



Green Electronics Council

227 SW Pine Street, Suite 300 • Portland, OR 97204 • V: (503) 279-9382 • F: (503) 279-9381 • www.epeat.net

OUTCOMES REPORT

EPEAT VERIFICATION ROUND IE-2016-03

1. Overview of Verification Round

Verification Round IE-2016-03 investigated four criteria that had not yet been investigated:

- 4.4.2.1 - Optional—Product upgradeability
- 4.5.2.1 - Optional—Product specific greenhouse gas emissions—life-cycle assessment
- 4.8.4.1 - Optional—Provision of take-back service for packaging
- 4.9.2.1 - Required—Documentation that product does not prevent the use of non-manufacturer cartridges and non-manufacturer containers

Fifty-three investigations were conducted on four criteria where 14 of the investigations were of required criteria and 39 of the investigations were of optional criteria. This Round was comprised of both Level 0 and Level 1 investigations. Round IE-2016-03 touched the following areas of the EPEAT Registry:

- 16 Manufacturers were investigated in the Round.
- Products were chosen from two countries (US and Canada).
- 4 criteria which had never been investigated before out of 58 criteria in IEEE 1680.2-2012 were investigated.

Selection criteria included the following:

- All products that were active in the Registry were eligible for inclusion.
- All geographies and Manufacturers with active products on the EPEAT Registry were eligible for inclusion.
- No Manufacturer had more than 4 investigations in this Verification Round.


2. Summary of Outcomes

Highlights from this Verification Round:

- 53 investigations completed
- 53 decisions of Conformance

There were no decisions of Non-Conformance found in this Verification Round.

Figure 1:



3. Key Lessons

Provision of information during Verification Rounds:

The IEEE 1680 standard and the EPEAT Manufacturer agreement require that Manufacturers provide the information identified in Verification Requirements to prove the accuracy of their declarations within 60 days of EPEAT's request. Manufacturers are reminded that failure to provide this information is inconsistent with the agreement and may result in termination of the Manufacturer from EPEAT.

4. General Message to Manufacturers

Initial response to Auditors:

When contacted regarding participation in a Verification Round, Manufacturers should respond to the Auditor as soon as possible to let them know they are communicating with the correct person or to inform them of the correct contact. This also helps the Auditor know that the e-mail address is valid.

5. Looking Forward

Plans for Future Verification Activities:

All 2016 Verification Rounds were started in 2016 and are in the process of being completed. In 2017 the Plan is to hold 4 Verification Rounds which will include Level 0, Level 1 and Level 2/3 investigations.

Conformity Assessment Protocols:

This and all future Verification Rounds have and will be conducted according to the guidance

provided in the Conformity Assessment Protocols and/or Conformity Guidance Packets posted on www.epeat.net.

Archiving products that are no longer being manufactured:

All products active on the EPEAT Registry are eligible for inclusion in a Verification Round at any time. If a product is no longer being manufactured and the Manufacturer is no longer actively working with suppliers on maintaining information related to conformance, the Manufacturer is strongly encouraged to archive this product. Please note that archived products still appear in the Registry (listed under archived products for each Manufacturer) should purchasers or other stakeholders want to access details regarding the product's previously active registration.

6. Background

To assure the credibility of the EPEAT Registry, verification of the claims by Participating Manufacturers are rigorous, independent and transparent. Verification is conducted according to policies and procedures described in documents provided on www.epeat.net. Manufacturers are given no forewarning that their products will be verified, and verification is performed based on the declarations as they are in the Registry at the time the Verification Round begins.

Investigations are performed by expert technical contractors called Auditors working for a Conformity Assurance Body approved by the Green Electronics Council (GEC). Auditors are free of conflicts of interest, and their recommended decisions are reviewed and finalized by a five-person panel of independent technical experts (called the Conformity Decision Panel) who are also contractors free of conflicts of interest. Decisions of conformity by the Conformity Decision Panel are made blind to the identity of the products and companies they are judging, based only on evidence collected and analyzed by Auditors. A serious consequence of receiving a Non-Conformance is that it is published publicly in an Outcomes Report, for purchasers, competitors, and others to see.

- In a Level 0 investigation, an Auditor assesses Conformance to a criterion by examining publicly available information only – no products are obtained for inspection or testing, and the Manufacturer is not asked to submit documentation. If the publicly available information is inconclusive (i.e. was not available, could not be found from public sources, or did not provide enough details to determine conformance), the Auditor may be instructed to proceed with a Level 1 investigation.
- In a Level 1 investigation, an Auditor assess Conformance to a criterion by examining information submitted by a Manufacturer. The Manufacturer is required to provide detailed and accurate information in a timely manner.
- In Level 2 investigations, the Conformity Assurance Body obtains a product without the Manufacturer's knowledge or involvement, and has the product disassembled and inspected to assess conformance with one or more criteria.
- In Level 3 investigations, the Conformity Assurance Body obtains a product without the Manufacturer's knowledge or involvement, and has the product analytically tested to assess conformance with one or more criteria.

Manufacturers must correct Non-Conformances, either by bringing the product into Conformance,

by un-declaring the criterion until Conformance is achieved, or by removing the product from the Registry. The Green Electronics Council also requires that Manufacturers examine other registered products to determine if their declarations should be corrected as well. If a Manufacturer corrects the Non-Conformance by un-declaring the criterion and the criterion is an optional criterion, they lose that point, and possibly the product drops a tier. If it is a required criterion, they must archive the product. If it is a required corporate criterion, they must archive all of their registered products.