

ErP Lot 4 VA - Steering Committee meeting
Monday 10 June 2013, 11am
DIGITALEUROPE, 14 rue de la Science, Brussels

PARTICIPANTS

Name	Company
Stephen Kimber	Brother
William Dazy	Canon
Tom Moriarty	Dell
Adam Romanowski	DG Energy, European Commission
Milena Presutto	ENEA (Italy)
Bram Soenen	Federal ministry of Environment (Belgium)
Pierre Sicsic	Hewlett-Packard
Sara Rodriguez Martinez	Hewlett-Packard
Markus Kelch	Konica Minolta
Remy Kadirbaks	Kyocera
Maxime Furkel	Lexmark
Peter McGregor	OKI
Laura Spengler	Ökopol (Germany), representing EEB
Marie-Helene Dubray	Panasonic
Tom Wagland	Ricoh
Dierk Ulken	Toshiba
Roy van den Boorn	VHK
APOLOGIES	
Karsten Lindloff Mike	DENA (Germany)
Walter Jörg	DEFRA (UK)
Palmersheim	ISOPA
Sharon Heymann	Sharp
Andy Cosgrove	Xerox
John Myers	Xerox

AGENDA

- | | |
|---|-------------------|
| 1. Opening of the meeting | William Dazy |
| 2. Approval of minutes of previous SC meeting | William Dazy |
| 3. VA revision | Pierre Sicsic/All |
| 3.1. Design for re-use | |
| 3.2. Design for Recycling | |
| 3.3. Material efficiency | |
| 3.4. Cartridge reuse | |
| 3.5. Information (total energy consumption of products sold?) | |
| 3.6. Products lifetime evaluation and disclosure | |
| 3.7. Others | |
| 3.7.1. Targets for reduced air emissions. | |
| 3.7.2. Noise limits. | |
| 3.7.3. Cartridge compatibility | |
| 4. Any Other Business | All |
| 5. Closing of meeting and reminder date next meeting | William Dazy |

MEETING MINUTES

1. Opening of the meeting

William Dazy, President of EuroVAprint and Chair of the meeting, opened the meeting and invited participants to introduce themselves. As the documents were "work in progress" it was asked they would not be circulated outside of the SC until finalized as they could give wrong ideas to people not following the discussions. Also, the Chair will ensure that working documents/slides for discussion will be sent several days in advance to facilitate discussions.

2. Approval of the minutes of previous SC meeting

The minutes of the SC held on 26 April were confirmed as approved by email and circulated to the SC in May.

3. VA revision

This phase of the revision is dedicated to the non-energy related aspects. It was reminded that the current VA already includes several non-energy requirements, such as duplex printing, Nup printing capability, etc. Adam Romanowski confirmed that the EC will seek an opinion of the Consultation Forum on the proposal for the revised agreement on imaging equipment. The meeting of the Consultation Forum is likely to be held in autumn 2013 but no date of that meeting has been yet set. Replying to Adam's question, Chair confirmed that invitations to the SC meeting have been sent to all members of the Ecodesign Consultation Forum.

3.1. Design for re-use

Stakeholders believe it makes sense to focus on components which are known to fail. The example of the ink absorber foam in an ink printer where currently has to be replaced by an engineer when it is full.

3.2. Design for Recycling

Recycling requirements must be measurable. A question was raised that sub-suppliers should also be submitting compliance information. The response was that as manufacturers were the ones placing product on the market, then the responsibility for the compliance of their products was fully with them.

3.3. Material efficiency

Discussion on recycled plastic content

- To only have declaration of content is not a good item as companies can declare different values instead of a minimum value.
- The statement "Consumers want products with recycled plastic content" was made but no justification shown.
- The consistent supply difficulties for good quality recycled plastic material were discussed, with emphasis on compliance with other standards such as RoHS and REACH.
- Laura (Ökopol) suggested VAS to consider a proportion (e.g. 30%) of the products they place on the market should contain recycled plastics.

