure for regulatory measures under ecodesign and energy labelling. The Chair clarified that there is no intention to regulate energy labelling through a delegated act before the co-legislators would finalise their discussions on the new framework regulation. The EC also noted that the preliminary drafts are based on the preparatory study, and that there has not yet been an Impact Assessment, which may subsequently change the draft measures.
5. **Proposal for Ecodesign**

After a presentation by the EC of the preliminary draft ecodesign measure, the Chair then opened the floor for questions and comments following the structure of the preliminary draft, starting with the scope.

**BE** pointed out that certain types of lighting products might not be regulated, and asked for clarification about how the scope of the ecodesign measure relates to the scope of energy labelling measure. The EC explained that the scope of both is almost the same: only lighting product components not emitting lights, such as control gear, would not be covered by energy labelling but only by ecodesign.

**IT** asked whether producers or dealers would be responsible for adhering to the ecodesign requirements, and emphasised that this was not yet clear. IT also suggested that the exemption of "pieces of art" presents a potential loophole. Furthermore, IT questioned the appropriateness of the temperature range of -20°C - +50°C for exempted products.

**SE** voiced support for the proposals, and noted that it expects the scope to work. Similar to IT, however, SE also noted that some exemptions, like "pieces of art" and specific operating temperatures, present potential regulatory loopholes which should be addressed.

**DE** agreed with IT and SE on the two potential loopholes. For some products it should therefore at least be required to provide specific information for consumers and authorities to minimise misuse.

**IALD** appreciated the proposal to simplify, but warned against over-simplification. It would be unclear, for example, whether optical elements are included or excluded in the definition. Some product accessories may reduce the product's energy efficiency, while simultaneously serving an essential purpose for the functioning of the product.

**PT** requested more information on how the "putting into service" clause of the scope would impact the application of the proposals.

**CLASP** argued that product exemptions should be described very precisely to avoid any further loopholes. CLASP then asked why the definition of lighting products contained a provision of a maximum lumen output per emitting area. If this was done for projectors, then maybe these should be explicitly exempted. Finally, CLASP asked why lighting products are restricted to a positive CRI and mains voltage only, and whether additional voltage levels could be included.

**CECED** called for exemptions for spare parts, as otherwise the proposal would contradict both the assumptions for the lifetime of products and the Circular Economy objectives.

**IT** suggested that a comprehensive list of products in and out of the scope with examples would be useful. IT also asked whether rechargeable products would be classified as a lighting product.

**NL** agreed with SE that the general approach to simplify the regulations is good. NL also agreed with IT that examples as to what could be classified as a lighting product would be useful. Regarding Article 1, NL furthermore agreed with other Member States that the exemptions could present too easily exploitable loopholes, especially exemptions (g), (h) and (i).

**BE** suggested to include a clear scope for the exemptions. UK liked this idea, also because it would be in line with Better Regulation objectives. UK stated its general concern about loopholes.
IALD noted that the concern relating to the provision on "pieces of art" could equally affect products in the high-end retail market. IALD pointed out that it would be important to make sure that also small museums do not have to fully re-equip their installations with expensive new lighting solutions. The proposal should not lead to a large cost for the art industry.

LightingEurope confirmed its support for further simplification of the regulations, and voiced its eagerness to discuss individual issues in greater depth over the course of the next six months. LightingEurope shared the same concerns as IALD, and voiced concern about potential regulatory ramifications for emergency lighting.

SORAA presented three comments: first, the correlation between CRI and efficacy must be evaluated carefully. SORAA then invited the EC to compare its proposal with requirements in California and the USA; it appears that the preliminary draft requirements are too stringent and would disadvantage high-end products. Second, differentiating between directional and non-directional lighting might be important, too. Third, there are advantages to adhering to one international standard.

ECEEE requested the scope of covered luminaires to be clarified.

ECOS supported the concerns voiced earlier that the provision with reference to "pieces of art" may present a loophole, and requested clarification in this regard.

IALD highlighted the importance of preserving the freedom for installers to combine different components.

