



Position on the Commission proposals to revise the Ecodesign & Energy Labelling regulations for Household Dishwashers

January 2018

Following the Ecodesign Consultation Forum Meeting of 19th December 2017, find our views below:

Energy efficiency aspects

Ecodesign energy requirements: very insufficient levels – tier 2 needed

The proposal only includes one tier of energy efficiency requirements, and at an extremely unambitious level, i.e. at EEI of 58 in the middle of current A+ class (future F class). However, the preparatory study has identified that the least life cycle cost (LLCC) option is at the level of the best products without a heat pump, that is at an EEI of 40 for a 13-place settings machine, meaning in the future C class. This has been achieved by introducing improvements to the design such as the automatic door opening, an optimised heat exchanger or a fan with better air circulation. This shows that solely phasing out G class products is fully contradictory with the requisites of the Ecodesign Directive.

We urge the European Commission to **set at least two tiers, and a second tier at the genuine LLCC level**, as assessed in the preparatory study. Tier 2 could, for instance, phase out classes F, E, and D by 2024.

New Energy Label classes: empty class A

The proposal provided for the future Energy Label should be adjusted to reflect the modified declaration of the Best Available Technology (BAT) where the EEI of a dishwasher with a built-in heat pump from the Swiss manufacturer V-ZUG, reaches a EEI of 32.8. In the explanatory notes of the preparatory study, the information on the product's energy consumption has been updated but the report calculates an incorrect EEI of 35. As a consequence, the thresholds for the classes are set taking an EEI of 35 and not 32.8, hence, the threshold for class A is set at 34. This means that the proposed class A will already be populated with the heat pump model. Class A should be empty as required in the revised Energy Label Framework Regulation and the BAT situated in Class B.

In addition, the preparatory study suggested to not consider the heat pump as BAT due to the estimated low sales. We disagree with this assumption as the product is currently available in Switzerland, its home market, and through the manufacturer's retail network in the Benelux area, France, Italy, Germany and the United Kingdom.

We urge the Commission to **review the Energy Label classes in order to comply with the Energy Label Framework Directive** to leave the top-class empty, and to take the heat pump operated models as the current BAT.

Support for non-deceptive programme names and reflecting consumer use

We fully support restricting the use of programme names such as normal/daily/standard/regular that can divert the user from using the ECO cycle, the program actually used to test the performance of dishwashers, for normally soiled tableware. Considering the risk of abuses on the market, it is essential that the Energy Label continues to provide clear and honest information to consumers.

The proposal however, recommends keeping the ECO programme as the labelled programme. We are convinced that the test method used for the declaration of the Energy Label should be representative of real-life use as much as possible. This is also required by the new Energy Label Regulation (Article 13). The preparatory study showed that the ECO programme is only used 19% of the time, making it the second most used programme after the “Normal/Regular programme 45°C/50°C/55°C” (22%) and before the “Normal/Regular programme 60°C/65°C” (17%). Therefore, as repeatedly stated, the best scenario would include a combination of programmes and functions selected based on consumer habits. Should the Ecodesign and Energy Label regulations only refer to one programme as proposed in the working documents, it should at the very least refer to the normal/regular programme, called that way, instead of to the ECO which is the most efficient, to avoid confusion.

Off, standby and networked standby modes

We disagree with the decision made to tackle the off, standby and networked standby consumption in this regulation and not in the horizontal standby and network standby regulation. Going for the vertical approach increases difficulties for regulation updates and undermines the level playing field.

It would be more beneficial to keep these definitions and requirements for the off, standby and networked standby modes in the horizontal regulation. The vertical regulation could instead potentially include a more precise/strict rule for the power management (e.g. 'after the completion of a cycle, a machine shall go to an off mode (as defined in Regulation 801/2013) after a maximum of 10 minutes'). This would significantly limit the energy impact of the left-on mode.

Compatibility with hot water inlet displayed on the label

We recommend adding a **pictogram on the energy label to identify products that can be used with hot water inlet**. This should also be included in the instruction manual and be prominent, as this can substantially reduce the electricity consumption of dishwashers, it is important that this option is promoted, and that more information is placed on the energy label or in the instructions manual. If a household's hot water is heated in an energy-efficient way and the pipe between water tank and dishwasher is short, then “Hot Fill” can save 20% of energy with most programmes. With special Hot Fill programmes that do not require additional heating, energy savings can reach 90%. Hot Fill for dishwashers is much easier to implement than for washing machines (only one water inlet, nearly all models can be linked to hot water already today, installed in kitchen where hot water is already used, and the tank is usually close).

