



ATLETE II
Appliance Testing for Washing Machines
Energy Label & Ecodesign Evaluation

**Report on the (possible) problems
encountered by the 6 testing labs when
testing washing machines according to the
new standard**

Prepared by Michal Zakrzewski, CECED
with input from ATLETE II project partners

(Deliverable 6.1)

October 2014



Co-funded by the Intelligent Energy Europe
Programme of the European Union

Table of Contents

REPORT ON THE (POSSIBLE) PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED BY THE 6 TESTING LABS WHEN TESTING WASHING MACHINES ACCORDING TO THE NEW STANDARD.....2

1.	INTRODUCTION	2
2.	MEASUREMENT METHOD: STANDARD EN 60456:2011	3
2.1	Brief description	3
2.2	Draft recommendation for an harmonised application of the new standard for washing machines	4
3.	TEST LABS PROBLEMS REPORTING	4
3.1	Minutes of the first meeting.....	5
3.2	Minutes of the second meeting	10
3.3	Minutes of the third meeting.....	13

Report on the (possible) problems encountered by the 6 testing labs when testing washing machines according to the new standard

1. Introduction

This document is prepared within Task 6.1 *Appliances testing for compliance verification* of WP 6 *Appliances testing: product verification and laboratory capacity building* of the ATLETE II project, financed by the European Commission programme Intelligent Energy Europe to support the EU and Member States Authorities dealing with compliance and verification issues, in order to help optimizing the available human, financial and time resources and minimizing the inconveniences for all stakeholders when enforcing legislation concerning Energy Labelling and Eco-design requirements.

The objective of D6.1 is to report the problems encountered by the selected test laboratories during the verification of the compliance of the investigated 50 washing machine models following the procedure described in Regulation 1015/2010 and delegated Regulation 1061/2010 and the test conditions of the new harmonised standard EN 60456:2011.

The tested parameters were:

- energy consumption (labelling and ecodesign)
- power consumption (in two low power modes: off mode and left-on mode)
- water consumption (labelling and ecodesign)
- washing performance (ecodesign)
- spinning performance (labelling)
- cycle and low power modes duration (labelling and ecodesign)
- generic requirements (under ecodesign, in case some will enter into force during the project development)

2. Measurement method: standard EN 60456:2011

2.1 Brief description

The main European standard for washing machines is EN 60456:2011 Clothes washing machines for household use - Methods for measuring the performance. It supersedes EN 60456:2005 + A11:2006 + A12:2011.

The DAV (date of availability) is 08.07.2011. DAV is the date when the definitive text in the official language versions of an approved CEN/CENELEC publication is distributed by the Central Secretariat.

A detailed description of the standard and a comparison with the previous Edition is included in Deliverable 3.8 *Report of the comparison of the old and the new measurement method for washing machines*, which is an independent stand-alone paper.

EN 60456:2011 refers to EN 50564:2011-62301:2011 “Electrical and electronic household and office equipment - Measurement of low power consumption” for the measurement of low power modes.

EN 50564:2011-62301:2011 is the European version of the international standard IEC 62301:2011 that specifies methods of measurement of electrical power consumption in standby mode(s) and other low power modes (off mode and network mode), as applicable. It supersedes EN 62301:2005 and incorporates FprAA (pr=22944), developed by the JWG TC108X-TC59X. It is applicable to electrical products with a rated input voltage or voltage range that lies wholly or partly in the range 100 V a.c. to 250 V a.c. for single phase products and 130 V a.c. to 480 V a.c. for other products.

The objective of this European Standard is to provide a method of test to determine the power consumption of a range of electrical and electronic household and office equipment in relevant low power modes, and the reporting of the results, generally where the product is not in active mode (i.e. not performing a primary function). It does not specify safety requirements or minimum requirements nor does it set maximum limits on power or energy consumption, but it contains limit values or procedures for verifying compliance with regulatory requirements.

It provides a method of measurement for a variety of modes which are defined elsewhere in other product specific standards.