The EC explained that while an exhaustive list of products based on their technical properties in and out of scope would be desirable, discussions with experts have shown that this would be difficult because there is no agreement on how to define such lists without creating loopholes or unduly phasing out products. Therefore the EC proposed to take a more holistic approach to avoid this problem. Regarding the provision on "pieces of art", the exclusion only refers to artworks where lighting is the art, not the lighting installations to illuminate pieces of art in a museum. The -20°C - +50°C temperate range is taken over from existing regulations, because there are still situations in which more efficient lighting technologies cannot replace old ones, such as in ovens. Nonetheless, the EC will seek to better define the exemptions, bearing in mind that additional information requirements may be contrary to simplifying the regulation. Regarding the scope of the proposal, it is important to assess the extent to which components are assembled or not assembled in a lighting product. If they are within an assembly, then they are a part of the lighting product, otherwise they are considered a lighting product component. The EC agreed that this might present an indirect incentive for the market to build replaceable modular lighting products. Regarding whether products with batteries are within the scope or not, the EC noted that if a product must be connected to the mains grid to operate, then it is within the scope. The EC clarified that there would not be any restriction for installers as long as each component fulfils the requirements.

BE asked why exempted products cannot be required to be "designed and specified" for their use. The EC responded that such a provision would be difficult as it would effectively ban standard products used by e.g. for military use or in means of transport, even though these sectors are excluded by the directive or by the treaties.

The Chair then opened the floor for questions and comments on the definitions.
IT noted that colour rendering is a measurement but not a definition. IT also noted that RA is not typically the unit measurement for CRI. Furthermore, IT explained that it finds "chromaticity" to be an overly-technical term.

IALD noted that it does not like the proposed CRI definition, as it would keep an old metric in the market. Instead, IALD proposed ISTM 3015 as a new, alternative metric, which is already being used by certain market segments.

DK stated that it liked the study and is grateful for the efforts to simplify the regulation. It also suggested that the definitions should be further simplified. DK also commented that both Article 2 and Annex 2 contain definitions. The document could be simplified if all definitions were in one place.

SE shared the concern that CRI might be a difficult metric. It also supported an extension of the definition of light products, reducing it to 30lm, or removing the lumen metric altogether.

CLAPS requested several terms to be better defined, including for example the standby mode, and questioned the 60lm threshold, suggesting it could be reduced to 30lm.

CEN/TC169 asked that every term that is used in the proposal should be defined. All definitions should be in one place. Ideally, only definitions that are already common practice should be used. It also noted that certain definitions were still unclear, such as the distinction between "visible light and white light". "Alternative current" should be re-phrased to "alternating current".

CENELEC/C34A agreed with IALD that it is important to make all definitions consistent across the document.

NL noted that definitions 9 and 10 needed further clarification.

The EC explained that the definition of lighting products referred to electro-magnetic radiation instead of just light, with the aim to close the possible loophole of "heatballs". The EC agreed that CRI is not an ideal metric, but also noted that CRI is presently the only widely-accepted method, and invited participants to submit better, alternative methods if possible.

The Chair then opened the floor for questions and comments on Article 3.

IALD noted that it appreciates the "Volkswagen clause", but also warned that this might influence the thermal management of some products negatively. Certain lighting products, for example, are designed in such a way that they automatically shut down if the temperature rises above a certain level.

NL explained that the purpose of the clause was to ensure that testing conditions did not differ from "real life" conditions. The "Volkswagen clause" addresses intentional manipulation only of testing conditions. NL also noted that, with reference to the staging of the proposal, it might make sense to delete stage 3, and instead revise the proposal by 2022.

SE agreed with NL that the testing clause only addresses intentional manipulation of testing conditions. SE also called for more ambitious energy efficiency requirements. Stage 2 should become stage 1, and stage 3 should become stage 2. The ambition of the first two stages would have to be increased.

DE agreed with NL and SE about the purpose of the testing clause. It also called for an earlier review of the proposal, as it would make little sense to define requirements up to 2024.
IT disagreed with SE and requested to hold on to the current first two stages. IT also requested that the ambition should not be increased, and that the proposal should be reviewed in 2020.

ECEE voiced support for stage three.

The Chair opened the floor for questions and comments on Article 4.

