

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

Final report on the MSA communication action and follow up

Prepared by Swedish Energy Agency and SEVEn

(Deliverable 7.3)

September 2014



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







Contents

1	MSA	A notification and follow up	4
	1.1	Introduction	4
	1.2	How the work was carried out	4
	1.2.	1 Structure and the list of responsible MSAs	4
	1.2.	2 Setting up the Communication protocols	5
	1.2.	3 Communication of test results on national markets	6
	1.2.	4 Setting up the Report on the sent communications (summary table)	6
	1.2.	5 Questionnaire to the MSAs	6
2	Res	ult of the communication activities	8
	2.1 availal	MSAs' response to the communication of test results for washing models on their national markets	
	2.2	Findings from the Questionnaire	9
3	Sum	nmary and conclusions	18
A	nnex 1	Individual results as communicated to the MSAs	21
A	nnex 2	Questionnaire to MSAs	47
A	nnex 3	MSA Communication protocol templates	50

Note: This document has been elaborated within ATLETE II project's Work Package 7, Task 7.3 – Reporting of the Communication activity and follow up, Deliverable 7.3; and in part Work Package 9, Task 9.2 – Discussion with national authorities. In addition, the questionnaire referred to in chapter 1.2.5 replaces the second questionnaire in Work Package 2, Deliverable D2.2 and D2.4.

The sole responsibility for the content of this document lies with the authors. It does not necessarily reflect the opinion of the European Union. Neither the EASME nor the European Commission are responsible for any use that may be made of the information contained therein.





About the ATLETE II project

Energy labels and ecodesign requirements are crucial drivers for market transformation towards more efficient appliances and phasing-out of the least efficient ones.

In addition, consumers should be sure that the products found on the EU market comply with the legislative requirements.

The goals of the ATLETE II project are to check the pan-EU compliance of washing machines with energy labelling and eco-design requirements using the new measurement method, to improve the capacity of testing laboratories and at the same time support co-operation among national Authorities for effective market surveillance.

The Project starts in May 2012 and is due to be concluded by end October 2014.¹

Authors:

Karolina Petersson (Lead author)

Swedish Energy Agency www.swedishenergyagency.se karolina.petersson@energimyndigheten.se

Project coordinator:

Stefano Faberi

ISIS - Institute of Studies for the Integration of Systems www.isis-it.com sfaberi@isis-it.com

Project consortium members:

http://www.ATLETE.eu/2/partners

3

Juraj Krivošík SEVEn, The Energy Efficiency Center www.svn.cz juraj.krivosik@svn.cz

¹ More information: http://www.atlete.eu/2/doc/AtleteII_Project-overview.pdf





1 MSA notification and follow up

1.1 Introduction

The appointed Market Surveillance Authorities (MSAs)² in each EU Member State have the legal power to enforce the applicable legislation, in this case the Ecodesign and Energy labelling legislations. MSAs normally make their own inspection plans, inspections and testing for enforcement purposes. MSAs also cooperate with each other and exchange test results and other information. MSAs can also cooperate with other stakeholders and can, in most cases and under certain conditions that may vary between MSAs, use test results provided by a third party, e.g. an independent project like ATLETE II.

The objective of this activity was to formally inform the MSAs on the results of the ATLETE II project's testing activity and follow the notifications in order to investigate the type of action and the timing of reaction. It has been led by the Swedish Energy Agency (SEA), who is both a National Agency and a formal MSA.

All the project test results³ obtained from laboratories, both the compliant and non-compliant cases, have been immediately notified to the MSAs. The test results have been communicated by e-mail, using a specific communication protocol (see Deliverable 7.1).

The task leader has then assessed the follow-up actions of the MSAs after the notification.

A good communication has also been established with the ADCO Group on Ecodesign and with the IEE project Ecopliant. Lessons learned about e.g. the use of third party tests have been transferred between the projects.

