



## **OUTCOMES REPORT EPEAT VERIFICATION ROUND 2012-01**

### **1. Summary and Details of Verification Round 2012-01**

This report provides the detailed results of EPEAT Verification Round 2012-01. Round 2012-01 consisted of 45 investigations of selected products for the criteria listed below:

- 4.3.1.8 – Required – Minimum 65% reusable / recyclable
- 4.4.3.1 – Optional – Availability of replacement parts
- 4.5.1.1 – Required – ENERGY STAR
- 4.7.1.1 – Required – Demonstration of corporate environmental policy consistent with ISO 14001
- 4.7.3.1 – Required – Corporate report consistent with Performance Track or GRI
- 4.7.3.2 – Optional – Corporate report based on GRI
- 4.8.1.1 – Required – Reduction/elimination of intentionally added toxics in packaging
- 4.8.5.1 – Optional – Declaration of reusable packaging

This Verification Round consisted of 45 investigations of products previously found in Non-Conformance or where other questions were found during Verification Rounds 2011-05 and 2011-06. All active Subscribers were verified for one criterion in this Verification Round, with the exception of four Subscribers who were still involved in Verification Round 2011-05. Only products declaring to the selected criteria were chosen for investigation. The verification was performed using level one investigations.

### **2. Outcomes of Round 2012-01**

The 45 investigations were done on a mix of required and optional criteria. Annually declared corporate criteria were also included. Following are the specific highlights of Round 2012-01.

- 45 investigations were planned and completed during this round.
- There were 36 decisions of Conformance for these investigations.
- There were 9 findings of Non-Conformance for these investigations.
- Investigations resulting in Non-Conformance findings are identified in Table 1. Table 2 identifies the Subscribers and products. Following the investigation phase corrective action was taken to resolve all identified Non-Conformances and restore the accuracy of the Registry. The impact of these corrective actions on the Registry was:
  - Four products were archived for Subscribers who failed to move into Conformance.
    - 2 Subscribers responded during the corrective action phase informing EPEAT they were leaving the EPEAT system. EPEAT archived all their products.
    - 2 Subscribers did not make corrections to their product declarations during the corrective action phase. Since the criterion investigated for both Subscribers was a required corporate criterion, the outcome of the investigation impacted all the Subscribers' products. In one case, the Subscriber archived all their products. In the other case the Subscriber had only two products on the EPEAT Registry. One

was deactivated<sup>1</sup> and the other was already archived. EPEAT took no further action.

- 4 Subscribers provided additional data which brought their products into Conformance with the criteria as originally declared.
- 1 Subscriber undeclared the Non-Conformant criterion for all products in the applicable country, restoring the accuracy of the Registry. This did not change the tier rating of the product.

### 3. Key Lessons of Round 2012-01

- This Verification Round found two categories of Non-Conformance findings.
  - 1) In 2 investigations, the Subscriber provided incomplete information to demonstrate conformance.
  - 2) In 7 investigations, the declaration on the EPEAT Registry was inaccurate.
- This Verification Round found 6 Non-Conformance findings for corporate criteria that apply to all products on the EPEAT Registry.
  - Criterion 4.7.1.1 - Required – Demonstration of corporate environmental policy consistent with ISO 14001.
    - *Message to Subscribers:*
      - *The Verification Requirements for this criterion specify that the corporate environmental policy must be indexed to the environmental policy section of ISO 14001 by the Subscriber. In all future investigations, an index must specifically be provided.*
  - Criterion 4.7.3.1 - Required – Corporate report consistent with Performance Track or GRI.
    - *Message to Subscribers:*
      - *The Verification Requirements for this criterion specify that a corporate annual report must be produced. While the report need not be public, 1) a copy of the annual report must be provided along with 2) an index to Performance Track (first three requirements) or GRI.*
      - *The most updated version of GRI may be used for indexing purposes.*
  - Criterion 4.7.3.2 – Optional – Corporate report based on GRI.
    - *Message to Subscribers:*
      - *The Verification Requirements for this criterion specify that a corporate annual report must be produced and be publically available. Annual reports starting with the declaration of this criterion on the Registry must also be available. A copy of the current annual report indexed to GRI must be provided.*
      - *Not all elements of GRI must be met; however, those that are met must be indexed and those that are not met must be specifically identified.*
      - *The most updated version of GRI may be used for indexing purposes.*
- *Message to Subscribers:*
  - a. *IEEE 1680 and the EPEAT subscriber agreements require that Subscribers provide the information*

---

<sup>1</sup> Deactivating a product removes it from the EPEAT Registry.

identified in Verification Requirements to prove the accuracy of their declarations within 30 days of EPEAT's request. Failure to provide that information is inconsistent with the agreement and may result in termination of the Subscriber from EPEAT.

- b. Where Non-Conformances are found it is the non-conforming Subscriber's responsibility to correct their declarations and, as necessary, all product declarations on the Registry that may have similar non-conformances but were not investigated must be updated. Further, we expect all subscribers to review the Outcomes Reports and, based on the identified non-conformances, correct their own declarations as necessary. EPEAT will continue to conduct follow up investigations to ensure that all Subscribers are making such corrections.
- c. When contacted regarding participation in a Verification Round, EPEAT staff request that you respond to the Qualified Verifier quickly to let them know they are communicating with the correct person or to inform them who they should be communicating with. This also helps the Qualified Verifier to know they have a valid email address.