The UK warned that the provisions under Article 4(c) may allow companies to cheat by defining the operating conditions.

DE agreed that Article 4(c) may allow for too much flexibility.

IT responded by noting that without Article 4(c) one would have to test the entire spectrum of products to find a suitable combination. Therefore, the current formulation may be the best solution.

The Chair opened the floor for comments on the remaining articles.

UK stated that a review should happen earlier. IT agreed.

NL, with reference to Article 8, requested the wording to be changed in such a way that the results are presented to the CF before the deadline.

LightingEurope gave a short presentation on its views on the proposal. It concluded that the consumption of energy of lighting products will continue to decline, while the energy consumption of electrical appliances will continue to increase. Potential energy efficiency gains in the lighting sector may therefore have reached their limit. LightingEurope also highlighted the importance of recycling, and a proper collection of old lighting products.

The Chair opened the floor for comments on Annex 1.

DE referred to definition 4 and noted that even after 10 hours there may still be a lot of change in the luminous flux of certain lighting products. Regarding definition 6, DE warned that most products would pass. To counter this danger, maybe stabilized values could be used. In any case, values should be consistent, and either be expressed in terms of luminous flux or stabilized luminous flux.

IALD noted that warming up time was only relevant for out-dated technologies.

CENELEC/TC34A explained that the 10h provision would be inadequate. Furthermore, the stabilized luminous flux is not used consistently. Finally, it pointed out that LEDs do not typically run at 50Hz.

The Chair opened the floor for questions and comments on Annex 2.

DE welcomed the intention of the proposal, but also noted that increases in energy efficiency may not necessarily reduce absolute energy consumption. DE furthermore warned that manufacturers may (falsely) claim high energy efficiency if the risk of being penalised for non-compliance is low. Additionally, although GLS lamps were officially phased out, these are still being sold in Europe under false labels claiming that they were produced in 2009. For all these reasons, DE therefore called for better market surveillance of lighting products. DE also noted that it would be too early to establish a third stage. While the calculation of the maximum allowed power uptake only incorporates the luminous flux and the CRI, other aspects may also be important and should be considered.

NL noted that it does not support a stage three, and warned against overloading the calculation of the maximum allowed power uptake with too many factors. This could make the regulation overly
complex again. **NL** reminded the CF that one main objective of the proposal is to simplify the regulation.

**IALD** argued that the calculation of the CRI would be unfair for certain products. The current formula is not technology neutral.

**ECEEE** noted that the new regulation would present a step backwards for conventional lamps by reducing the requirements for some lamp types. It also agreed with **SE** that the first two stages are not ambitious enough.

**CLASP** agreed with this statement. Furthermore, the current proposal would lead to the danger of backsliding in requirements for certain products. **CLASP** made four suggestions: first to shift the stages forward, so that stage 2 become stage 1; second, to introduce a 'break' at the maximum allowed power uptake at 1300lm and requiring higher efficiencies above this level; and third, to incrementally increase the energy efficiency requirements, hold on to the current product classes, add new product classes, and to then introduce a one-size-fits-all "LED approach" in 2020 to prevent backsliding; and fourth, to ban all mercury-containing lamps by 2020.

**ANEC/BEUC** welcomed the new proposal for determining the allowed maximum power uptake. A split at 1300lm would complicate this situation as many lighting products have replaceable lighting sources. **ANEC/BEUC** also noted that the 2W addition to compensate for electric losses and the 60lm scope threshold could be problematic.

**LightingEurope** agreed with previous comments that skipping stage 3 could be a good idea. During stage 2 there would be danger of banning low lumen output lamps. Furthermore, street lighting luminaires, which use high pressure sodium lamps, could not easily use replacement LED lamps.

**UK** agreed that stage three should be removed, but also noted that stages 1 and 2 could be more ambitious.

**DE** warned that the preparatory study appears not to be technology neutral. The **EC** explained that the study and the preliminary draft proposals are technology neutral, because a minimum energy efficiency requirement for all technologies is proposed.