The second edition of 50564:2011-62301 cancels and replaces the first edition published in 2005 and constitutes a technical revision. The main changes from the previous edition are as follows:

- greater detail in set-up procedures and introduction of stability requirements for all measurement methods to ensure that results are as representative as possible

- refinement of measurement uncertainty requirements for power measuring instruments, especially for more difficult loads with high crest factor and/or low power factor
- updated guidance on product configuration, instrumentation and calculation of measurement uncertainty
- inclusion of definitions for low power modes and use of these new definitions and more rigorous terminology throughout the standard
- inclusion of specific test conditions where power consumption is affected by ambient illumination
- Note Z5 specifies that where this standard is referenced by more specific standards or procedures, these should define and name the relevant conditions to which this test procedure is applied.

2.2 Draft recommendation for an harmonised application of the new standard for washing machines

A specific stand-alone document titled “D3.7 Recommendations for a harmonised application of the new standard for washing machines: Collection of the legislation and other provisions for washing machines” has been published within the ATLETE II project. An easy to found and complete collection of EU legislation and related papers for washing machines was in fact considered by project partners not only as an added value of the project but also an excellent – and currently missing - tool to support and facilitate the action of the national market surveillance Authorities, when asked to react to ATLETE II communications about compliance/non-compliance models.

This document collects and summarizes in a unique paper all available EU legislation on energy labelling and ecodesign of washing machines, along with Corrigenda, Commission Communication and Commission opinions on the application of labelling and/or ecodesign requirements.

For each collected documents the link to the public website is given, but also there is the possibility to directly open each file by clicking on it.

3. Test labs problems reporting

Despite the initial anxiety of project partners about the possible problems for test laboratories in the application of the new measurement method, no major problems were encountered during the testing period.

Only the following minor elements of concern were reported:

- It was highlighted that it was not task of the labs to assess the compliance or non-compliance of a product. Laboratories task was to test the relevant parameters and report the test results.
- The identification of the standard cotton programmes at 60°C and 40°C on the programme selection device or the washing machines display (mandatory since December 2012), was

discussed due to apparent different interpretations of this ecodesign requirement also among labs. The issue was solved by the project consortium by asking a formal opinion of the Commission on this point. This opinion has been published on the ATLETE II project website to make it publicly available to all interested stakeholders. The Commission interpretation was applied equally to all models tested in the ATLETE II Project.

- The hole that that was made in the back of the appliance for spinning speed testing should be as small as possible in order to keep the appliance in the best conditions for donation to charity. A proposed solution was to cover the hole after testing. It was not possible to align the measure of the hole among labs, because the testing equipment used by the labs differs. In any case this hole does not create safety problems to the user.
- Most of involved manufacturers visited the relevant testing laboratories during the testing of their own models. Some manufacturers' experts asked to prolong the visit for more than one day, even for the whole testing duration (i.e one week). It was also reported by some labs that experts were asking for the disclosure of the test results (and of the model compliance/non-compliance). Laboratories were initially informed - and agreed on this rule - that no result, even partial, should have been disclosed by them to manufacturers. There were no complaints from the manufacturers' side about the quality of the testing laboratories and the application of the standard testing conditions.

Further details can be found in the minutes of the 3 meetings with the testing laboratories in the following paragraphs.

3.1 Minutes of the first meeting

Minutes of the 1st meeting with the laboratories within Atlete II Project (6/02/2013):

The meeting was attended by:

A. Ribes – CTTN

Christoph Türk – VDE

Jeremy Owens – INTERTEK

L. Bidaut – CTTN

Michal Zakrzewski – CECED

Milena Presutto – EDEA

Sanne Goossens – CECED

Sonia Martin – LCOE

Stefano Ferrari – IMQ

Uwe Rabe – SLG

Luigi Meli – CECED (partially)

1. Objectives of the meeting

Michal Zakrzewski, being responsible for the ATLETE Project in CECED, presented the overview of the ATLETE II project, its aims and timing. Luigi Meli, CECED General Director underlined the importance of the project and its sensitive nature for market surveillance. He underlined that the meeting was aimed at clarifying all doubts of the laboratories before the starting of the field work. He also reminded participants that test reporting would have been done in a very clear and transparent way and that the test reports will be publicly available at the end of the project.