#### 4. Looking Forward

1. **Plans for Future Verification Activities:** There are 6 Verification Rounds planned for 2012. Investigations will include Level 1, Level 2 and Level 3 investigations.
2. **Training:** An expanded worldwide training schedule has been created for 2012. US based training took place in Portland, Oregon, May 21-24, 2012. The next training session will take place in Stuttgart, Germany on September 17-20, 2012. For more information please contact Andrea Desimone at [andrea.desimone@greenelectronicscouncil.org](mailto:andrea.desimone@greenelectronicscouncil.org).
3. **Conformity Assessment Protocols:** This and all future rounds will be conducted according to the Conformity Assessment Protocols posted on [www.epeat.net](http://www.epeat.net).

#### 5. Investigation Tables

**TABLE 1: Non-Conformance Findings**

Criterion	Description	Total # of Investigations	# of completed investigations	# of NCs
4.3.1.8	Required – Minimum 65% reusable / recyclable.	6	6	0
4.4.3.1	Optional – Availability of replacement parts.	6	6	1
4.5.1.1	Required – ENERGY STAR.	6	6	0
4.7.1.1	Required – Demonstration of corporate environmental policy consistent with ISO 14001.	5	5	1
4.7.3.1	Required – Corporate report consistent with Performance Track or GRI.	5	5	2
4.7.3.2	Optional – Corporate report based on GRI.	5	5	3
4.8.1.1	Required – Reduction/elimination of intentionally added toxics in packaging.	6	6	1
4.8.5.1	Optional – Declaration of reusable packaging.	6	6	1
	Total	45	45	9



**TABLE 2: Non-Conformance Findings: Corrective Actions Taken**

Subscriber	Product	Country	Product Category	Verification Criterion	R or O	Criterion Description	Description of NC finding	Corrective Action Taken
EIZO NANA Corporation	FlexScan S2433W	United States	Displays	4.4.3.1	Optional	Availability of replacement parts.	Incomplete information was provided by the Subscriber.	Subscriber provided additional information.
Northern Micro Inc.	P8Q67-AS SFF	Canada	Desktops	4.7.1.1	Required	Demonstration of corporate environmental policy consistent with ISO 14001.	All elements of criterion not met.	Subscriber updated website to include all required information.
Procomp	LS-5505	Brazil	Desktops	4.7.3.1	Required	Corporate report consistent with Performance Track or GRI.	The declaration on the EPEAT Registry was inaccurate.	Subscriber archived all products.
Tangent Computer Inc.	VITA 2000	United States	Integrated Desktop Computers	4.7.3.1	Required	Corporate report consistent with Performance Track or GRI.	The declaration on the EPEAT Registry was inaccurate.	Subscriber archived all products.
On Line Datensysteme Gmbh	>>es on<< view 190	Germany	Displays	4.7.3.2	Optional	Corporate report based on GRI.	The declaration on the EPEAT Registry was inaccurate.	EPEAT archived all Subscriber's products.
Ace Computers	LogiCAD 55525A	United States	Workstation Desktops	4.7.3.2	Optional	Corporate report based on GRI.	All elements of criterion not met.	Subscriber updated website to include all required information.
Cybernet Manufacturing Inc.	Cybermed MP15T	United States	Integrated Desktop Computers	4.7.3.2	Optional	Corporate report based on GRI.	The declaration on the EPEAT Registry was inaccurate.	EPEAT archived all Subscriber's products.

Subscriber	Product	Country	Product Category	Verification Criterion	R or O	Criterion Description	Description of NC finding	Corrective Action Taken
Ilhaservice Servicos de Informatica Ltda.	IWP8007	Brazil	Desktops	4.8.1.1	Required	Reduction/elimination of intentionally added toxics in packaging.	Incomplete information was provided by the Subscriber.	Subscriber provided additional information.
MMD Taiwan Ltd.	235P2	Hungary	Displays	4.8.5.1	Optional	Declaration of reusable packaging.	The declaration on the EPEAT Registry was inaccurate.	Subscriber undeclared criterion for all products sold in Hungary.

## 6. Background

To assure the credibility of the EPEAT Registry, verification of the claims by participating manufacturers (called “Subscribers”) are rigorous, independent and transparent. Verification is conducted strictly according to policies and procedures described in the IEEE 1680 Standard and in documents provided on [www.epeat.net](http://www.epeat.net). Subscribers are given no forewarning that their products will be verified and verification is performed based on the declarations as they are in the database at the time the round begins.

In level one verification investigations, subscribers are required to provide detailed and accurate information that is identified in each criterion of the standard in a timely manner that demonstrates conformance, such as supply chain management records. In level two and three investigations EPEAT buys or borrows products without the Subscriber’s knowledge, disassembles them, and conducts detailed analytical testing if needed. Level two investigations can also take the form of site visits. Investigations are performed by expert technical contractors who are free of conflicts of interest, and their recommended decisions are reviewed and finalized by a 3-person panel of independent technical experts (called the Product Verification Committee or PVC) who are also contractors free of conflicts of interest and are blind to the identity of the products and companies they are judging. This panel makes a conformance/non-conformance decision on each investigation, based on evidence collected and analyzed by Qualified Verifiers. A serious consequence of receiving a non-conformance is that it is published publicly in an Outcomes Report, for purchasers, competitors, and others to see.

Subscribers must correct findings of non-conformance, either by bringing the product into conformance, by un-declaring the criterion until conformance is achieved, or by removing the product from the registry, and they must do so for all products that are similarly incorrectly declared, not only the product(s) that were investigated. If they correct the non-conformance by un-declaring the criterion and the criterion is an optional criterion, they lose a point, and possibly the product drops a tier. If it is a required criterion, they must archive the product. If it is a required corporate criterion, all their products must be archived.