1.2 How the work was carried out

1.2.1 Structure and the list of responsible MSAs

EU Member States are responsible for surveillance activities on their own territory. Some member states have gathered market surveillance responsibilities for a number of product related directives and regulations at one or a few national market surveillance authorities. Some member states, on the other hand, have chosen to organise the ecodesign and energy labelling market surveillance together with energy policy development. Some countries have in addition organised the ecodesign and energy labelling market surveillance at regional level, sometimes with one common national coordinator who participates in the ADCO-

² See e.g. a list of national contact points in charge of market surveillance under Ecodesign Directive: <u>http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/sustainable-business/documents/eco-design/national-</u> <u>contacts/market-surveillance/index_en.htm</u>

³ See all individual documents: <u>http://www.atlete.eu/2/final-results</u>







groups etcetera. In some EU-countries, the responsibility for market surveillance is divided between two different MSAs, typically one for consumer products and one for industrial products.

In order to obtain the fully updated list of individual contacts, the task leader contacted the chairs of the ADCO Energy labelling and Ecodesign working groups. The chairs are hold by the UK and the Netherlands Market Surveillance Authorities respectively.

ADCOs are Market Surveillance Administrative Cooperation groups and consist of national market surveillance authorities, meeting regularly twice a year to exchange views and seek for harmonization of different market surveillance practices across the EEA.

The ADCO chairs provided the organiser up-to-date contact lists for all EEA countries. The task leader has then prepared a general list of the contacts and kept it updated throughout the project developments.

In addition to MSA-representatives in each country, the list has also included ATLETE IIpartners in the countries where ATLETE II-partners are situated. The national partners have been in copy in the e-mails sent out the MSA representatives in the respective country, in order to facilitate possible national communication about the project.

1.2.2 Setting up the Communication protocols

In the beginning of the project, the WP leader SEA, with the support of the other partners of the ATLETE II-project, developed the "communication protocols" (See Annex 3 and the link below)⁴, i.e. templates through which the test results of the compliant and non-compliant washing machine models were to be communicated to the MSAs of the countries where the models were sold.

It was decided by the project consortium that two communication protocols were to be set up:

- one for informing in advance the MSAs about the upcoming tests of washing machines available on their market, and
- one for informing the MSAs on the results of the tests performed on machines available on their market.

Both communication protocols also included general information about the ATLETE II project, the product selection methodology⁵, and a general reference to ATLETE II website and activities.

The information about the sale markets came from the data purchased within a specific tender organised by the project for the selection of the 50 individual models to be tested.

4

http://www.atlete.eu/2/doc/WP7%20Annex%201_D7%201%20Communication%20protocol%20(templ_ate%20for%20data%20transmission)

⁵ <u>http://www.atlete.eu/2/models-selection</u>





1.2.3 Communication of test results on national markets

When the test result were available, they were communicated to the MSAs in each of the countries were the machines were sold. All non-compliance cases as well as all compliant cases (to stress the good products available on the national markets) have been notified to the MSAs.

Since the project testing activities took place in three stages, the results were also sent out batch-wise, which in some cases caused a delay, since some machines went on to Step 2-testing of the three additional units being tested.

For many suspected non-compliance cases, the manufacturers had proposed and carried out specific **remedy actions**. The PEC-subgroup of the project, including e.g. the expertise of CECED and ENEA, had analysed the proposed remedy actions and in many cases deemed that these actions were satisfying and that the models could be considered compliant after the remedy actions. In these cases, the test results were communicated to the MSAs as "Compliant, but after remedy actions" with a short description of each case⁶.

Summaries of the test results for each individual model that have been communicated to the MSAs are found in Annex 1 to this document.

In addition to the summaries of each tested model available on their markets, the MSAs also received the complete test protocol. Upon request, the task leader also provided the MSAs with all individual communication about possible remedy actions taken by the manufacturer.

1.2.4 Setting up the Report on the sent communications (summary table)

The organiser of this task initially prepared a template for the collection of the communication action, a table with all selected models, delivery date, recipient MSAs, outcome and feedback from MSAs and other information about the communication.

The table (project Deliverable 7.2) has then been updated during the communication period, so that by the end of the testing phase it contains all tested models, information on when and to whom the communications have been sent, and any response received.

It also contains information on to whom the follow up questionnaire has been sent, and whether any answers to this questionnaire were received or not.

1.2.5 Questionnaire to the MSAs

As mentioned above, a questionnaire regarding the use of test results from ATLETE II and also more general questions about the possibility to use third party test results was prepared and sent out to the MSAs in June 2014.

⁶ Full description of remedy actions also available online: <u>http://www.atlete.eu/2/final-results/2-non-categorizzato/58-full-individual-results</u>





The main purpose of this questionnaire was to get additional feedback from the MSAs about the usefulness of these kinds of projects, as a complement to their own MV&E activities (monitoring, verification and enforcement), and about third party test results in general.