**BE** noted that the 2W power allowance for lighting products with low lumen output could be lowered further to 0.5W. A single regulation with one formula was also seen as desirable, but this approach could lead to a least common denominator outcome with negative environmental consequences. **BE** agreed with **SE** that the level of ambition of stages 1 and 2 could be increased to 80lm/W and 120lm/W respectively. Regarding directional and non-directional lighting, one possible definition for direct lighting could be that at least 80% of lighting must be emitted in one specific direction. A 20% efficiency bonus could be granted under this condition. **BE** suspected that a split in the efficacy formula at 1300lm could be a potential solution, and stated that preserving technology neutrality is important.

**FR** voiced support for simplifying the regulations, and agreed with the **UK** that the third stage goes too far and should maybe be removed. It agreed with the proposed ambition levels.

**SE** noted that lowering the standards for certain products would send the wrong signal to the market and consumers. On the other hand, introducing requirements on hazardous substances to ban mercury would send a strong signal to the global market.
**DE** noted that if mercury in lamps would be banned, high-pressure sodium lamps would be phased-out.

**DK** voiced concern that the proposal would lead to a step back in some situations. The 2W power consumption discount is seen as too high and should be lowered.

**IALD** noted that clarifying the definition and requirements for standby modes is important. Further, most lighting products are imported from Asia. While it would be nearly impossible to survey all these products, a functioning regulation would require a full regulatory enforcement on all products to work properly.

**BE** asked whether clearly non-compliant products can be confiscated from the market if they are discovered by market surveillance, or whether they must first be formally tested for non-compliance.

**VHK** explained that an efficacy requirement of 120lm/W by 2020 would be rather extreme with negative impacts on functionality. For this reason **VHK** proposed 80lm/W by 2020 and to increase the level of ambition in the following years. The 2W discount provision, in turn, was chosen to adhere to the goal of simplifying the regulation. Small lamps that use less energy should not be penalised in favour of larger lamps.

**ECEEE** noted that the cost of LEDs may be lower than suggested in the model, and will submit supporting data after the Consultation Forum.

The **Chair** opened the floor for questions and comments on Annex 2.2.

**IT** asked what the EC means by "certain lighting components". **IT** also noted that the provision for outdoor products could present yet a further loophole, as anyone could claim that their product is intended for outdoor use. **IT** furthermore explained that the endurance test would only be suitable for LEDs and is biased against other technologies.

**IALD** stated that while the proposal lacked ambition in certain aspects, it would be too ambitious in others. A failure rate of 10% is seen as too high and should be reduced to approximately 2%.

**DE** noted that only LEDs would fulfil some of the functionality criteria, for example regarding the warm-up times.

**NL** asked where the 10% failure rate derives from, and whether this is the case because the verification test only foresees a sample of 10 units.

**BE** asked whether the 1% lumen deterioration could be increased to, for example, 2%.

**SE** agreed with **BE** that it would be very hard to adhere to verify the 1% lumen deterioration.

**DE** asked what would happen if one out of the ten samples fails. Furthermore, **DE** agreed with **SE** and **BE** than a 1% lumen deterioration level would be difficult to measure.

**CENLEC/TC34A** stated that the proposed accelerated endurance test has been prepared for LEDs. While there are caveats to the test, it is intended to simulate real life by forcing early failures. It agreed that the 1% lumen deterioration would be hard to verify with the measurement uncertainties in testing labs.
ANEC/BEUC requested that the nominal colour values of products would be verified. While some models claim a colour temperature of 2700K, in reality their colour temperature could be around 3000K. Similar difficulties would apply to CRI statements. ANEC/BEUC also called attention to the importance of minimum lifetime requirements, although this would make market surveillance more difficult.

LightingEurope noted that the warm-up time and flickering provisions would lead to a phasing-out of HID and low-pressure discharge lamps. LightingEurope also asked about the usefulness of the power factors.

CECED appreciated the exclusion of information requirements for products such as refrigerators or freezers, but also noted that lighting in refrigerators should in general not be covered by this proposal.

The EC replied by indicating that refrigerators are not in the scope of the proposal.

NL agreed with the view that the proposal is not about lighting in refrigerators. NL also noted that the provisions on verification measures and their respective tolerances must be simplified. It should be made clear that tolerances cannot be abused.