For the future, any doubt or concern of the laboratories should be immediately reported for clarification to the project leader and CECED representative.

2. Confidentiality and relation with manufacturers, project team and IAC

Following with the presentation of details of the project, laboratories representatives were informed that they will be provided with contact details of the manufacturers whose products were to be tested. Laboratories representatives were asked when informing manufacturers – always copy to project leader Stefano Faberi and Michal Zakrzewski of CECED - in due time about the expected start time and duration of the testing of the respective models, to allow them to organize the visit to the laboratories premises and assist to the testing. It was also agreed that the manufacturer could stay for one day at the laboratory and should agree with each lab the date of the visit. Project partners and IAC members are also allowed to assist the tests provided that they agreed for a date with the laboratory.

It was strongly highlighted that no direct communication between laboratories and manufactures, project team or IAC members is allowed. All communications shall go through the project leader and CECED. Laboratories are also not allowed to disclose any partial results to the representative of the manufacturer, project team or IAC members or discuss the test results during the above mentioned visits. Laboratories are asked to report to CECED any attempts of “off-line contacts” from any side.

3. Status of washing machine delivery to labs and testing

a. Expected delivery of the first washing machine batch for testing

Laboratories were informed that they should expect the delivery of the selected models to their premises by 15th February at latest. All units of the randomly selected models were purchased by ICRT and will be delivered by them or logistics companies contracted by them.

Some of the laboratories reported that had already received the WM models. They also noticed that it was difficult to distinguish immediately that these were the models for ATLETE II testing, and suggested for the future to provide them with the reference number of each shipmen in addition to the reference number of the models, to make the identification of the delivered appliances quick and easy.

b. Wascator reference machine

In order to reduce as much as possible the measurement variability, it was decided that CECED will order Wascator locked cards for all laboratories. They should be delivered to laboratories premises about 10 days after the meeting.



4. Product testing procedure

- a. The procedure: 1 + 3 units

Each laboratory will receive 2-3 models of the first batch of selected models. Laboratories were informed that most of the contacted manufacturers signed a Voluntary Protocol which allows them, should their models be suspected of non-compliance after Step 1, to agree with the test report results and to take remedy actions without going to Step 2 testing (i.e. testing 3 additional units of the same model). For the small manufacturers or for those where there is expectation that the selected models may disappear quickly from the market, it was decided to purchase 4 units of the selected model(s) immediately.

- b. Parameters to be tested

Laboratories were reminded the technical parameters and formal requirements to be tested for ATLETE II and the relevant tolerances. It was also clarified that we are testing off-mode energy consumption etc., but not verifying the stand-by regulation 1275/2008.

The following parameters will be measured for the combination of the standard 60°C and 40°C cotton programmes at full and partial load (7 runs):

1. Energy consumption (in Wh per average cycle and for the single run)
2. Water consumption (in litre per average cycle, for the single run and for the standard 60°C cotton programme)
3. Washing performance (per average cycle and for the single run)
4. Spinning performance as residual moisture content (in % per average cycle and for the single run)
5. Spin speed attained for the standard 60°C cotton programme at full load and half load and for standard 40°C at half load (in rpm)
6. Capacity (indirect) in kg
7. Power consumption (W) and duration (min) of off-mode and left-on mode (per average cycle and for the single run)
8. Ecodesign generic requirements¹:
 - presence of the 20°C washing cycle (mandatory from 01.12.2013)
 - information on the booklet of instructions (mandatory since 01.06.2012)
 - identification of the standard programmes (mandatory from 01.12.2012)

Noise is NOT measured.

Tolerances for the measured parameters are:

Parameter	Unit	Tolerance	
		Step 1	Step 2
Delegated Regulation 2010/1061/EU			
Annual Energy consumption (AEC)	kWh	10%	10%

¹ For ecodesign generic requirements the laboratory will be asked to check their presence only after the application date. In case of the requirement is legally applicable and is not present in the washing machine model under test the date of placing on the market of the model will be asked to the supplier before the final verdict of compliance/non-compliance.