Repeatability, reproducibility and representativeness of measurement methods

When the documents make reference to repeatability and reproducibility of the measurement methods, they should also mention representativeness or reflection of real-life conditions/usage, as per the Energy Labelling framework regulation.

Circumvention beyond power consumption

We support the introduction of an anti-circumvention clause in Article 5 of the Ecodesign proposal, since this has been explicitly mentioned in the 2017 Energy Labelling Regulation and is not present in the 2009 Ecodesign Directive.

While Article 5 only makes reference to power consumption in terms of circumvention, the scenario to alter other performance parameters to demonstrate better power consumption results in a test should also be covered.

Verification tolerances

Assuming that the quality of test methods improves, any increase in verification tolerances should be clearly justified (i.e. *Cleaning Performance (I_c): The determined value shall not be less than the declared value of I_c by more than 14%, while the value in the current Regulation is 10%*).

Resource efficiency aspects

We are pleased to note and strongly support all the measures outlined in the Working Document that address material efficiency considerations (dismantling, spare part availability and repairability) under Annex I. In particular for dishwashers, where there is a trend towards reduction in product lifetimes¹, lifetime extension via improved repair has proven benefits², and the Ecodesign regulation is the key legislative tool to address this. The opportunity should be seized to strengthen certain aspects even further:

Spare part availability (Annex I, 2.3)

One of the major factors causing unsuccessful repair of products is the availability of spare parts in terms of:

- being able to find spare parts for purchase (17% of those trying in a recent survey³ could not find suppliers for the necessary parts) and/or
- the prohibitive cost of spare parts (18% of those trying to carry out repair found the parts too expensive).

Therefore, the availability of spare parts is a key material efficiency consideration that requires policy attention.

¹ <https://blog.yaleappliance.com/bid/86114/should-you-fix-your-dishwasher-costs-reviews>

² Report on benefits and impacts/costs of options for different potential material efficiency requirements for Dishwashers March 2015, Ardente y Peiró

<http://publications.jrc.ec.europa.eu/repository/bitstream/JRC95187/lb-na-27200-en-n.pdf>

³ <https://www.ellenmacarthurfoundation.org/assets/downloads/ce100/Empowering-Repair-Final-Public.pdf>

We welcome the proposal from the Commission to set a minimum period for the availability of spare parts. However, **we call for an extension of the minimum period to a fixed number of years that is representative of the expected lifetime of the product** (e.g. 12 years, as assumed in the preparatory studies):

- The Austrian standard ONR 192102 specifies that the availability of replacement parts for large household appliances must be guaranteed for a period of at least 10 years.
- A fixed timeframe is necessary to avoid a situation where the spare part is only available at the time of placement on the market: this is the period where a spare part is highly unlikely to be necessary yet.
- Market surveillance actions requires a time limit: without a specified time duration for availability, regulatory requirements cannot be verified.

Spare part maximum delivery time (Annex I, 2.4)

We strongly support requirements for spare part maximum delivery time. We consider that the timeframe of three weeks could be further reduced to avoid this time-lapse to become a reason for consumers to replace their product. Existing suppliers and manufacturers usually dispatch between 1 to 3 days, or 1 to 2 weeks for some less common parts. The requirement could be finetuned to only account for the time in the hand of the manufacturers (e.g. 2 weeks for sending out the spare part, excluding shipping time).