The full list of questions asked in this questionnaire can be found in Annex 2, the next section describes individual answers received.





2 **Result of the communication activities**

2.1 MSAs' response to the communication of test results for washing machines available on their national markets

The laboratory tests for 50 washing machines were carried out in three batches. Therefore, the communications were also done in three batches: for each batch, first by informing the concerned MSAs about the upcoming tests, and later by sending the summarized test results and individual test protocols.

In total, washing machines available in 23 EU-countries were tested by the project and therefore MSAs in 23 EU member countries have received detailed information about the project and about the individual test results.

Upon receiving the project communications, a number of MSAs have spontaneously replied or commented. 16 out of these 23 countries have expressed some interest (in most cases even a *large* interest) in the test results: 14 of them as a result of the communications and 2 as a result of the follow up questionnaire. Some countries have replied that this information is valuable for their own market surveillance. Some countries have asked for further detailed information about the test procedure and/or the test results.

In total 12 countries have replied to the questionnaire. From one of these countries, two responses were received: one for the Energy Labelling MSA, one for Ecodesign MSA. The answers to the questionnaire are further described and analysed below.

7 out of 23 countries have not provided any response at all, neither to the communications nor to the questionnaire.

According to the project working plan, the project duty was also to assess the actions undertaken by the MSA upon the notification of the testing results.

When summarizing the results and reactions from the MSAs, one must bear in mind that the project results communicated to the MSAs showed a high compliant rate with the technical requirements and also the generic information requirements - at least after remedy actions. Therefore, not much action needed to take place by the MSAs.

Out of fifty models selected, two washing machines have been communicated as technically non-compliant. These machines are sold in total in two countries. A MSA representative from one of these countries has come back with detailed questions about the test results of one of the non-compliant models. It is not known whether this has led to any follow up or enforcement activities. In total, five machines have been communicated as formally non-compliant. At least one national MSA has followed up on this non-compliance.

As the test results sent out to the MSAs showed high compliance rate, it was difficult to assess the reactions from the MSAs and the actions undertaken by them, since there was not so much to react on for the majority of the MSAs. The high compliance rate was therefore





one of the reasons for sending out also the questionnaire to the MSAs. The questionnaire was designed to raise some general issues regarding the possibilities to use third party test data such as the ATLETE II project.

2.2 Findings from the Questionnaire

Use of the ATLETE II results

1. The Atlete II-project has sent out e-mail communications including test results on washing machines that are available on your national market.

Are you aware of these test results?

13 MSAs confirmed of the awareness on the test results by answering the project questionnaire

Where you the right person who should get it? Did you forward them to another responsible person or organisation?

Seven MSAs gave a general confirmation

Three MSAs gave a confirmation on behalf of the MSA which is only responsible for one type of legislation (e.g. Energy label)

Three MSAs gave a confirmation and a confirmation of forwarding the information either to other colleagues, an external collaborating body or to a new person being engaged internally

2. What was your organisation's reaction to Atlete II's test results (in general or concerning the models available in your country)?

Positive reactions obtained:

Three MSAs expressed a positive reaction concerning the high compliance of test results obtained from the project.

Three MSAs explained that since all results obtained concerned compliant models, no further action has been needed or taken.

One MSA confirmed an interest in the project, as ATLETE II is "a reliable and independent way to assess the situation for washing machines on our local market", another one that it was a "useful information".





One MSA appreciated the remedy actions taken by the project and the specific corrections made.

Neutral reactions obtained:

One MSA confirmed a need to check that the remedy actions have been really undertaken on their national market.

One MSA noted that it could take any measures only on products bought directly on its own market. It further confirmed that in case of any shortcomings, the respective economic operator would have been asked for information and clarification and to take measures to solve the problem.

Negative reactions obtained:

One MSA expressed its concerns that the results of the project tests were made available to the manufacturer to take corrective actions, rather than the market surveillance authority, which "is best placed to take enforcement actions as necessary e.g. sanctions and consumer restitution etc.".

3. Have you been able to use the test results of Atlete II? In what way? (please, specify it both regarding the compliant and non-compliant models)

Positive reactions:

One MSA expressed its gratefulness that the specific products from the national market are tested at the expense of the project.

