

NL comments on the energy label and eco-design proposals for light sources

Hans-Paul Siderius (Netherlands Enterprise Agency) – 25 January 2018

General comments

The Netherlands welcome the energy label and eco-design proposals for light sources.

We agree with the elimination of the energy label for luminaires. We support the concept ‘containing product’ and agree that requirements also apply to light sources placed on the market in a containing product.

We do not agree with the relabeling of current lighting products on sale by means of a sticker, since this is a too high burden for retailers.

Detailed comments energy label

Article 2 (Definitions)

Article 2(1), last paragraph states: “If a containing product is itself a light source, the light source to be considered for the purpose of this Regulation is the smallest physical unit that can be readily removed from the containing product without permanent mechanical damage and that meets the definition for light source.”

We assume this statement is added to deal with “luminaires”. However, it raises more problems than it solves. First, if the containing product is a luminaire, this is not a light source and therefore the statement would not be applicable. If the product is an “integrated luminaire” where the source of the light cannot be (readily) removed, then the product is a light source according to the definition. This leaves light sources where the source of the light can be readily removed; however, since the definition of light source only provide a general description of its operation (‘electrically’), this could lead to disputes on how to test this source of light.

We suggest to delete this paragraph.

The definition in Article 2(3) of ‘containing product’ in combination with the paragraph in Annex VIII means that light sources in containing products can be dismantled without permanent mechanical damage (to both the light source and the containing product).

Article 3 (Obligations of suppliers)

Since this article contains obligations for suppliers of light sources and suppliers of containing products, we suggest to explicitly mention that the obligations under Article 3.1 refer to suppliers of light sources.

Please clarify in Article 3.2 that in case a containing product contains a light source, the supplier of the containing product shall ensure that the product data, both public and compliance, has been entered into the product database. If the containing product

contains a light source from another supplier, the supplier of the containing product shall provide a reference to the light source in the product database. If the light source in the containing product is placed on the market by the same supplier as the containing product, this supplier shall enter the data in the product database. This also better clarifies that suppliers of containing products do not need to provide a printed label with each containing product.

Since the label is to be printed on the packaging we suggest to formulate this explicitly in Article 3.1(a).

We support that the parameters of the product information sheet are only entered into the product database and that the product information sheet does not need to be with each individual unit. However, we suggest to make this explicit in a recital of the Regulation to avoid any confusion.

We question whether the obligations in Article 3.1(c) and (d) are necessary in addition to what is already stated in Article 3.2 of Regulation (EU) 2017/1369 and given the fact that the label and the product information sheets can be downloaded from the product database.

The even more holds for the obligation in Article 3.1(j) which does not add anything compared to Article 3.5 of Regulation (EU) 2017/1369; we suggest to delete this.

We do not agree with relabeling of units placed on the market before the Regulation comes into force. This is a too high burden for retailers and entails too high costs for manufacturers regarding printing and distributing the stickers.

However it should be made clear that units placed on the market after the Regulation has come into force should carry the correct label, even if the model was placed on the market before the Regulation came into force.

We miss in the obligations of suppliers the period, proportionate to the average lifespan of the product, that customers shall have the option to refuse without avoidable loss of functionality software updates that increase the power consumption

Article 4 (Obligations of dealers)

We do not agree with the relabeling of units placed on the market before the Regulation comes into force; see remarks under Article 3.

Article 8 (Repeal)

Since the “luminaire” label is discontinued, it should be clear that there will be no obligation to enter data for luminaires into the product database. This obligation could exist if the date of application is after the 1st of January 2019 when the product database comes into operation. Therefore we suggest to repeal Articles 3.2 and 4.2 of Regulation (EU) No 874/2012 as of the day of entry into force of the new regulation (and not as of the day of application).

Article 9 (Entry into force and application)

If the obligation to enter data in the public part of the product database applies 4 months before the application date in Article 9.2, should this not also apply to the obligation to enter data in the compliance part of the product database?