Energy consumption (E_t)	kWh	10%	6%
Programme time (T_t)	min	10%	10%
Water consumption (W_t)	litre	10%	10%
Remaining moisture content (D)	%	10%	10%
Power consumption (P_o and P_i)* if $> 1W$	W	10%	10%
Power consumption (P_o and P_i)* if $\leq 1W$	W	0,1 W	0,1 W
Duration of the left-on model (T_i)	min	10%	10%
Regulation 2010/1015/EU			
Washing performance	I_w	4%	4%
Water consumption (W_t) for the standard 60°C cotton cycle)	litre	10%	10%
Rated capacity	kg	(0%)	(0%)

*EN 60456:2011 uses a different symbol for the two low power modes

- c. Test reports: use of lab own test report and ATLETE II test report template

Milena Presutto presented ATLETE II test report template, which laboratories will be asked to fill in addition to their own tests report. The test report was already delivered to the labs before the meeting. Labs were asked to provide comments and to check formulae and internal links of the spread sheets. Following a request from the labs to use only one test report it was agreed that for the 1st batch both ATLETE II and the laboratory own test reports would be used. Should the new test report template prove to be sufficiently accurate and suitable for the correct reporting of the test results, for batch 2 and 3 of testing, only ATLETE II test report template will be used.

- d. Results reporting

Laboratories were reminded that they are not allowed to disclose any partial results to the manufacturers visiting the laboratories. All the completed test results will be delivered only to Project leader and CECED. All problems should be reported immediately only to Project leader and CECED.

5. Measurement method: questions, unclear points, etc.

It was highlighted that it is not task of the labs to assess the compliance or non-compliance of a product. Laboratories task is to test the relevant parameters and report the test results. It is then a task of Market Surveillance Authorities to decide the compliance or non-compliance on the basis of the test results. For ATLETE II this decision will be taken by some project partners within the PEC.

The identification of the standard cotton programmes at 60°C and 40°C on the programme selection device or the washing machine display, if any, or both (mandatory since December 2012), was discussed, due to apparent different interpretations of this ecodesign requirement. For laboratories, any varying interpretation is difficult to manage when performing compliance tests, because it is unclear which interpretation is correct.

In addition, the date of placing on the market of each washing machine unit needs to be determined, in order to define whether it has to comply with the ecodesign requirement. Labs are therefore asked to take a picture of the programme selection device or the



washing machine display and the instruction booklet, to be enclosed in the test report. In addition also a picture of each unit rating plate should be taken and sent to Mr. Zakrzewski in order to determine the date the appliance was placed on the market. Then, it will also be possible to report that there is no homogeneous reporting from the side of the manufacturers.

Luigi Meli said that any issue of controversial interpretation should be brought to the PEC in order to take a decision to be applied consistently to all washing machines models. Milena Presutto stated that the spirit of the specific ecodesign prescription was quite clear and did not see room for a discussion in the PEC. She said that she will probably try to find a solution to the issue before the start of the testing phase by presenting it for an opinion to Member States and the Commission at the next ecodesign Regulatory Committee.

6. Mini Ring Test exercise

In order to provide for capacity-building of labs, the project's initial intention was to invite those labs that were not selected for the ATLETE II testing, in order for them to further improve their testing ability. There was an idea to hold three ring test of three labs each, thus in total nine labs. Washing machine models found compliant within the ATLETE II testing will be used for the mini ring tests.

