

Minutes of the second Stakeholder Meeting for EuP Preparatory Study Lot 25: Non tertiary coffee machines

Venue: BIO Intelligence Service
20-22 Villa Deshayes
75014 Paris France

Date / Time: 23 June 2010, 10:00-15:30

Document: Meeting Minutes

Contact BIO IS: Shailendra Mudgal, Benoît Tinetti
Tel.: +33 (0)1 53 90 11 80
Email: shailendra.mudgal@biois.com, benoit.tinetti@biois.com

PARTICIPANTS

Name:

Organisation:

European Commission

Villő Lelkes (VL)

European Commission – DG Energy

Project Team

Shailendra Mudgal (absent)

BIO Intelligence Service

Benoît Tinetti (BT)

BIO Intelligence Service

Ian Kuwahara (IK)

BIO Intelligence Service

Perrine Lavelle (PL)

BIO Intelligence Service

Lorcan Lyons (LL)

BIO Intelligence Service

Charlotte Sannier (CS)

ARTS

Marie-Aude Jean-Jean (MJ)

ARTS

Stakeholders

Susanne Heutling (SH)

German Federal Energy Agency

Sandra Bichler

University of Bonn

Barbara Josephy (BJ)

TopTen / ECOS

Anders Vestreli (AV)

Nestlé

Eva Brommer

Oeko Institut

Thomas Hollitzer

BSH Bosch und Siemens Hausgeräte GmbH

Andreas Aigner

BSH Bosch und Siemens Hausgeräte GmbH

Massimiliano Vignocchi

Delonghi

Adelmo Pilone (AP)

Philips SAECO

Ana Patricia López Blanco (ALB)

CECED

Kathrin Völker

HKI

AGENDA

10:00 – 10:30	Welcome, “Tour de table”, Introduction to the Ecodesign Directive, schedule update
10:30 – 11:15	Task 1 - Definition: Presentation and discussion
11:15 – 11:30	COFFEE BREAK
11:15 – 12:00	Task 2 – Economic and Market Analysis: Presentation and discussion
12:15 – 13:00	Task 3 – Consumer Behaviour: Presentation and discussion
13:00 – 14:00	LUNCH BREAK
14:00 – 14:30	Task 4 – Technical Analysis: Presentation and discussion
14:30 – 15:00	Task 5 – Base Case Analysis: Preliminary discussion
15:00 – 15:30	Next Steps – Tasks 6, 7 and 8 and Conclusion

The presentations and discussions in this meeting were based on the documents published on the project website: www.ecocoffeemachine.org

INTRODUCTION, TOUR DE TABLE AND PROGRESS UPDATE

BT presented the agenda for the day and introduced the project consortium. A tour de table was done to introduce all attendees.

BT presented an overview of the Ecodesign Directive and background information on BIO Intelligence Service. CS completed with a presentation of ARTS.

TASK 1 – DEFINITION OF SCOPE

PL presented the results and conclusions of the Task 1 document.

AP: The testing standards shown are generally not for energy performance testing. The Swiss FEA methodology (developed with CECED) and the S.A.F.E methodology are the only two testing standards for energy performance. The FEA test standard was developed in 2008-2009 in collaboration with manufacturers present on the Swiss market. In September 2009 the method was adopted for the voluntary Swiss energy label. It is only applicable to household espresso machines with more than 5 bars of pressure which is the most prevalent product type in Switzerland.

ALB: The FEA methodology is already in use in Switzerland. It is supported by manufacturers such as Euro Appliances and Oster. Many manufacturers now use this

method for performance testing of their products even though the method was developed as a voluntary measure.

AP: The method is currently under review by CENELEC TC 59X/WG15 in conjunction with EN 60661 to be harmonised at European level for performance testing. Expansion of the procedures to include drip filter machines is also under consideration but this represents extra work as extending the methodology to these types of machines is not straightforward. Expansion to low pressure pod/pad systems is also in progress and is simpler and more straightforward (than to drip filter). Note that manufacturers worked with FEA to produce their methodology but it was not their proposal.

BJ: There are several disadvantages to adopting the FEA energy label methodology at European level. The method could be inconsistent with reality due to bias in the procedure for calculating the electricity consumption of different modes. First, the method requires test operators to restart machines with auto-standby features which put the machine on standby after 10-60 minutes. Second, if a machine goes to auto-standby sooner than 10 minutes, it is assumed that no ready mode exists. Third, if a machine has rinse or other extra power consumption features after 60 minutes, they are not included in the measurement either. These three points punish certain machines and privilege others arbitrarily. For example, a Martello Athena machine could jump three Swiss efficiency categories, from D to A, simply by reducing its auto-standby from 15 minutes to 9 minutes. This is very unfortunate and should be considered in detail before a label is adopted at the European level. The Blue Angel method, based on S.A.F.E test standard, may be a better alternative, or the FEA methodology could be revised in collaboration with CENELEC. It would be very valuable for this information to be raised at the CENELEC TC59X/WG15 meeting on 1 July.

