

TELEVISION STUDY GROUP MEETING MINUTES
Thursday April 23, 2009
11 to 1 PM EDT

Welcome from Patty Dillon and John Katz, co-chairs.

Roll Call/ Attending:

Walter Alcorn (Alcorn Consulting); Rion Austin (MBA Polymers); Cate Berard (EPA); Clifford Bast (Acer); Mike Biddle (MBA Polymers); Pamela Brody-Heine (Eco-Stewardship Strategies); Stephanie Castorina (IPC); Gerard Catapano (Consumer Union); Paul Chalmer (Natl. Ctr. For Manufacturing Sciences); Sue Chiang (Ctr. For Environmental Health); Mike Coop (heyCoop); Shannon Davis (EPA); Patty Dillon (Dillon Env. Associates); Ric Erdheim (Philips); Faridoon Ferhut (CIWMB); Missy Hayes (Mitsubishi); Garth Hickle (MN PCA); Yoshiaki Ichikawa (Hitachi); Sego Jackson (Snohomish Co.); John Katz (EPA); Richard Kerr (Bayer); Michael Kirschner (Design Chain Assoc.); Susan Landry (Albemarle); Sergei Levchik (ICL); Judy Levin (Ctr. For Env. Health); Jason Linnell (NCER); David Maciel (Sony); Pat Mayer (AHLA); Frank Marella (Sharp); Colleen Pickford (ITI); Jack Price (FL DEP); Wayne Rifer (GEC); Nicola Shirru (self); John Short (JazzCom Group); Leonard Tsai (self); Richard Vernam (Panasonic); Jade Wang (China United Certification Ctr.); Ed Weil (NYU Polytechnic Institute); Cat Wilt (Univ. of TN); D'Lane Wisner (Amer. Chemistry Council); Keiko Yokoyama (Sony).

Agenda Review: Patty elaborated on the agenda for the call. The key issue for today is wrapping up the Study Group process and transitioning to the Working Group process. A few participants reported problems with accessing materials on the site.

Approval of March Minutes: Minutes from meetings will be posted on the public section of the web site after approval. In discussion of the March 11 minutes, there was one correction related to replacing the word "agenda" with "minutes" in the title of the document. [Minutes](#) were approved as amended by affirmation.

General Announcements:

Update from Imaging Equipment (IE) Working Group: The IE Working Group has formed subgroups to develop criteria in 10 environmental performance categories. In addition to the 8 categories outlined in the TV PAR, the IE Working Group added two categories: consumables and indoor air quality. These subgroups are in the process of defining their scope and identifying criteria that are common across product groups.

Balloting of 1680.1: This ballot closed on April 16. It met requirements for 75% representation and had 96% approval of the balloting group. The ballot resolution committee will meet to address comments received. After that, the ballot will go out for recirculation.

WG Policies & Procedures: We have been using the EASC Policies & Procedures (P&P). Now IEEE is recommending the adoption of policies and procedures specifically for working groups. There is a draft working group P & P circulating in the EASC; we will continue to use the EASC P&P's until the Working Group document is approved. Working groups will have an opportunity to review them before they are finalized.

Outcome of PAR Vote: Patty referenced the document titled "EPEAT TV Study Group PAR Vote Summary." The Study Group had an electronic vote, which was open from April 1-7. 78.4 % of eligible participants voted in favor of the PAR (40 of 51 votes) and 21.6 % of eligible participants voted against the PAR (11 of 51 votes). Patty provided a walk-through of the results by stakeholder category, noting that participants from each stakeholder category cast votes in favor of the PAR, and referenced the comments received. With this vote, the TV

Study Group is now officially the IEEE 1680.3 Working Group. While some participants disagreed with the language in the PAR, the Working Group (WG) will not revisit issues raised, since greater than 75% voted in favor of the PAR as it was written.

Public Announcement on TV Standard Development: The EASC P&P state that discussions within a WG should not be communicated outside the group without approval. A proposed statement, "TV Study Group PAR Vote Statement," was provided to the WG for approval. There were no comments on the statement. There was a request to allow additional time for review since some participants had difficulty accessing the web site prior to the call. [The statement was conditionally approved, pending submission of any comments.](#) Participants should send any comments to John or Patty by the end of this week. If there are no comments, the statement will be considered approved and posted on the website next week.