The idea to invite all labs, including those already participating in the ATLETE II testing was tabled on the meeting and discussed. All laboratories present at the meeting declined the invitation. In particular, for one of the laboratories the "capacity building" exercises is seen as an exercise in which an appliance is measured by different labs in order to see the variance between the measurements done by higher ranked labs and lower ranked labs. However, because this exercise is partly paid by the project and partly paid by the labs (in terms of free testing time), it was argued that the good labs are expected to pay for an exercise which should improve the capacities of other labs which can be considered competitors. Another laboratory said that they have just completed a ring test for CENELEC on the EN washing machine standard (to test the testing method); 14 Labs were involved, including the manufacturers and non-manufacturers labs; there is a second test planned, intended to establish errors and uncertainties, and expected to start end 2013/beginning 2014. Both tests are also done for free, and developed under a specific mandate of the European Commission to the CENELEC. As conclusions, the participation to the ATLETE II mini Ring Test is considered not feasible.

7. Donation of products to the charities or delivery to the recycling plants

The laboratories were informed that according to the provisions of the project all washing machine models complying with the ecodesign requirements should be donated to the charities and all non-compliant models should be recycled. The decision will be taken after each individual model test is completed. There is a possibility that manufacturer may want to have the tested model back to his premises for further investigation and in turns donates new one(s) to the charity. This latter possibility has been accepted by EACI during the previous ATLETE project. Laboratories were reminded to keep documentation (exchange of letters, pictures, etc) of the donated models.



8. Financial matters

- a. Payments
- b. Cash flow

- Labs were asked to issue an invoice after each batch of testing, including the names of the machines that have been tested, to be sent to CECED.
- CECED was asked to send an order confirmation to the labs, together with the reference number of the shipment, in order to communicate to the labs which models to be delivered belong to the ATLETE II project.

9. Any other business

The hole that is made in the back of the appliance for spinning speed testing should be as small as possible in order to keep the appliance in good conditions and safe for donation to charity. A solution can be to cover the hole after testing. It is not possible to align the measure of the hole, because the equipment used by the labs differs. No lab can guarantee that the appliances delivered to the charities will not break down in time due to the testing procedure that was performed. As long as the appliance is safe, this is not considered to be a problem, because the fact that the donated models are second-hand will be communicated to the charities on forehand.

10. Next meeting

- The next meeting will ideally take place after the first batch of models has been tested. Therefore, the next meeting is expected approximately May/June. By the end of March, a proposal for the next meeting will be circulated.
- A final meeting will be scheduled after the last batch has been tested, in order to evaluate test results.

3.2 Minutes of the second meeting

Minutes of the 2nd meeting with the laboratories within ATLETE II Project (17/10/2013):

1. Update on the ATLETE II project status and main observations

Michał Zakrzewski gave an overview of the project status. Everything seems to be going according to the planning and due to smooth progress of testing this phase is even a bit ahead of the schedule.

2. Sharing of the positive experiences observed

There was generally positive assessment of ATLETE II Project by the laboratories taking part in it. Many manufacturers visited testing laboratories during the testing of their models. Some of them wanted to stay more than one day, even the whole week. Sometimes they were very pushy about having any results disclosed, but the laboratories proceeded according to the rules and no partial results were disclosed. There were no complaints from the side of manufacturers about the quality of the testing laboratories and the application of the standard testing conditions.

3. Financial matters



- a. Payments
- b. Cash flow

All invoices issued after the testing, by the laboratories were paid on time by CECED. There are no problems reported in this respect.

4. Update on the testing calendar

- a. Expected delivery of 3rd and last batch
- b. Expected finalization of testing procedure
- c. Discussion, necessary adjustments

Participants were informed that the selection of models for 3rd testing batch is fixed on the 7th November. Shortly after models will be purchased and delivered to the testing laboratories. Laboratories are asked to start testing before Christmas 2013 as much as possible. All step 1 tests should be finished by end of January 2014 and all step 2 tests, if any, should be finished by end of March 2014 the latest.

5. Mini Ring Test – update

Participants were updated about the fact that there are two mini Ring-tests on-going, with the laboratories that were not selected for verification testing. Two compliant models - tested by IMQ and SLG - in the first batch are used in this exercise. It was agreed that the outcome of the mini-RT, in an anonymous way, will be discussed during the last meeting with the testing laboratories. It may help explaining diverging results if there are any.