Four MSAs confirmed that the information about the compliant models has been registered internally and that these models would be excluded from the MSAs future testing activities, to avoid double testing.

One MSA reacted that all test results obtained concerned compliant cases only and confirmed that it would use the results in case noncompliant test results would have been submitted.

One MSA appreciated the information obtained as an insight to the laboratory activities, which could be used for its own future testing surveys.

One MSA confirmed that the results will be used in their own future market surveillance activities.

Neutral reactions:

One MSA noted that all results obtained concerned compliant models. Since it currently did not plan to test washing machines, it did not investigate farther about the other cases of noncompliance.

One MSA confirmed that it took no action or communication on the compliant cases. It confirmed, however, that in case of non-compliance the project results would be valid





for contacting the respective manufacturer for requesting an information or a voluntary remedy action. In case no solution would be provided by the manufacturer, the MSA would have to act on its own – either undertake document inspection, administrative shortcomings, or repeat the testing on its own.

Two MSAs noted simply that no non-compliant models were found on their market.

Negative reactions:

One MSA expressed a view that the results received were too old to be used within their own statutory timeframes and also that the types of non-compliances detected were not considered as high risk or priority areas to justify reallocation of the MSA resources.

(The project organisers' reaction on that would be that tests were run in three batches and results were shared after the end of each of the batch. The low risk types of non-compliance probably relate to the generic requirements issued by the Ecodesign legislation, concerning specific information provision to consumers. ATLETE II took a formal approach in verifying all requirements specified in the legislation.)

4. The test results showed that the majority of the tested models from your market were compliant (at least after a certain remedy action by the manufacturer). How do you think you would have used the results in case of stated technical non-compliance?

Positive reactions:

Three MSAs confirmed that they would approach the company and allow a specific time frame to the respective manufacturer / economic operator to bring the product into compliance for all machines on the national market. In case of a remaining noncompliance, the official enforcement would have been started, one of the MSAs mentioning a fine to be considered as the next step.

Three MSAs confirmed in general, that an inspection procedure would start, and the economic operator would be obliged to take remedy action.

One further MSA confirmed that it would have tried to use the "foreign data" coming from the ATLETE II project.

Another MSA confirmed it would sent the test reports to the parties concerned and would request a due response on the test results.

One MSA confirmed that it would impose penalties according to the legislative provisions.

One MSA confirmed that it would have been able to restrict a further distribution of non-compliant products from the national market, but also appreciated that all products concerned were brought to compliance within the project's remedy procedure.





Neutral reaction:

One MSA noted that there are differences between nationally based suppliers or dealers and the responsible economic operators and that it would seek to take appropriate action at the highest level. It also noted that since the results are coming from a joint action, the results of testing would be taken over in legal procedures whenever necessary.

One MSA confirmed that it would use ATLETE II results as a "base information" and that in case of a remaining technical noncompliance it would have to proceed with its own testing.

5. Has the ATLETE II test results led to any enforcement activity in your country?

Six MSAs reacted that it has not lead to any actions.

(Presumably as all test results communicated referred to compliant cases).

Four MSAs reacted as "not yet" or "Not at the moment".

One MSA confirmed that it would have done so in case of some major non-compliance being identified by the project.

Two MSAs confirmed that such further action would take place.

One MSA also asked if the project would have any capacity to make sure non-compliant products would be removed from the EU market.

Test data and the use of third party test data

1. Do you have any previous experience of using test results from a third party (obtained for example by another fellow MSA?)?

Five MSA replied that they have no such experience, three of them specifically for Ecodesign and Energy labelling area.

Four MSAs confirmed to have an experience with using such test results, one of them listing the tyre labelling by its industry association.

One MSA confirmed that it previously received specific cases from two other national MSAs and that it took action against its own nationally based legal representatives.

One MSA confirmed that it once received other results, but not by another MSAs. Given that the respective economic operator denied the results, the MSA had to undertake its own testing.







One MSA confirmed that results from other MSAs would be taken with the same internal procedure. Results from other types of stakeholders would have to be investigated within a different procedure.

Another MSA stated that so far it used third party test result only as "base information".

2. Do you see any obstacles to use test data from a third party (such as EU projects ATLETE II, CompliantTV, ECOPLIANT)?

Five MSAs confirmed not to see the obstacles.

