



OUTCOMES REPORT

EPEAT VERIFICATION ROUND SV-2019-01

1. Overview of Verification Round

Verification Round SV-2019-01 investigated targeted criteria from the NSF/ANSI 426 – 2018 standard with randomly chosen products. Four Level 1 investigations were completed in the Verification Round. In Level 1 investigations, an Auditor assesses Conformance to a criterion by examining information submitted by a Manufacturer. The Manufacturer was required to provide detailed and accurate information in a 60-day period.

The products and criteria were selected as follows:

- All products currently active on the Registry were eligible for inclusion and were chosen first through a random selection process.
- All geographies and Manufacturers were eligible for inclusion.
- No Manufacturer was subject to more than 2 investigations during this Round.
- The Server standard was been updated via a continuous maintenance process after the original set of criteria were published. This Verification Round excluded verification of criteria which were updated in continuous maintenance process (2018) in order to ensure adequate time for Manufacturers to come into Conformance with the new requirements.

The four criteria which were investigated during this Round were all Required criteria. They are as follows:

- 5.1.1 – Required – ENERGY STAR
- 6.1.5 – Required – Conformance with supply chain communication provisions of European Union REACH
- 9.1.1 – Required – Design for repair, reuse and recycling
- 12.4.1 – Required – Manufacturer conformance with occupational health and safety performance (corporate)

2. Summary of Outcomes

For new product categories, most criteria have been recently Desk Reviewed. Therefore, it is likely that criteria investigated will be in Conformance. This was the case for this first Server Verification Round SV-2019-01:

- 4 Investigations completed
- 4 Decisions of Conformance

3. Key Lessons

As no Non-Conformances were found, there are no key lessons to share.

4. General Message to Manufacturers

Understanding documentation requirements for Verification Rounds:

You can find more guidance and examples of conformance documents in the Conformity Sample Packets located in the “Help & FAQ” under My Account. Go to epeat.net to log in.

Initial response to Auditors:

When contacted regarding participation in a Verification Round, Manufacturers should respond to the Auditor as soon as possible to let them know they are communicating with the correct person or to inform them of the correct contact. This also helps the Auditor know that the e-mail address is valid.

Conformance of products that may share similar traits and/or supply chains:

If a Non-Conformance is found for a particular criterion and product, Manufacturers should be prepared to determine if other products on the EPEAT Registry are similarly impacted due to use of similar materials and/or supply chains, and develop corrective action plans to address the future conformance of these other products.

5. Looking Forward

Plans for Future Verification Activities:

There are no more Verification Rounds planned for the Server product category in 2019.

Conformity Sample Packets:

This and all future Verification Rounds have and will be conducted according to the guidance provided in the Conformity Sample Packets posted on www.epeat.net under “Help & FAQ” in My Account.

6. Background

To assure the credibility of the EPEAT Registry, verification of the claims by Participating Manufacturers are rigorous, independent and transparent. Verification is conducted according to policies and procedures described in documents provided on www.epeat.net. Manufacturers are given no forewarning that their products will be verified, and verification is performed based on the declarations as they are in the Registry at the time the Verification Round begins.

Investigations are performed by expert technical contractors called Auditors working for a Conformity Assurance Body approved by the Green Electronics Council (GEC). Auditors are free of conflicts of interest, and their recommended decisions are reviewed and finalized by the Conformity Assurance staff of GEC. Decisions of conformity are made blind to the identity of the products and companies they are judging, based only on evidence collected and analyzed by Auditors. A serious consequence of receiving a Major Non-Conformance is that it is published publicly in an Outcomes Report, for purchasers, competitors, and others to see.

- In a Level 0 investigation, an Auditor assesses Conformance to a criterion by examining publicly available information only – no products are obtained for inspection or testing, and the Manufacturer is not asked to submit documentation. If the publicly available information is inconclusive (i.e. was not available, could not be found from public sources, or did not provide enough details to determine conformance), the Auditor may be instructed to proceed with a Level 1 investigation.
- In a Level 1 investigation, an Auditor assess Conformance to a criterion by examining information submitted by a Manufacturer. The Manufacturer is required to provide detailed and accurate information in a timely manner.
- In Level 2 investigations, the Conformity Assurance Body obtains a product without the Manufacturer's knowledge or involvement, and has the product disassembled and inspected to assess conformance with one or more criteria.
- In Level 3 investigations, the Conformity Assurance Body obtains a product without the Manufacturer's knowledge or involvement, and has the product analytically tested to assess conformance with one or more criteria.

Manufacturers must correct Non-Conformances, either by bringing the product into Conformance, by un-declaring the criterion until Conformance is achieved, or by removing the product from the Registry. The Green Electronics Council also requires that Manufacturers examine other registered products to determine if their declarations should be corrected as well. If a Manufacturer corrects the Non-Conformance by un-declaring the criterion and the criterion is an optional criterion, they lose that 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, they must archive all of their registered products.