6. Donation of products to the charities or delivery to the recycling plants

Most of the batch 1 products can be donated to the charities. Michał Zakrzewski will send individual confirmations to the laboratories. When donating products laboratories are requested to:

- (i) inform that they have been used for tests within the ATLETE II project and
- (ii) check the units for defects posing a risk to people that will use them.

Laboratories have to prepare short donation report, to be signed by them and by the receiving charity subject and including, if possible, few pictures of the moment of donation.

7. Round table discussion on the main difficulties experienced so far

Laboratories did not report major difficulties with testing, as they said that EN standard is rather clear. They reported some issues with the manufacturers pushing to have test results immediately and asking to stand one week in their premises. Also in few cases it was difficult to find all necessary information in the manufacturers' booklets of instruction.

8. Real cases:

- a. Eco-design generic requirements (e.g. Standard cotton program indication, booklet of instructions etc.)



- b. Technical compliance
- c. Discussion on the difficult cases

Laboratories mentioned that in some cases the duration of standard program was quite long, up to 6h 30 min, which will probably make difficult for the consumer to use the standard program(s). They proposed that the duration of standard program(s) could be either limited in the regulation or declared in the energy labeling documentation. CECED and ENEA mentioned that standard program(s) can be often used at night with the low energy tariff, and that once program(s) duration is clearly mentioned by the manufacturer and justified by lower energy/water consumption that the consumer could understand the benefit of using such program(s). However, in the mentioned example the program time appears to be excessively long: a further investigation of the actual relation between standard program(s) time and annual energy consumption will be done within ATLETE II to understand if the laboratory proposals are substantiated by facts and could be beneficial for the consumers

A discussion about the identification of the standard cotton program(s) on the machine front/display followed. The ATLETE II Team applied the latest EC opinions when checking the compliance of the washing machine models. The discussion with the labs was focused in particular on those cases where it is possible to select different temperature than 40°C or 60°C when the standard cotton program(s) are selected. Generally it was agreed that manufacturers have proposed a full set of solutions going from the mandatory text printed on the machine front/display to the use of the alternative “arrows” or a mix of the two solutions,.

9. Template test report

- a. Comments
- b. Possible improvements
- c. Discussion

ATLETE II template test report was discussed. Generally it was welcomed by the laboratories. However, few comments were expressed:

- There are too many entry sheets in the fill; it is easy to forget something. There should be one-two simple entry sheet(s) only in order to allow labs to link them with their data acquisition systems
- Empty rows in the sheets are not necessary and are causing problems in copying the formulas and inputting data
- There should be shorter names of the sheets
- Water hardness should not be expressed in German degrees only
- It was unclear what is meant by letters “WX” with the test strips
- The duration of the left on mode should be understood as the one declared by the manufacturer



- There should be more possibilities left for commenting the data at the side of the figures entered (by adding for example a specific column)
- In documents & requirements sheet “no indication” should be deleted as it is misleading and there are too many rounding applied
- Load of reference machine should be mentioned
- There should be possibility to add laboratory logo and logo of accreditation body
- At the table S.2.1 there are too many requirements not requested by the standard
- In the table for 3 units, there should be Unit 2,3,4 instead of Test 1,2,3

It was concluded that a revised test report template will be prepared correcting most of the mentioned issues, while by the end of the project the entire test report template will be re-designed to solve the reported difficulties for data input. Until the end of the project laboratories are asked to deliver test reports both in ATLETE and their own template.

10. Final conference and publication of the results

It was mentioned that one of the possible dates for the ATLETE final conference could be the EUSEW 2014, to be held probably in June 2014. Whatever the exact date will be testing laboratories are invited.

One more meeting with the testing laboratories is foreseen after the finalization of testing, but before the final conference. It will be most probably in spring or late spring 2014.

11. Any other business

No any other business were discussed

3.3 Minutes of the third meeting

Minutes of the 3rd meeting with the laboratories within ATLETE II Project (15/05/2014)

List of participants is attached in pdf file. LCOE representatives could not participate to the meeting, but had a phone call with Michał Zakrzewski few days before the meeting and expressed their comments on most of the points in the agenda.

