

LIGHTING GLOBAL QUALITY ASSURANCE STAKEHOLDER WEBINAR NOTES

November 12, 2013

OVERVIEW:

Below are notes from the Lighting Global Quality Assurance webinar hosted on November 12th, 2013. The QA team described outcomes of the most recent stakeholder process including updates to the Minimum Quality Standards, the removal of public-facing Performance Targets and a proposed stakeholder process to determine appropriate performance reporting requirements for products going forward.

PRESENTERS:

Dr. Arne Jacobson

Technical Lead for Quality Assurance for Lighting Global

Peter Alstone

Member of the Quality Assurance Team

PARTICIPANTS:

There were 24 Participants from the US, Europe and Africa.

PRESENTATION OF WEBINAR SLIDES:

Most of the information presented during the webinar was included on the slides. You can watch the webinar on You Tube (www.youtube.com/watch?v=XBijfeaijIU) or download the slides from the Lighting Global Stakeholder webpage (<http://www.lightingglobal.org/activities/qa/stakeholder-engagement>).

In brief:

- Peter Alstone introduced webinar logistics; asked all to write in where they are “sitting today”
- Arne Jacobson introduced himself and Peter and gave a brief overview of Lighting Global Quality Assurance and the stakeholder process thus far.
- Peter described the accepted changes to the Standards
- Peter listed some highlighted comments that were received regarding the Standards
- Arne presented and discussed changes to Targets framework:
 - The Performance Targets have been eliminated as a public element of the Lighting Global quality assurance program.
 - Performance-based eligibility criteria will be maintained for consumer awareness activities (roadshows, etc) through the Lighting Africa or Lighting Asia programs, but it will not be publicly announced whether a product does or does not meet these criteria.
 - Lighting Global will soon launch a stakeholder process for determining appropriate performance reporting requirements.

QUESTIONS:

QUESTION	ANSWER
Have the junction box IP requirements and procedures for testing been decided?	We have not yet finalized those test methods, but will work to get those in place reasonably soon. We are conscious of the timeline and how that influences manufacturers in that process. It is possible we will have a slight delay in implementing that element of the new Minimum Quality Standards because, of course, we have to have new framework in place and give manufacturers time to respond as needed with regard to that.
Could you tell us a bit more about 'eligibility criteria for participation in consumer awareness campaigns' - how does that work?	<p>The way these criteria would work is that for certain consumer awareness campaigns supported by Lighting Africa or Lighting Asia the program would maintain the ability to set a minimum threshold for performance for participation in those campaigns. The threshold would depend on the audience and any expectations that the program thinks that that audience might have for how those products might perform. So those criteria will remain in place there, but they will not be as public as before. The thresholds will be publicly available, but not be widely advertised.</p> <p>For example, if there were a consumer awareness campaign that involved a roadshow, for a product to participate and be shown in that roadshow, it would need to meet the eligibility criteria. We are doing this based on feedback received from end-users over the years. When they see a product in that context, they feel that the product has been fully endorsed by the program, and that endorsement, in their view, includes the idea that the product meets both quality standards and will meet their satisfaction levels in terms of brightness and runtime.</p> <p>It has been our experience that in consumer-facing contexts, people are disappointed if there are products that are included in a campaign that are very dim or operate for very short periods only. So, it is only in the context of these Lighting Africa/Lighting Asia consumer education campaigns that these eligibility criteria will be used.</p>
In regard to the performance reporting requirements: With more and more systems able to do more than provide just light, some indication of what can be powered additionally seems relevant (despite the earlier discussion) !	This will be in the scope of the upcoming stakeholder discussion. Deciding beyond brightness and runtime, which are obvious to include, what else belongs on label or in a standardized reporting framework? Of course understanding that manufacturers are allowed to put anything that they'd like on a box, given that it is truthful.

QUESTION	ANSWER
<p>What are the plans for testing on bigger systems (solar home systems)</p>	<p>With regard to solar home systems, we have gotten quite a bit of feedback from the market and have been thinking about this for some time ourselves. We are in the process of looking to expand the current quality assurance framework so that it would cover what we would call solar home system kits. These are plug and play systems, very likely DC only, but would go to larger sizes than the ones that have been covered historically. We are in the process of looking at the current test methods and how they would need to be expanded or modified in order to accommodate these larger systems. We are moving forward with that both within the Lighting Global program, but also in conversation with the International Electrotechnical Commission. And, of course we are interested to engage in a stakeholder process around that as well before any implementation would take place. We are aware that there is significant interest for us to move forward on this in the market, and are taking that sense of urgency quite seriously.</p>
<p>I would like to take the opportunity for those who do not know me, my name is Hans-Peter Birkhofer and for the past two to three months, I have been the Technical Director for GOGLA. In this question of Quality Assurance, GOGLA would like to position the industry's voice, the private sector's voice, a little bit more and we also would like to support this Quality Assurance activity through some contribution which we plan to do with GIZ. GOGLA would like to contribute in this area to provide the industry view in the Quality Assurance process. We from the industry see it as very important, what Arne said, that we are partly separating the Minimum Quality Standards from the Performance Targets with values. If there is anything, we will work together on this activity and then also discuss if it results in a quality seal or quality logo as well as some quality performance reporting requirements.</p>	<p>Thank you. We also want to thank GOGLA in particular for its feedback during the most recent revision process, we felt that a number of the comments that came in from the Association were quite productive and influential in terms of particularly the way that we thought about the Performance Targets and the changes we made in that regard. We also felt that the session that was held in June with the Quality Assurance working group was a very productive one. We look forward to further engagement and want to thank GOGLA for the past organizing and engagement in this area.</p>