

SELECTION OF PRODUCTS FOR VERIFICATION TESTING

Mark Ellis



Asia-Pacific
Economic Cooperation

APEC Expert Group on Energy Efficiency and Conservation (EGEE&C)
Under the APEC Energy Working Group

BEST USE OF SCARCE TESTING RESOURCES

- Testing process:
 - *Screen test one sample to identify possible failures*
 - *Avoid 'golden sample'*
 - *Test multiple products later to provide level of certainty needed for enforcement*
- Model selection:
 - *Random selection is useful to identify overall rate of compliance*
 - *But very expensive and inefficient way to identify non-compliance!*
 - *Better to use risk assessment to target products most likely to damage the objectives and credibility of the program*

ASSESSMENT OF RISK - DAMAGE TO S&L PROGRAM

- **Primary targets:**
- Appliance categories representing major energy consumption
- Large variation between claim and performance
- Non-compliance in models with high market share

MODEL SELECTION

- Most programs make model selection based on the credibility of company claims. E.g.
- At brand level:
 - *Does the brand have a good record of compliance?*
 - *Here and/or in other economies?*
- At a model level:
 - *What is the quality of evidence for claims – is the test lab known and credible?*
 - *Have competitors provided evidence of non-compliance?*
 - *Are the claims of performance excessively high - unbelievable?*
- **These criteria help to target likely non-compliance**

COMBINING THESE CRITERIA TO PINPOINT PRIORITY MODELS

Criteria	To identify products with a high risk of failure	To identify products which have the greatest potential impact on the E3 Program
1a. Complaints from competitors		
1b. Intelligence from consumer groups and individuals		
1c. Intelligence from overseas testing programs		
Supported by independent evidence	25	
Supported by non-independent evidence	10	
Without evidence	5	
2. Models with a high market share		0-15
3. Brands with a history of non-compliance	5	
4. Product categories with the highest greenhouse gas emissions		0-5
5. New Brands or brands with limited exposure to the Program	5	
6. Brands with a history of passing check testing	-5	
7. Product categories with comparatively high levels of non-compliance	0-10	
8. Models supported by test laboratories with a past history of failing check tests	5-10	
10. Models supported by test laboratories without a past history	10	
11. New product categories. Less than 5 yrs =0-10/ longer than 5 yrs = 0	0-10	

CONCLUSIONS

- Programs have scarce testing resources – more programs allocating this wisely
- By using market intelligence to target likely cases of non-compliance
- Industry can play a major role in highlighting misleading claims
- Sharing intelligence amongst economies can help to identify issues/brands/products/laboratories with poor performance
- The better we can target instances of non-compliance, the less funds we will need for testing
 - *So long as we follow-up with enforcement!*
- Make criteria transparent