1. Update on the ATLETE II project status

a. Final conference invitation

Michał Zakrzewski (CECED) informed and invited all ATLETE II Laboratories for the final conference taking place on the 25th June 2014 in Brussels within the EUSEW.



b. Conclusions of the project

Michał Zakrzewski summarized the project, mentioning very good cooperation with all testing laboratories and smother progress with testing comparing to ATLETE I Project. All tests were completed and final information is being delivered to the MSAs. Laboratories were still asked to keep models from 2nd and 3rd batch in their premises until further notice.

c. Publication of the test results

All final test results, together with remedy actions if relevant, will be published on the project web-site www.atlete.eu at the day of final conference, that is 25th June 2014.

2. Round table discussion on the main difficulties observed

Representatives of the laboratories reported main difficulties experienced in the project:

- LCEO reported some issues with two manufacturers whose representatives wanted to stay for the whole week of testing or were trying to take photos without permission in the laboratories premises. Those cases did not have any influence on the outcome of the tests.
- Intertek also mentioned the issue of manufacturer wanting to stay for the whole week in laboratories premises. They also experienced some problems when slightly different models then notified initially arrived eventually. This was mainly due to sometimes different references of GfK and real ones on the products and due to changes in the production lines. All these issues were positively solved.

3. Sharing of the positive experiences observed

- LCOE underlined the fact that there was a designated project partner in charge of search and purchase of products in ATLETE II. According to them that was significant improvement comparing to ATLETE I project where laboratories were in charge of purchasing the models on the market. Intertek, even though not participating in ATLETE I, also mentioned that this was apparently good solution.
- Intertek also mentioned that ordering wascator cards at the beginning of the project by CECED, for all laboratories was good solution.
- In general laboratories highlighted that the standard seems to be ok and much clear compering with original expectations.

4. Real cases:



- a. Eco-design generic requirements (e.g. Standard cotton program indication, booklet of instructions etc.)

There was shared understanding that this requirement seems to be problematic and it is sometimes difficult to judge if the given model is compliant or non-compliant for this parameter. However, in all similar cases absolutely the same interpretation was always followed.

- b. Technical compliance

Laboratories mentioned the issue of length of the standard cycle that is very often very long and as a result may not be that often used by the consumers. Names of the programs are not that relevant, but it is crucial that correct information is provided in the user's manual.

- c. Discussion on the difficult cases

Individual cases were basically discussed directly when they occurred. Laboratories representatives are still welcomed to comment and report on any relevant issues.

5. Template test report

- a. Final comments

In general the project test report template was recognized and appreciated, but sometimes the formatting was complex, too many information in too many different places were required. It is a good basis for language neutral test report, which then could be differentiated by putting laboratories logos. Some more work with formatting is still needed.

- b. Agreement on the final version to be endorsed at the end of the project
Milena Presutto (ENEA) will take respective comments into attention and will revise the test report template accordingly. It will be delivered to the final project report and shared with ATLETE II testing laboratories.

6. Mini Ring Test – update

Participants were informed that the mini ring test is being finalized. Once the report is made available it will be shared with representatives of all laboratories as well.

7. Donation of products to the charities or delivery to the recycling plants – final confirmations

All products from 1st batch of testing were cleared for donation to the charities or recycling, depending on the outcome of the test. In principle all models should go to charities, with the exception of those not fulfilling ecodesign



requirement that have to be recycled (we suggest to consider only energy and water consumption and washing performance requirements, the other requirements are not so important). The others can go to charity even if they are not compliant with information requirements or have non-compliant instructions booklet. Obviously if laboratories see any safety concerns or broken appliances during testing, they should be recycled as well. Decision about donation time of 2nd and 3rd batch will be communicated on the later stage.

8. Financial matters

Michał Zakrzewski (CECED) asked all participants is there are no outstanding invoices or any other pending financial issues. The representatives of the laboratories confirmed that all respective invoices were paid by CECED in due time.

9. Any other business

Laboratories were asked to send further observation and comments to the ATLETE II project by the 10th June 2014 if possible.