LightingEurope responded to the NL by noting that if tolerance levels are decreased, then some requirements must be relaxed to not unintentionally phase-out some products.

IT noted that market surveillance would be greatly facilitated if the relevant metrics would be clarified from the beginning.

BE asked industry whether there is a need for nominal values. LightingEurope replied that these are desirable to categorise products.

NL asked whether it is the intention of the EC to make tolerances for lighting products consistent with tolerances used in the verification process of other products. If this is the case, then the EC should clearly state this. This would mitigate any confusion in industry.

The EC replied that alignment is indeed one of its aims.

The Chair then opened the floor for comments and questions on information requirements.

LightingEurope, with reference to the previous comments by BE, explained that using actual values would be problematic, because each product from the same model family might have slight deviations in parameters, and nominal values should therefore be used.

IT noted that "nominal use of flux" is not defined. Furthermore, paragraph 3.2.1. would be difficult to understand and should be re-formulated. IT further stated that it would be difficult to assure that the front of a lighting product is indeed always displayed towards consumers in stores. IT also pointed out that the standby metrics are currently expressed in mW. To make all metrics consistent, using W is recommended, especially because it is questionable if any useful measurement could be made in the mW range.

IALD stated that it is impossible to print all information on a product's packaging. An alternative would be to print a website address on the packaging so that consumers know where they can find additional information. Such a webpage could, for example, be managed and maintained by a company or even an industry association.
SE requested that the proposed "flicker warning" should be more clearly defined.

ECOS noted that a provision should be included, which states that the term "energy saving lamp" can only be used for lighting products that fulfil the highest energy efficiency standards.

ANEC/BEUC agreed with ECOS on the way the term "energy saving lamp" must be used and protected. ANEC/BEUC also supported the proposition of IALD to create a website with additional information for consumers. The packaging should indicate whether a product contains mercury. ANEC/BEUC also reiterated the warning that while some producers claim a colour temperature of 2700K, in reality their product displayed has a colour temperature of around 3000K. The exact colour temperature should also be included on the packaging, together with an UV radiation warning. Additionally, the packaging should give some guidance on how to properly dispose of the lighting product. A homepage with additional information, in turn, could also provide some guidance on what lighting parts, such as dimmers, are compatible with certain lighting products.

DE noted that since UV warnings are related to safety issues, such warnings should be covered by product safety regulation. DE furthermore stated that it would be impossible to make measurements in the 180-220nm range in air, and that such measurements would only be possible in a vacuum. The proposal should take this into account.

IT called for abandoning unmeasurable metrics. Market surveillance must be able to verify any proposed metric.

NL responded that metrics must not be verified, but verifiable. The NL also warned that it would be difficult to define high flickering.

DE agreed that regulations must be enforceable.

The EC reminded participants that this is a preliminary draft with the aim to facilitate a discussion to improve the regulation, but agreed that market surveillance must be able to verify the required metrics.

CENLEC/TC34A called for a harmonised standard for dimmers, potentially with symbols to indicate which lighting products they are particularly suitable for. Further, it stated that UV warnings are important for safety reasons.

LightingEurope referred to the wavelength requirements by stating that it would be impossible to measure 180nm. As an alternative one could return to a range starting at 250nm, as is currently the case under Regulation 244/2009.

The Chair then opened the floor for comments and questions on Annex 3.

The UK referred to paragraph 6, and asked whether the EC would be trying to circumvent a decision by the European Council on information sharing of market surveillance authorities.

IT noted that the sample batch does not specify how large the sample must be, only a maximum size. A specific minimum sample size would close this potential loophole.

IALD asked how a sample of 10 units could be assured if certain customized products were only produced in a very small number.
NL agreed that some of the wording of the proposal may make market surveillance difficult. The issue raised by IALD could be solved by adding a special provision for products that are only manufactured in small numbers.

ANEC/BEUC pointed out that an arithmetic mean would allow for a large variance in the difference between samples, and would not protect against large sample differences.

SE supported the proposed sample size, and also agreed that it is important to assure reasonable metrics for values.

BE noted that faster testing procedures may be available with portable devices.