In accordance with remarks about relabeling of units placed on the market before the Regulation comes into force, we do not agree with Article 9.4, which therefore shall be deleted.

Annex II (Definitions)

Is actuation by movement covered in the definition of ‘data-connection parts’ (7)?

The definitions for ‘standby mode’ (14) and ‘networked standby mode’ (15) are confusingly similar because the definitions of ‘control signal’ (17) and ‘remotely initiated trigger’ (18) overlap. The difference between standby and networked standby – as defined in the (amended) Regulation (EC) 1275/2008 is that the standby mode is the mode where the product “waits” for an internal trigger, including remote control (that is delivered with the product), whereas in the networked standby mode the product “waits” for an external trigger (via a network). We suggest to keep this distinction in this Regulation by specifying in definition (17) that the control signal is a signal from an internal source, including remote control.

Moreover, the definition of ‘control mode’ (16) uses the wording ‘lighting control signal’ and ‘external control signal’ that are not defined, but does not use the wording ‘remotely initiated trigger’.

Annex III (Label for light sources)

The green color of the frame and around the word ‘ENERGY’ can be confusing in relation to the same green color of the energy efficiency class A. We suggest to use a different color.

The words ‘BRAND’ and ‘Model Number’ are not used in point 2. We suggest to replace these with ‘supplier’s name or trademark’ and ‘supplier’s model identifier’.

The product database requires an alphanumeric code as model identifier. Please note that Regulation (EU) 2017/1369 provides a definition of model identifier, so there is no need to repeat this.

In the first proposals for the product database, the QR-code refers to the model information in the product database. We find the wording chosen in the Annex – redirecting to a website – too general and open for various interpretations which then would result in an unlevel playing field. We suggest that the QR-code refers to the public part of the database which could include a link to a website of the supplier.

Please note regarding point (2).V that on-mode operation is not defined; we suggest to replace this with full-load.

The label application rules (b) and (d) make the labeling of light sources at the point of sale cumbersome because their rules require a separate label (i.e. not the label that is printed on the packaging).

Since, as we suggested above under Article 3, the label is printed on the packaging, there is no need for rule (f). The requirement of the label to be clearly visible, which is especially relevant for blister packages, can be introduced in rules (a) and (c). We suggest to delete rule (f).

Annex V (Product information)

In point 1 (Product information sheet) a general reference is made to the information specified in point 4.1. However not all information need be part of the product information sheet, e.g. items (c), (l), (m), (n) and (o). This information should be excluded in point 1.

Annex V (Technical documentation)

We note that the information on the energy label and the information in the product information sheet mentioned in point 2 overlap with the information entered in the product database. Nevertheless it is probably useful to mention these individually.

Annex V (Information to be displayed on the packaging)

Please note that 'light source as an independent product' is not defined. The addition 'as an independent product' is not needed, since the first sentence of this section qualifies when the information shall be displayed, i.e. if a light source is placed on the market in a packaging containing information to be visibly displayed to users prior to their purchase. This means that (bulk) packaging for transport of light sources to be processed by another supplier in a containing product need not to have this information.

Since the information in this point is to be entered in the product database, we suggest to check that the data to be entered is as much as possible language neutral.

The wording 'not longer than the declared lifetime' in point 3.1(e) is not needed because Annex VIII has a general statement that this is not allowed. Therefore, this also holds for the other information provided and it would be confusing to mention it for this parameter and not for others.

For light sources that can be set to emit light with different characteristics, the information shall in any case be reported for the reference control settings (in the proposed text the supplier can alternatively indicate a range of obtainable values, but this would make comparisons between light sources cumbersome).

Annex V (Product database – public part)

Since the energy label will be generated by the database, there is no need to enter it. On the contrary, entering a separate label can create confusion if the supplier's name or trade mark or model identifier are not identical.

The date of last update of the information is generated by the product database.