Four more MSAs confirmed no obstacles under specific conditions, such as the documents received to be considered reliable, available in English, and results coming from an accredited laboratory. They also see an advantage if at least one of the partners would be an MSA. One MSA raised a possible problem in case of the economic operator's complaints about the test report.

One MSA noted that while it could not take a formal action due to its specific legal requirements, the experience shows that the majority of cases would be solved on a voluntary type of remedy action.

One MSA confirmed this under the conditions of data coming from an accredited laboratory and for an identical product. It has also noted, however, that it does not have a formal procedure in place to handle such cases, if the economic operator would challenge the results.

One MSA stated that it could pose a problem with its national justice system but so far there was no court case in this field in this specific country.

Further comments made by MSAs in this regard include:

- Member state can only request corrective action when there is sufficient evidence to that.
- Member states have the obligation to notify and follow up. An MSA commented that the surveillance system would fail if every member state would have to create new evidence on the same product.
- Economic operator could present counter evidence that a specific product is not technically identical to the one sold in another member state. But typically a product is banned based on the type reference and a product with the same type reference cannot be compliant and noncompliant based on its technical file.
- If test results come from a third party, that third party can be held responsible for its test results and even deemed to compensate consequences if the results do not show correct evidence.





3. What conditions need to be fulfilled in order for you to be able to use this kind of test results and documentation? (regarding e.g. model specification, sampling, language, laboratory requirements, other accompanying information...)

Two MSAs simply requested the fulfilment of the respective legal requirements.

Three MSA listed the precise product model number and manufacturer identification, as well as a short description of the non-compliance, including the specification of the regulation and provisions violated.

Three MSAs requested a report from an accredited laboratory. One MSA has requested the measurements to be made according to the standards and to be verifiable.

One MSA noted the information to be provided in respective language. Another MSA asked for English language documentation as it is widely understood.

One MSA conditioned the acceptance of the data by receiving it in a timely manner and with demonstrated traceability of evidence.

One MSA requested a copy of the technical documentations that verifies noncompliance and/or the full test report from the accredited laboratory performing the verification testing.

One MSA commented that the sampling would has to be done by the Authority inspectors, testing to be performed by an accredited laboratory recognised by the Authority, and apply the administrative procedure to the national representative of the manufacturer, or the retailer (if there is no national representative present).

One MSA appreciated the way ATLETE II provided information – from describing the product selection, through laboratory tendering, to providing evidence to all measurements to avoid any obstacles in interpretation.

One MSA commented on problems with the implementation of such results in case there are more national or regional MSAs involved, who would have to share the involvement in such survey.

4. What criteria are important for you as an MSA when using test data for enforcement actions?

13 MSA answering	1	2	3	4	5	I don't
	Not import- ant				Very import- ant	know
Test ordered by my own organisation	3x		5x	1x	4x	





<i>Test done at a laboratory within my country</i>	6x		2x	2x	3x	
<i>Test done at a laboratory within EU</i>	2x	3x	2x	2x	2x	2x
Test ordered by another MSA	2x	2x		3x	4x	2x
<i>Test done at a lab</i> <i>accredited to e.g. ISO17025</i>			1x	3x	9x	
Test done at a lab accredited to e.g. ISO17025 and accredited according to relevant test methods			2x	2x	9x	
<i>Test data in a specific language</i> *	1x	1x	5x	2x	3x	1x

* 3 MSAs listed specifically either English language, other regionally understood language, or the national language

Appropriateness of EU-funded project

1. How do you see the role of projects such as ATLETE II, i.e. non-MSA actors monitoring the market and verifying products according to legislative requirements?

Positive reactions:

Three MSA considers it as very useful, one other MSA considers it as a positive supplement to the national programmes, listing the high degree of information and coordination as a must, another one appreciating the opportunity to test products otherwise not covered by its national activities.

One MSA highlighted the usefulness of such action for countries which do not have accredited laboratories for the respective product groups.

One MSA confirmed the interest, especially in areas with a lack of capacity for the MSA to perform the monitoring of all respective regulations. They stressed however the need for good quality information and the fact that only the MSA remains responsible for taking decisions and requesting corrective actions.

One MSA appreciates such project for the sake of demonstrating how complex compliance verification activities are and to make the legislators aware of this when imposing specific requirements to the individual Member States.