3.4. Cartridge reuse

- A majority of signatories are in favor of keeping the current wording, but could accept some amendments if these do not seek to limit useful innovation. Innovation is critical for OEM companies who work in a competitive market and need to provide ever more features to users.
- Bram (Belgian federal ministry) argued that printers are sold at a loss and the profit is made on consumables - bringing no evidence to support this view.
- Adam reported that remanufacturers complained about reuse being prevented. VAS reiterated this was not true as all OEM cartridges are re-usable. In fact, remans complain about OEMs introducing new technologies for purposes of better quality or user-friendliness. Such new technologies make their task of remanufacturing more difficult and costly. For VAS, this is an economic issue. OEMs will not refrain from innovating for the sake of preserving the remanufacturers' business model. OEMs also explained that for empty cartridges there are two main process flows: one through remanufacturing by ETIRA members, another through the collection/recycling processes by OEMs operating in "closed loop" (building new cartridges out of recycled plastic from empty cartridges).
- All published LCA studies show little variation between the environmental impacts of the two processes. In fact when print quality is taken into account, studies are more favorable to OEMs than to remans. VAS committed to sharing available studies showing the merits of OEM vs. remanufactured cartridges.
- Adam asked about OEM cartridge collection rates, wondering if a common, centralized collection scheme could be envisaged in order to increase OEM collection rate. In response, OEMs said that would not be in favor of remans, as it would deprive them of access to many empty cartridges. Real-life examples of OEM/reman cooperation exist - however in France, it took up to 3 years to set up. Such projects will not be easily replicated in other EU countries over a short period.

3.5. Information (total energy consumption of products sold?)

It was proposed to make TEC information available for lasers and information based on OM for inkjets after each reporting period.

3.6. Products lifetime evaluation and disclosure

- OEMs argued that this section should focus on B2B products as these are normally professional products with a SLA in place. End user expectations differ from a €70 inkjet compared to a €400 laser device. For example, a consumer typically replaces (inkjet) products after 3 years.
- Spares and repairs should be available for both categories for at least two years.
- How would this affect consumer warranties? This is not an issue for the VA as it is a commercial issue.
- It may be more efficient to give user a new machine after 3 years.
- Adam asked whether there would be any benefits in manufacturers having a joint return/repair scheme.
- Maybe have 5 years B2B, 2 years B2C as minimum.

3.7 Others - Overall comments from meeting

- Adam stressed that the self-regulation is considered as a valid alternative to an implementing mandatory Regulation. Consequently, it should have a proper level of ambition that is higher than business as usual.. By joining the VA, the Signatories commit to comply with its requirements. Effective monitoring system, including through the Independent Inspector and audits is necessary. Market surveillance authorities may also perform their compliance checks. Adam would like these elements to be incorporated in the revised agreement..
- Adam commented that out of the 13 issues discussed there was agreement between manufacturers on only 5 of them. Adam was concerned about the level of ambition for the revised VA, to which Pierre said that VAS were at the maximum possible with manufacturers' agreement. VAS implemented several requests from the wish lists they received. DEFRA's position is they would only like a few to be included but they have a long list as a discussion point.
- On the level of ambition, William said issues needed to be ranked and invited stakeholders to send written input reflecting their priorities.
- Adam stressed that the EC expected the Signatories to prepare a proposal for the revised agreement with the proper level of ambition that would be positively assessed by stakeholders at the CF meeting. In his opinion, further work was required on the proposed draft for the revised agreement. He also stated that the revision (version 5.0) will enter into force 12 months after its adoption by the SC.

4. AOB

No AOB were added to the agenda

5. Date of next Steering Committee

The next meeting will take place on **Thursday 26 September 2013 in Brussels**, at EVAP HQ (52 rue Defacqz, 1050 Brussels), from 11am CEST to 4 pm CEST.

6. Closing of the meeting

William Dazy closed the meeting at 15.35.