Effective MVE system

International Monitoring, Verification and Enforcement Conference

Sep. 14, 2010

Lee Ki-Hyun

KEMCO (Korea Energy Management Corporation)

khlee@kemco.or.kr

+82-10-8228-1448

Pre-market verification

What are the energy efficient products?

- Voluntary self declaration
 - Products suppliers' claim(self testing) on energy efficiency
 - Low companies' expense and low reliability
 - Appropriate when the standards are relatively simple
 - Periodic education and monitoring are needed.
- Third party verification (TPV)
 - Independent testing parties' inspection on energy efficiency
 - High companies' expense and high reliability
 - Appropriate when the standards are complex and stringent
 - Management of, and cooperation with testing parties

Post market surveillance

Are they working as energy efficient products?

- Field test and label check
 - Labeling condition check in factory and retail stores
 - Low expense; simple test such as standby power
- Performance test
 - •Independent testing parties' inspection on energy efficiency
 - High expense; complicated performance test in laboratories
 - Enhancement of reliability of the whole S&L process

Pre-market verification



Post market surveillance

How can we ensure that the whole process works properly?



Pros and cons of each designs

- Overall design can work effectively when combined.
 - The purpose and target is different from each other.

	Pre-market verification		Post market surveillance	
Categories	Voluntary self declaration	Third party verification	Field test and label check	Performance test
Cost of the administration	low	medium (supervising)	Hiç (Continuous injuitime and	ection of funds,
Participants' cost	Low (low barrier)	High (high barrier)	Lo (basically gove	
Compliance Rates	Relatively Low	Relatively high	High (Actual monitoring and management are possible.)	
Other issues		testing Infrastructure		testing Infrastructure

Appropriate Metrics

- Realistic compliance rates?
 - Ultimate goal and target of every MVE systems
 - Each government must set up a specific compliance rates target and annual feasible MVE action plan.
 - Statistical approach for introduction of methodology
- Sampling methodology is crucial
 - Currently, compliance rates are not perfect and do not reflect realistic levels of compliance in the actual market.
 - If we focus on the specific products or market with suspicion?
 - To get information representing the market, sufficient samples have to be selected deliberately according to regulation.
 - International cooperation is needed for standardization.

2. Korea's MVE for Energy S&L

♦ Overall legal process

3 Energy Labels and Standards Programs

Categories	Energy efficiency Label and Standard (M)	E-Standby Program (M)	High Efficiency Equipment certification (V)
Voluntary self declaration	O (approved)	O (approved)	
Third party verification (TPV)	O	O	O
	(designated)	(designated)	(designated)
Post market surveillance	O	O	O
	(Annual)	(Annual)	(Annual)

^{*}designated, approved : by MKE(Ministry of knowledge Economy)

Process for annual surveillance



Second test (one time if applicable)

2. Korea's MVE for Energy S&L

♦ The results of MVE activities

Category		Y2006	Y2007	Y2008	Y2009	Y2010(p)
F	Reported	16,440	19,654	21,608	20,011	21,012
Energy efficiency	Tested(%)	180(1.1%)	181(0.9%)	142(0.7%)	179(0.9%)	172(0.8%)
Label and Standard (Self: 5%, TPV: 95%)	Failed	26	47	10	10	N/C*
(Oeii : 570, 11 V : 5570)	CR(%)**	85.6%	74.0%	93.0%	94.4%	-
F. Otomollou	Reported	3,699	3,993	4,973	5,529	5,805
E-Standby Program	Tested	84(2.3%)	88(2.2%)	93(1.9%)	109(2.0%)	112(1.9%)
(Self : 43%, TPV : 57%)	Failed	0	5	3	0	N/C*
(3011: 1370, 11 7:3770)	CR(%)**	100.0%	94.3%	96.8%	100.0%	-
High Efficiency	Reported	3,256	3,449	4,512	5,116	5,372
Equipment	Tested	160(4.9%)	135(3.9%)	82(1.8%)	50(1.0%)	78(1.5%)
certification	Failed	7	18	22	N/C*	N/C*
(Self : 0%, TPV : 100%)	CR(%)**	95.6%	86.7%	73.2%	-	-
Total (2 mya awa ma)	Reported	23,395	27,096	31,093	30,656	32,189
Total (3 programs) (Self : 11%, TPV : 89%)	Tested	424(1.8%)	404(1.5%)	317(1.0%)	338(1.1%)	362(1.1%)
(Sell. 1170, 1FV . 6970)	Failed	33	70	35	10	N/C*
	CR(%)**	92.2%	82.7%	89.0%	97.0%*	-

*N/C : not completed, **CR : Compliance rates

Note) All failed products were made public and administrative action was taken against them.



2. Korea's MVE for Energy S&L

Annual Budget (2010)

Energy efficiency Label and Standard	E-Standby Program	High Efficiency Equipment certification	
400K USD	250K USD	230K USD	

- Treatment for non-compliance
 - Public reporting(official gazette) and press coverage
 - Administrative action such as prohibition against sales, indication of correct energy efficiency label, etc
 - Punishment with 20,000(MEPS) or 5,000 USD fine

Issues and challenges

- MVE process is very dependent on annual budget.
 - Is MVE of the whole market the right of only government?
- Effective sanctions that affect manufacturers' activities

3. Requirements of effective MVE

- How to enhance the reliability
 - Is pre-market verification itself enough for MVE?
 - Risks of circumvention and mistakes are not predictable.
 - Can autonomous operation protect consumers and savings?
 - Governments' proactive Intervention is necessary.
 - Governments have to intervene in the overall MVE process.
 - Governments' systematic intervention
 - The whole process conducted according to the regulation
 - Measurement and management of realistic compliance rates
 - Introduction of periodic and rational MVE scheme
 - Sustainable investment for post market surveillance
 - Powerful and practical enforcement and sanctions
 - Heightening the perception of risk in industry
 - Public reporting of information on all kinds of MVE activities

Thank You!



For more information,

E-mail: khlee@kemco.or.kr, candy_says@naver.com

KEMCO homepage : http://www.kemco.or.kr/eng/