One MSA confirmed that the project gave them "necessary information" and helped them to focus on their own market surveillance activities.





Neutral reactions:

One MSA highlighted the importance of an MSA presence in such projects in order to make sure that the other MS Authorities to be reacting to such project results.

Another MSA commented on the way that stakeholders participate to such projects as being critical, including how the specific formal MSA activities are disclosed to third parties. The fact that the ATLETE II project worked under the EU funding scheme gave it a higher acceptance.

One MSA appreciates the value of covering the markets more widely with such projects, but sees the risks in possible manufacturer non acceptance of the results in order to be able to demonstrate credibility of the non-MSA measurements.

Negative reactions:

One MSA confirmed its belief in market surveillance funded projects but that is sees less value in non-MSA actors monitoring the market and verifying products as its representatives believe that this can have unintentionally adverse affects on market surveillance.

2. Do you believe that the European Commission should continue to finance actions to assess the technical and formal pan-EU compliance of products and equipment covered by the energy labelling and the ecodesign requirements (such as the ATLETE, ComplianTV, MarketWatch, projects)?

Three MSAs expressed a clear general agreement with such statement. All respondents expressed some positive reaction to these kinds of projects, provided that certain conditions are taken into consideration, as described in a-c below.

a. if yes, on which products/equipment

The suggestions made by the MSAs include mainly the following categories:

- o All regulated products
- Starting with the products with high energy consumption
- Recently adopted product categories and new regulations
- New challenges such as systems and business to business products
- Products important for end consumers
- Products groups with a track record of non-compliance
- Priorities to be determined based on the results of the national enforcement actions overviews





- **Products with complex testing conditions**
- products that are complex to control, that have a limited number of manufacturers or importers.
 - *b. if yes, under which conditions*

The following conditions were listed by the individual MSAs:

- Ensuring transparency and objectivity
- Independent inspectors and full independence from manufacturer influence
- Fully following the verification procedure
- Using accredited laboratories and ensuring credibility of testing
- $\circ~$ Product categories with only limited number of laboratories available in the EU
- In partnership with MSAs, including MSA testing experts, administrative officers, etc.
- A correct balance between MSAs with legal obligations and other stakeholders
- Ensuring a timely distribution of test reports in order to make sure the products are still available on the market
- Ensuring a selection of "no name" products
 - c. if no, why?
- Yes, but providing that the projects are market surveillance projects run by MSA's.





3 Summary and conclusions

General ATLETE II project's principles related to product testing and MSA information sharing:

- The ATLETE II project has tested 50 selected washing machines in such a way to follow the formal legislation requirements concerning Energy labelling and Ecodesign as closely as possible.
- The laboratories have been selected in a public tender in order to ensure their ability to meet the highest quality standards for testing procedures.
- All information about the project from the list of models tested to the test reports from individual laboratories were made publicly available not only to the MSAs but also in the end of the project to any interested stakeholders, media and the general public.

Specific activities undertaken by the ATLETE II project within the communication with the MSAs:

- One of the information requested about the individual washing machine models to be tested included the list of countries, where these have been available. Note that this information has been provided by GfK, the provider of the market information, not by the individual manufacturers upon a formal request of the MSA(s).
- As soon as individual models for testing have been selected, purchased in stores and delivered to the individual laboratories, all relevant MSAs have been informed about the starting testing activities with sending them the list of models available on their market.
- Testing activities took place in three batches and as soon as the testing results of individual batched have been available and concluded, including the eventual remedy action negotiation with the respective manufacturer, all relevant national MSAs have been also informed about the individual results of tests for the models which have been identified to be available on their markets.
- Information submitted to the MSAs included list of models tested, overview of results, description of the non-compliance (if relevant) divided by technical noncompliance and generic / information noncompliance, description of remedy action offered and applied by the manufacturer, the test report from the respective laboratory.
- This information has been sent to the MSAs by the ATLETE II project partner Swedish Energy Agency (SEA), which is also the national market surveillance authority. SEA has been then also available to explain any procedural or technical requests from the MSAs in case of their interest.





• Some MSAs have also participated in the IAC (International Advisory Committee), an independent group of stakeholders that have been following the project closely.