Unrestricted independent operator access to information on repair (Annex I, 2.5)

In a recent study, the most commonly cited reason for an unsuccessful repair was the lack of information and is the cause for one out of three failed repairs (32%)⁴. As such, references to “unrestricted access to appliance repair and maintenance information to independent operators” should be retained and refined:

- The current wording does not require that access to information is completely open to the public but can be somewhat ambiguous. For this reason, **we propose to add an explanatory section to the definition of “independent operator”** as in Regulation EC715/2007 on the availability of vehicle repair and maintenance information. We propose to adapt the sentence as follows: “‘independent operator’ means an undertaking other than authorised retailer and repairer which is directly or indirectly involved in the repair and maintenance of household dishwashers, in particular repairers, manufacturers or distributors of repair equipment, tools or spare parts, publishers of technical information, not-for-profit repair initiatives, operators offering training for repairers”.
- The ability to apply fees already add a significant layer of restricted access: the regulation allows for “reasonable or proportionate” fees to be charged, which would sufficiently restrict the audience of the documents to avoid non-qualified / unskilled repairers undertaking repairs.

Requirements for dismantling (Annex I, 2.2)

We call on the Commission to replace the term “dismantling” with **“disassembly” to go beyond material recovery and recycling, and to also facilitate repair** of household dishwashers. This would also support the in-situ repair of appliances.

⁴ <https://www.ellenmacarthurfoundation.org/assets/downloads/ce100/Empowering-Repair-Final-Public.pdf>

In clause 2, point 3, the **size limitation of LCD is unreasonably large** and means that a large number of displays will not be addressed by the requirement. The size limitation should be reduced or removed in order for the requirements to apply to the majority of dishwashers. In addition, we would like to reinforce here that with regards to the proposed dismantlability of LCD screens, this issue is better tackled through horizontal requirements under the display regulation. However, since the latter is not yet acted upon, we call on the Commission to keep the dismantability requirements here, with no conditions of size, and go even further by adopting disassemblability requirements.

We also believe that **motors and hoses should be added to the list of components** that must be easily accessible without the need of proprietary tools as these may contribute to the most common faults in dishwashers.

The provision of information in itself is insufficient to improve the disassemblability of dishwasher parts. Building upon current drafts of standard prEN 45555 in response to mandate M/543, recyclability requirements should include the following:

- **Maximum time for dismantling for PCBs and LCDs of 300 seconds** performed by a professional, in line with the JRC report⁵.
- **The concept of “proprietary and not commonly available tools” is insufficiently defined.** Pending the provisions in the final standard under mandate M/543, we propose to specify that “(removal) must be possible without the use of any tool that is not readily available for purchase by any individual or business without restrictions”.
- Restrictions should be placed on the **use of plastics/polymers that impede adequate recycling**, such as non-compatible for recycling polymer blends, incompatible coatings, very dark plastics that have no recycling routes, etc.

Furthermore, the information measures under Annex I, 2 should be listed in line with the waste hierarchy, hence any clauses referring to end-of-life treatment should be placed last (e.g. disassembly clauses such as (1) and (2) to be listed last).

Free warranty

In addition, we call on the Commission **to include the free warranty periods on the Energy Label** as this will emphasize best practices on the market, promote longer lasting products and guide consumers in their purchasing decisions.

Miscellaneous

We have identified several mistakes in the draft Regulations and encourage the Commission to reassess the whole content in detail and polish it. Some examples include:

- The link of the QR code on the label is not specified. It should be clarified that it has to link to official data, such as the one provided in the official EU product database, and not a manufacturer/supplier website.

⁵ <http://publications.jrc.ec.europa.eu/repository/bitstream/JRC95187/lb-na-27200-en-n.pdf>

- It is unclear how networked standby will be considered in the requirements. Clarification should be provided on whether it is fully included in the definition of “Pb”, and if so, why there is a separate definition for networked standby.
- The text currently requires that the instruction manual contains “information concerning, and delivered by means of, proprietary tools and equipment”, which would make proprietary tools mandatory.

Bearing in mind that the goal of the Energy label and Ecodesign regulations is not to promote automatic dishwashing, but to remove the worst performing products from the market and allow consumers to compare appliances, we recommend avoiding references to the comparison with hand washing as proposed in Annex I, 3 (e).

Lastly, in the light of the next review of the regulation, we invite the Commission to better assess the work on standardised spare parts so that they can be interchangeable. Such a process would significantly help independent operators by allowing them to change, have access and stock spare parts more easily, while it would create a market for spare parts and result in benefits related to energy efficiency. We recommend the Commission includes this aspect within the revision clause under Article 8.

Contact:

ECOS – European Environmental Citizens’ Organisation for Standardisation

Nerea Ruiz, nerea.ruiz@ecostandard.org