VL: Above all, the European Commission wants a measurement method that accurately represents the real-life energy usage of these machines. The Swiss example is useful but it is not necessary to copy it. It is not clear where the mandate to CENELEC to start developing a new measurement method originated, i.e. it is not clear if it was officially sent by the Commission. VL is working to provide an official EC mandate since a measurement standard is needed in any case. CENELEC will not have to restart its work.

ALB: CECED agrees that the measurement method should be developed to reflect accurate testing and not in regards to the history of the development of the method. The FEA methodology was based on market research (the Synovate study) into consumer behaviour in Italy, France, Germany and the Netherlands that found that machines are kept ready-to-use for five hours at a time. The goal is to make this ready mode more efficient by driving technology improvements. CENELEC may have been asked to work on a draft by CECED in order to save time in the event of a regulation being put in place before a measurement standard is ready

SH: The Blue Angel label rejected a measurement method proposed by CECED about 18 months ago because it was not clear whether the method accurately represented all aspects of the machine's operation based on market research.

VL: Standby issues, which are already creating work for manufacturers, are to be addressed in a forthcoming study and in legislation.

TASK 2 / TASK 3 – MARKET ANALYSIS, CONSUMER BEHAVIOUR AND LOCAL INFRASTRUCTURE

IK presented the results and conclusions of the Task 2 and Task 3 working documents.

IK: Stock calculations and lifetimes are needed for later tasks. Task 8 will include a sensitivity analysis.

AP: Espresso machines are likely to be bought in addition to drip filter rather than only as replacements. Further, fully automatic espresso machines are likely to see a stronger growth rate – as much as 5.5% per year.

SH: Users might not respond accurately when they are asked about their switching-off habits. Behaviour is dictated by the technology to a large extent.

TASK 4 / TASK 5 – TECHNICAL ANALYSIS AND BASE CASE ANALYSIS

LL presented the preliminary results of Tasks 4 and 5.

ALB: Normally in other EuP lots, the manufacturers associations or the manufacturers themselves provide the BOMs to ensure they represent European averages. It may be good to pursue this in Lot 25 as well. Single BOMs from disassembled machines may be misleading when considering European averages. CECED can provide these averages.

BT: The consortium can provide the BOMs to the manufacturers for verification before the task documents are published.

AV: To find information on WEEE recovery figures in different EU Member States is difficult. It is hard to find data for all Member States. The end-of life for a coffee machine is very uncertain and seems to vary between Member States.

VL: Manufacturers should be able to provide this information as they are the ones who are ultimately responsible for the waste recovery of products covered under this Directive. VL will contact the EC policy officer responsible for the WEEE Directive recast.

ALB: This information is not immediately available from manufacturers associations. It is possible that this information could be provided, and this will be checked. However, it may not be the manufacturers who would know this information but rather the retailers.

AP: It should be highlighted that the environmental impacts are not necessarily associated with electricity consumption only. Capsules also have a significant environmental impact, due to the use of aluminium, and this should be noted. Capsule

manufacturers should pay for the environmental impacts of their capsules, not the manufacturers of the machines that use the capsules.

AV: A plastic coffee capsule has a relatively small environmental impact in comparison to the overall life cycle impacts of the coffee machine (including the use of the machine) and coffee bean supply chain. Coffee production and transportation have a larger environmental impact than the capsule.

BT: Coffee production is outside of the scope of the study. The environmental impacts of the capsules may or may not be included depending on whether it is considered a dual system. These points will at least be noted and discussed in the study.

AP: Water that is consumed by people (i.e. in coffee beverages) should not be considered as an environmental impact as it is being consumed by people. This is necessary for people to live and should not be counted the same as water used in a washing machine or power plant.

ALB: It is unclear where all the water consumption in the use phase comes from. Water consumed to make electricity should not be counted in the use phase because impacts of electricity production may be double counted – in energy use, water consumption, greenhouse-gas emissions, etc.

IK: The impacts are linked and one process can have several impacts on the environment which could appear to be double counted but are not. The intent is just to show all the diverse impacts that the different environmental aspects can have.

AV: Drip filter machines are usually over-filled and there is significant waste of coffee through this. They also are more likely to brew too much coffee which would also be wasted. The study may need to consider this.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

ALB: It will be confirmed whether the details of the FEA methodology can be distributed to the participants of the meeting along with the base case proposition document which was also sent to the consortium earlier in the month. CECED will also check the distribution of A-D awards.

BT concluded the discussion and thanked all participants for their valuable input.