DE, with reference to Annex 3.1, stated that it would be important to specify that the samples must be taken from different sources.

CENLEC/TC34A reported that alternative testing techniques may soon be available.

DE pointed out that the temperature within a climate chamber proposed for verification may depend on many factors, such as the speed of the air movement within it.

IALD voiced its concern for the temperature range of the accelerated testing procedure. Testing for only 1000h would not provide sufficient information. Furthermore, certain product designs that regulate the temperature of a lighting device could not be defeated, making testing impossible.

NL asked for the aim of the test to be clarified.

The EC explained that the accelerated testing procedure aims at simulating the ageing of a product within a short time frame. Previous experience shows that a required testing time of 6000h is a huge burden. For this reason, it is proposed to reduce the testing period of 6000h to 1000h or 2000h. The EC welcomed any further input to improve testing procedures, and is looking forward to comments by stakeholders on this matter. Further, Article 6 is not intended to circumvent market surveillance. It is intended to encourage information sharing between Member States for market surveillance purposes.

LightingEurope warned that the accelerated testing procedure would remove some lighting products from the market, because some technologies are not made for these temperatures. Additionally, it would be expensive to re-fit laboratories to be able to test lighting products in a temperature range of -20°C to +50°C.

BE noted that if a product was designed in such a way to resist extreme temperatures, then this would not be a problem for the test. In such cases the product would display higher resilience.

CENLEC/TC34A responded to the comments on the testing procedure and noted that the purpose of the test is to assess products' endurance. Different tests would evaluate different types of potential failures.

DE asked whether tests should be included that accounted for a frequent cause of product failure, namely distortions in the grid as set out in the EMC Directive.

The EC responded to DE by confirming that the EMC Directive does indeed cover grid distortions. The EC also emphasised that temperature testing was nothing novel, and a standard procedure for electronics. The proposed accelerated testing is based on a draft lighting standard, and was proposed to facilitate market surveillance.
**LightingEurope** agreed that temperature testing is common practice for electronics. However, some lighting products may contain non-electric components that could not sustain the temperatures being tested.

**NL** agreed that the testing procedure would have to be evaluated carefully.

The **Chair** opened the floor for comments and questions on Annex 5.

**IALD** stated that 200lm/W lighting products do not exist and would be an overly ambitious benchmark.

**SE** responded by pointing out that 200lm/W will exist in two years when the regulation will come into force.

**IT** noted that the best products presently on the market would achieve 185lm/W, which is why 200lm/W would be an unfair benchmark.

**CEN/TC169** agreed with previous comments that 200lm/W would be very ambitious. Furthermore, **CEN/TC169** questioned energy efficiency as the only benchmark criteria presented. Other criteria would be important to in evaluating the total efficacy of a product.

**LightingEurope** commented that the current discussion appears to be very theoretical.

**VHK** responded that products with 200lm/W would be entering the market next year, therefore even before the regulation would come into force. Some producers would even work on products with efficacies near 300lm/W.

**IALD** proposed to use the average of the top 10% of the market as the upper benchmark.

The **Chair** closed the discussion on the preliminary draft ecodesign proposal and moved on to the preliminary draft energy labelling proposal.

### 6. PROPOSAL FOR ENERGY LABELLING

After a presentation by the EC of the preliminary draft measure for energy labelling, the **Chair** opened the floor for questions and comments on the entire proposal.

**NL** supported the idea to discontinue the luminaire label. With reference to some of the comments made by **IT** earlier, the **NL** noted that while it would not be possible to require stores to place products in a certain way, it would be possible to instruct manufactures to design the packaging in a way for stores to allow consumers to see the labels.

**IT** stated that it does not like the current proposal, and that it thinks it is premature. As many lamps would remain in the market, a new label would create significant problems for market surveillance. It would be unrealistic to require stores to have an employee standing next to its product shelves, assuring that products are always positioned in a certain way.

**DE** requested the term “final owner” in Article 2 to be removed. **DE** also asked whether a very simple luminaire, e.g. one that is just an extension cord, would also have to display a label.

