

**Western Electronic Product Stewardship Initiative Meeting Summary**  
**Market Drivers Subgroup**  
**December 3, 2001**  
**Via conference call**

**Members in Attendance**

Kathy Hudson-Kerns, PSU  
Scott Klag, Metro  
Vicky Salazar, EPA

Holly Evans, EIA  
Indigo Teiwes-Cain, Portfolio 21  
Wayne Rifer, WEPSI Staff

*Meeting* The fourth meeting of the subgroup occurred on December 3 by conference call.

*Review of summary of third meeting* – It was agreed that the meeting summary for 11/19 was accurate.

*Discussion of Consensus Items on the Assessment Tool:* The subgroup talked through the consensus points from the 11/19 meeting summary to confirm that there was indeed consensus.

Holly noted that the WEPSI subgroup may lack the **technical expertise** that would be needed to fully develop the assessment tool. It was mentioned that the subgroup's intent is to develop a blueprint for the tool, not its full development. That may be the job of some other organization. It was pointed out that the WEPSI group may play a further role in system development following the scheduled multi-stakeholder meetings.

It was agreed that the assessment standards should be **performance-based**.

A **multi-stakeholder organizational** approach was discussed and it was pointed out that there may be other organizational structures worth considering. For example, the Energy Star program is an internal EPA program, though other stakeholders are consulted extensively in developing standards. The important thing is that the process have transparency, that there be consensus in the development of the standards, and that it be voluntary. The "Prospectus on Progress To Date" will be modified to reflect that there may be different approaches.

It was asked: If the assessment system is voluntary and performance-based, **how will participation by companies be encouraged?** It was discussed that the assessment tool may tie into other programs, such as the eol financing fee, or EPP, or a consumer label. These would provide the incentive.

Holly pointed out that if we are thinking that this assessment tool could tie into the **NEPSI financing system**, it will be important to bring our work to the attention of the NEPSI Financing Subgroup. She is on that subgroup and will help carry the message. She also noted that many of her members do not believe that end-of-life product characteristics are the best way to structure a fee. There may be better ways. But it is worthwhile exploring different options.

The group discussed a **company's application process**, which is conceived as being through a paper work application with the applicant providing assurance of accuracy. There may be spot checks of products. This was agreed to, but an interesting idea emerged that there could be different levels of certification, a lower level requiring only paper certification, and upper levels involving product audits by an independent lab. The "Prospectus on Progress To Date" will be modified to reflect these different approaches.

An interesting discussion ensued about the basis for setting standards. **Where do we set the bar?** Energy Star, for example, looks at the best available technology in products of a given type on the market. They set the standard at the top 25% of the most energy efficient products, as long as there are multiple technologies that will achieve that efficiency. Alternatively, TCO explicitly pushes technology development, making their standard “tough, though not impossible”. Also, the LEED standard has four levels, and no building has yet achieved the upper two (gold and platinum), indicating that their standard is really pushing the limits of current practice.

Scott Klag reported on his research on **Energy Star**. See the paper in the “Tools” document. Energy Star started with a limited set of products and has grown considerably. It is perhaps in the process of enlarging its mission from product energy efficiency to a “total energy solutions package”.

It was noted in conclusion that we need to be sure to discuss in the future the issue of **incentives** for companies to use this assessment tool.

### **Research/Tasks**

Rifer will edit the Prospectus to include the suggestions made today.

For the presentation to the 12/12 multi-stakeholder meeting:

Rifer will develop PPT slides and present the Situational Analysis and the Prospectus on Progress to Date.

Klag will report on Energy Star and LEED.

### **Group Process**

Future meeting: We will meet generally on a 2-week interval. A future meeting was set for Dec. 12 at the multi-stakeholder meeting.