

EPEAT Clarification #38

Evidence required to prove recycling for cardboard and other fiber-based packaging materials in criterion 4.8.2.2

This Clarification applies to the following IEEE Standards and criteria:

Applicable Standards:

- IEEE 1680.1 – Computers and Displays
- IEEE 1680.2 – Imaging Equipment
- IEEE 1680.3 – Televisions

Applicable Criteria:

4.8.2.2

Conformity Decision Panel (CDP) Determination:

Per criterion 4.8.2.2 in 1680.1, the CDP has determined that cardboard and other wood pulp based material are normally recyclable, compostable, or disposable in a municipal sewage program and therefore evidence is not needed to prove cardboard and other fiber-based material (i.e. derived from a natural fiber) are recyclable, compostable, or disposable in a municipal sewage program; e.g. bagasse, bamboo, hemp, kenaf, mushroom, straw, wood. Manufacturer would still need to demonstrate conformance to verification requirement b) for cardboard and other fiber-based based material coated in latex, wax or synthetic material.

Background information:

Participating EPEAT Manufacturers have requested clarity on what evidence is needed for verification requirement b) in 1680.1 which reads, “Demonstration that material is normally recyclable or, if not, that there exists a market/use.” Due to the fact that cardboard and other wood pulp based packaging materials are normally recyclable, compostable, or disposable in a municipal sewage program the CDP finds that it is not necessary for Manufacturers to provide specific demonstration that these materials are normally recyclable, compostable, or disposable in a municipal sewage program. In fact, it appears that this topic has evolved because later standards (IEEE 1680.2 and IEEE 1680.3) consider fiber-based materials as recyclable or compostable without additional documentation. Other packaging materials are not

considered normally recyclable, compostable, or disposable in a municipal sewage program and therefore evidence must be provided to prove verification requirement b).

Change History: Revision A approved by the Conformity Decision Panel and moves to 30 day comment period on 07/06/2016. Revision B sent to CDP after incorporating public comments and was approved on 09/09/2016. Since the changes were many, Revision B moves to another 30 day comment period which closed on 10/19/2016. Comments received were questions as opposed to requests for changes so Revision B, with the addition of this text becomes Revision C published February 2017.