**SE** proposed to re-think the efficiency boundaries, as the scale would be insufficient at the lower end.
IALD agreed with IT that the current proposal could lead to confusion in the market, especially if there would be two different labels. Furthermore, IALD did not support colour-only labels as this would lead to additional costs for producers.

ECEEE voiced support for both the new proposed label, and the removal of the luminaire label.

CLASP agreed with ECEEE and supported the new label and the A-G scale. It particularly liked that there is only one scale, which would also simplify matters for industry. CLASP proposed to replace kWh with a new standard metric of lumen. Therefore lumen should be included on the label, which would also increase the profile of the label. CLASP agreed with SE that there was insufficient differentiation at the lower end.

CECED noted that the proposal does not refer to lighting products that are integrated into other products, such as household appliances. Further, it asked what would happen to electrical products such as refrigerators.

ANEC/BEUC asked whether lamps with "fancy" colours would be covered by the proposal.

LightingEurope opposed the new label. It also asked whether there could be two labels, one for direct and one for indirect lighting products. LightingEurope also pointed out that most people will not actually see the labels, as most lighting products are pre-installed. The proposal could cost industry a lot of money. Instead of a label, information should be made more easily accessible, either on the internet or at the point of sale, but not on a label.

SORAA noted that designing a product of the energy efficiency class E or better would be very demanding. Most high-end products would currently fall in class F. The best available lights at 120lm/W would currently be classified in class E. SORAA therefore requested more realistic classifications.

IT proposed to include digits, to clarify the individual boundaries of the different classifications.

ECOS stated that the classes would be too ambitious. A present, an A++ lighting product would be classified as class D under the new scheme. ECOS also suggested to remove the exemptions under Annex 3, as these could lead to loopholes. ECOS supported the idea of a "mercury free" logo.

BE proposed to reword the labelling size provisions to set clear boundaries.

DK voiced support for the new label, but noted that the levels would not correspond to the levels of the ecodesign proposal. This would make it difficult to communicate the label to consumers.

DE noted that it would be difficult to have an opinion in the scale, given the uncertainty with the framework legislation and the future lighting market.

The EC responded to several of the above comments collectively: a cable luminaire would only get a label if the cable is part of the lighting product. Otherwise only the lighting product gets a label. As a refrigerator does not qualify as a lighting product it does not need a 'lighting' label. A reference to standby modes is not foreseen to be included. There appears to be no need for digits on the scale as the boundaries are sufficiently clear, and using anything different from the A-G classes could confuse consumers. Further, information concerning the use of mercury is already provided on products, and the additional benefit of including this on the label is questionable.
The Chair closed this point of discussion and noted that written comments should be submitted by 31 January 2016.

7. CONCLUSIONS, NEXT STEPS AND ANY OTHER BUSINESS

The Chair explained that the EC will wait until it receives all comments in written form, and then begin to revise the proposal. The EC will take the ongoing discussion on the framework legislation in the European Parliament and Council into account, including whether the proposal will be put forward as a delegated act or an implemented act. If the proposal has to be revised in a major way, then there might be a need for another consultation forum.

The Chair opened the floor for further comments.

DE asked what the next procedural steps would be, because it considers this only a preliminary draft.

The EC noted that it presented a proper working document, and that participants can submit comments in written form until the deadline. Unless there are any major criticisms or substantial changes, there may not be a need for another Consultation Forum.

CEN asked whether the presentations and the minutes will be circulated.

The EC confirmed this.

The Chair presented an overview of further ongoing ecodesign work, and opened the floor for any questions and comments.

IALD asked about the time frame for the preparatory work on lighting systems.

The EC noted that the preparatory study is foreseen to be completed by the end of 2016.

IALD responded by requesting the lighting systems work to be either accelerated, or the lighting products proposal to be delayed.

The EC noted that the scope of lighting products and lighting systems is different. Lighting systems work builds on that for lighting products, and hence the latter does not need to be delayed for the former.

The Chair clarified some further administrative details on the ongoing "taps and showers" proposal. As a result of personnel changes, the EC may have to delay the work on some product groups. The Ecodesign working plan should still be published before the end of the year.

The Chair thanked all participants for the discussion and closed the Consultation Forum.
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