Standard Development Process Roadmap: John reviewed the standards development process, referencing the document entitled "TV Standard Development Process & Timeline." We have passed a couple of milestones, namely the approval of the PAR. The EASC approved the TV PAR at their meeting on April 21. The PAR now goes to the IEEE Standards Approval Committee. The TV Working Group can commence its work while that approval is pending. We will revisit the roadmap occasionally to update the timeline. There is no minimum length of time to complete the overall process; however, there are minimum timeframes for things like balloting and public notification.

Transition to IEEE 1680.3 Working Group

Patty reviewed several participation issues.

- *WG Membership.* We checked with IEEE and we can "rollover" the Study Group membership to the Working Group. Please let Patty or John know if you do NOT want to remain part of the process. We are not required to solicit new members, since we undertook that process to form the Study Group. However, we can add representation or areas of expertise that the group feels are lacking.
- *Participation requirements.* The draft WG P&Ps delineate rostered vs. observer status. Rostered members have participation requirements (i.e., can't miss 2 consecutive meetings unless there are justifiable conflicts) and voting rights, while observers have no participation requirements or voting privileges. Both rostered and observers can participate and have full voting rights in subgroups, provided they meet participation guidelines. A concern was expressed that observers could potentially distract the work of the group with questions. Patty explained that developing an ANSI standard requires openness and transparency, but also felt it was appropriate to share this concern with the EASC as the working group P & Ps are under development.
- *WG Co-Chairs:* Patty Dillon and John Katz are willing to stay on as co-chairs of the Working Group with the approval of the WG. John will be on temporarily on assignment to the Climate Change office from mid-May to September, but would like to continue in the role. His colleague, Shannon Davis, has agreed to fill in for him in his absence. [Patty Dillon and John Katz/Shannon Davis were approved as WG co-chairs by affirmation.](#) Shannon introduced herself to the group. She has been working on recasting EPA's solid and hazardous waste program into a lifecycle-based materials management framework.

Performance Categories: Patty referenced the document titled "1680 Performance Categories and Criteria" and stepped through the existing 8 performance categories. As stated in the PAR, Working Groups can choose to address additional performance categories. It was

suggested that the WG consider the new EuP Directive, which has a life cycle scope and therefore doesn't fit neatly into any one of the existing EPEAT performance categories. Patty suggested that the WG discuss this idea further on the May call, and requested that background documents be provided to WG members in advance of the call. Patty asked the group to email any other ideas for additional performance categories for discussion on the May conference call.

Criteria Development: John suggested an approach for organizing the criteria development process as outlined in the document "Possible Strategy for Criteria Development." As co-chairs, we're trying to identify ways to streamline the process for efficient use of participants' time, recognizing that there is considerable overlap between TV WG members and the subgroups recently formed in the Imaging Equipment (IE) WG. In addition, based on the IE subgroup work to date, it's likely that some performance categories will have mostly criteria that are common across product categories. For these reasons, John recommended that the TV WG:

- First form subgroups to address the performance categories that do NOT have significant overlap with the IE subgroups and may have unique issues for TVs, including: Energy Conservation, Design for End of Life, Product Longevity, and Packaging.
- Hold off on forming TV subgroups for the remaining categories with significant participant overlap until we see what emerges out of the initial discussions about common criteria within the IE subgroups. These categories include: environmentally sensitive materials, material selection, EOL management, and corporate performance). We can then discuss with the IE chairs and subgroups if it makes sense and how best to join common criteria discussions with the IE subgroups. For example, some TV WG members could join the IE subgroups or we could wait for the IE subgroups to develop the common criteria, while the TV WG develop additional criteria unique to TVs.

John asked if there were any questions about how subgroups work or the recommendation to stagger the formation of the subgroups? None voiced. Is there was any preference for one approach versus another? There was some support voiced for merging discussions with IE. A concern was also voiced about the current size of the IE subgroups, which might make merging TVs with IE challenging.

Next Steps:

- Patty will send out an email request for volunteers to participate on the four subgroups that will be launched first, as well as volunteers to chair the subgroups.
- Participants should send Patty:
 - Any comments on the PAR vote public statement by the end of the week.
 - Ideas for additional performance categories for discussion on the May conference call.
- The face-to-face meeting tentatively scheduled for June will be postponed, possibly to the fall.
- Patty asked the group if they had a preference on how future meetings are scheduled, and if there was a time preference. Should we set up a regularly scheduled conference call time or send out a Meeting Wizard request on a month-by-month basis? All those responding preferred Meeting Wizard. The 11:00 eastern start is okay for the majority, although Asian participants would ideally prefer a 10:00 a.m. start. Patty acknowledged this preference, but noted that given the number of US west coast participants is was unlikely to work.