

IEEE Standards Interpretations for IEEE Std 1680™-2009 IEEE Standard for Environmental Assessment of Electronic Products

Copyright © 2011 by the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, Inc. 3 Park Avenue New York, New York 10016-5997 USA All Rights Reserved.

This is an interpretation of IEEE Std 1680-2009.

Interpretations are issued to explain and clarify the intent of a standard and **do not** constitute an alteration to the original standard. In addition, interpretations are not intended to supply consulting information. Permission is hereby granted to download and print one copy of this document. Individuals seeking permission to reproduce and/or distribute this document in its entirety or portions of this document must contact the IEEE Standards Department for the appropriate license. Use of the information contained in this document is at your own risk.

IEEE Standards Department Copyrights and Permissions 445 Hoes Lane, Piscataway, New Jersey 08855-1331, USA

May 2011

Standard Title: Environmental Assessment for Electronic Products

Clause, Subclause, Annex, Figure, or Table: Clause 1.4

Interpretation Request #1

Clause, Subclause, Annex, Figure, or Table: Clause 1.4

It is requested that IEEE conduct an interpretation of IEEE Std 1680-2009 to determine if the intent of the IEEE 1680 Working Group was to allow multiple Market Surveillance Entities (MSEs)

Interpretation Response #1

In response to a request for interpretation of IEEE Std 1680-2009, 1.4, the Environmental Assessment of Standards Committee (EASC) believes that this standard must allow for more than one Market Surveillance Entity (MSE) in order to comply with Section 3.2 of the ANSI Essential Requirements. This will allow purchasers and users of the standard to express their preferred platform for identifying products declared against the IEEE 1680 family of standards ensuring that the market, and not the language of the standard, will determine the number of entities that can endure.

The Environmental Assessment of Standards Committee provides this interpretation recognizing that the intent of the stakeholders developing IEEE 1680 was to lay the groundwork for a program that could provide a single product rating scheme and a comprehensive resource for the purchasing community. The EASC also recognizes that the standard does not explicitly state if there shall be one or more MSE. However, a review of the documents suggests that the creation of this resource was not intended to limit

the number of conformity assessment bodies nor create an anti-competitive environment. The stakeholders also intended to create an American National Standard to assure a highly credible process to develop, implement, and sustain this standard and to comply with the ANSI Essential Requirements including but not limited to those in Section 3.2 for commercial terms and conditions

Interpretation Request #2

It is requested that IEEE provide clarification of IEEE Std 1680-2009, 1.4. Footnote 1 states that the EPEAT Registry is an example of a Market Surveillance Entity's (MSE's) Registry and that equivalent services may be used. Elsewhere the text in 1.4 (on page 3) states that "The determination of regions or countries in the geographic scope of this IEEE family of standards shall be governed by the single MSE" (emphasis added). An interpretation is sought clarifying whether IEEE Std 1680-2009 requires a single MSE or permits more than one MSE (of which EPEAT would be an example).

If the standard is interpreted to permit more than one MSE, it is also requested that during a revision or amendment of the standard, the footnote should be removed and the sentence in IEEE Std 1680-2009, 1.4 should replace "the single MSE"" with the phrase "each MSE."

Interpretation Response #2

In response to a request for interpretation of IEEE Std 1680-2009, 1.4, the Environmental Assessment of Standards Committee (EASC) believes that this standard must allow for more than one Market Surveillance Entity (MSE) in order to comply with Section 3.2 of the ANSI Essential Requirements. This will allow purchasers and users of the standard to express their preferred platform for identifying products declared against the IEEE 1680 family of standards ensuring that the market, and not the language of the standard, will determine the number of entities that can endure.

The Environmental Assessment of Standards Committee provides this interpretation recognizing that the intent of the stakeholders developing IEEE 1680 was to lay the groundwork for a program that could provide a single product rating scheme and a comprehensive resource for the purchasing community. The EASC also recognizes that the standard does not explicitly state if there shall be one or more MSE. However, a review of the documents suggests that the creation of this resource was not intended to limit the number of conformity assessment bodies nor create an anti-competitive environment. The stakeholders also intended to create an American National Standard to assure a highly credible process to develop, implement, and sustain this standard and to comply with the ANSI Essential Requirements including but not limited to those in Section 3.2 for commercial terms and conditions.