Differentiating the information on the luminance maintenance factor and the survival factor for FL and HID light sources for new and other light sources will create confusion and will make enforcing the provision of this information difficult. We suggest to ask only for the data up to 6 000 h.

The wording 'The information does not need to use the exact wording on the list above. In addition, it may also be displayed in the form of graphs, drawings or symbols.' would prevent any standardization that is necessary to make the information in the database useful. In order to clarify this, the following wording could be used instead: 'The information shall be entered in the format as given by the instructions of the product database.'

Annex V (Product database – compliance part)

Regarding the last point of 4.2(d) we suggest that the other measurable parameters, e.g. chromaticity coordinates, are explicitly mentioned, to avoid any ambiguity.

Annex VI (Distance selling)

We suggest that the QR-code is printed next to the arrow and that it is explained to the customer that he or she can use to QR-code to access the product information database containing the full label and the product information sheet.

The final Regulation shall contain the minimum dimensions of the arrow and the QR-code to be shown in paper distance selling.

Annex VIII (Verification procedure)

We are not in favor of leaving market surveillance authorities the choice (based on the acquisition costs) of testing 10 or 3 units, because this will create an unlevel enforcement field in the Union.

Detailed comments eco-design

Article 2 (Definitions)

Article 2(1), last paragraph states: “If a containing product is itself a light source, the light source to be considered for the purpose of this Regulation is the smallest physical unit that can be readily removed from the containing product without permanent mechanical damage and that meets the definition for light source.”

We assume this statement is added to deal with “luminaires”. However, it raises more problems than it solves. First, if the containing product is a luminaire, this is not a light source and therefore the statement would not be applicable. If the product is an “integrated luminaire” where the source of the light cannot be (readily) removed, then the product is a light source according to the definition. This leaves light sources where the source of the light can be readily removed; however, since the definition of light source only provide a general description of its operation (‘electrically’), this could lead to disputes on how to test this source of light.

We suggest to delete this paragraph.

Article 4 (Removal of light sources and separate control gears)

While we agree with this requirement, we would expect a qualification for the “second step” (removal by professionals instead of end-users), e.g. because of safety or functional reasons.

Annex II (Definitions)

Is actuation by movement covered in the definition of ‘data-connection parts’ (7)?

The definitions for ‘standby mode’ (15) and ‘networked standby mode’ (16) are confusingly similar because the definitions of ‘control signal’ (18) and ‘remotely initiated trigger’ (19) overlap. The difference between standby and networked standby – as defined in the (amended) Regulation (EC) 1275/2008 is that the standby mode is the mode where the product “waits” for an internal trigger, including remote control (that is delivered with the product), whereas in the networked standby mode the product “waits” for an external trigger (via a network). We suggest to keep this distinction in this

Regulation by specifying in definition (17) that the control signal is a signal from an internal source, including remote control.

Moreover, the definition of 'control mode' (17) uses the wording 'lighting control signal' and 'external control signal' that are not defined, but does not use the wording 'remotely initiated trigger'.

Annex III (Ecodesign requirements)

We suggest to provide all requirements with two decimals (where applicable).

Annex IV (Verification)

We suggest to align wording and the order of this Annex as much as possible with the corresponding Annex in the delegated act under energy labelling.

We are not in favor of leaving market surveillance authorities the choice (based on the acquisition costs) of testing 10 or 3 units, because this will create an unlevel enforcement field in the Union.

Annex V (Functionality after accelerated endurance testing)

This Annex seems to be part of the verification procedure. We suggest to clarify this in Annex IV.

As for Annex IV, we are not in favor of leaving market surveillance authorities the choice (based on the acquisition costs) of testing 10 or 3 units, because this will create an unlevel enforcement field in the Union.

The three tests in point 1 require in total 30 units, 10 for each test, which makes this an expensive test. We suggest to simplify the tests or reduce the number of tests.