Feedback received from the national market surveillance authorities:

- MSAs in 23 EU member states have been informed about the product testing and the individual test results. All of these have been also invited to respond to a questionnaire survey searching for more information on the opinion of the MSAs on the ATLETE II type of activities, and searching for specific information about activities the individual MSAs may have undertaken based on the ATLETE II results.
- 13 individual MSAs, from 12 countries, have responded to the questionnaire, providing further insight on the activities undertaken and opinions on such international-level types of activities.
- In principle, the majority of the reactions received from MSAs were positive about the ATLETE II type of activities undertaken. Some of the feedback and reactions received include:
 - Necessity to provide fully professional and independent assessment of the product compliance.
 - Advantage of pre-negotiating the remedy actions with individual manufacturers.
 - Ability to share the testing activities among the MSAs in order to avoid any duplicity of activities.
 - Several MSAs confirmed that a national level surveillance action could be possible based on the ATLETE II activities, at least requesting a feedback from the respective economic operator.
 - The usefulness of covering a specifying product category was highlighted by MSAs which either would not cover this by their normal activities, or would not have sufficient national infrastructure in place such as the laboratory.
- A few MSAs have reacted in a neutral way to some of the questions posed:
 - Results of limited validity, as only products purchased on the national market could be taken into account for a specific MSA.
 - Given that most results circulated have been positive (compliant cases), or anyway not detecting any technical noncompliance, no direct national activity was deemed necessary.
- In principle, only one MSA has expressed its concern about the ATLETE II type of projects with the following arguments:





- Product testing should be first made available to the MSAs who should take the decision on next steps, not be first shared with the manufacturers.
- Sharing of results should be even more up-to-date, not only after the batch of tests being concluded, in order to ensure the relevant product to be still available on the market.
- Preference for the future projects of this type to be run by the MSAs themselves.
- There are diversifications between the MSAs regarding what specific conditions that has to be fulfilled in order for the MSAs to use test data for enforcement actions.
- The majority of the MSAs consider use of accredited test laboratories of outmost importance.
 In addition, most MSAs consider that the laboratories should also be accredited according to relevant test methods, if the data is to be used for enforcement actions.

Recommendations on how this specific action could be improved:

- Shorter time between laboratory test to notification to MSAs
- Use of accredited laboratories would enable more MSAs to be able to use test results directly since a number of MSA require that only accredited labs are used for market surveillance purposes
- Additional market surveillance authorities directly involved in the project.





Annex 1 Individual results as communicated to the MSAs

In total, 50 models of washing machines have been randomly selected from individual market segments. Full list of results, laboratory reports, and remedy actions taken are available on the project website⁷.

Physical testing took place in three stages.

		Formal co	ompliance		
MODEL	TESTING LABORATORY	Generic Tequirement Compliance Co		Technical compliance	
		Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010	Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010
SAMSUNG WF0600 NCW	LCOE (Spain), ISO 17025-accredited	remedy action pending	yes	yes	yes

• Batch 1 testing results

Country of availability: Portugal, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia

Formal non-compliance:

missing information in the booklet of instructions (mandatory since 1 July 2012) about indicative information about remaining moisture content and water consumption for the main washing programmes at full or partial load, or both

Proposed remedy actions:

- revised booklet of instructions including missing information. However, the manufacturer has not come up with any evidence that retailers have been informed, thus still possibility that models with non-compliant booklet of instructions are sold.

The model was discontinued from production in December 2012. **Status as of June 2014**: Communicated as compliant, since remedy action taken later.

		Formal co	ompliance		
MODEL	TESTING LABORATORY	Generic requirement compliance	Documentation compliance	Technical	compliance
	LADORATORI	Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010	Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010

⁷ www.atlete.eu/2/final-results





HAIER VDE (Germany), HNS 1000 A ISO 17025-accredited		yes, but after remedy action	yes	yes
---	--	------------------------------------	-----	-----

Country of availability: Germany

Formal non-compliance:

- missing information in the booklet of instructions (mandatory since 1 July 2012) about
 - indication that the actual water temperature may differ from the declared cycle temperature
 - recommendation on the type of detergents suitable for the various washing temperatures
 - indicative information about remaining moisture content for the main washing programmes at full or partial load, or both (information given only for the cotton 60C programme);
- no identification of the standard cotton 60°C and 40°C programmes on the programme selection device or the machines display, mandatory from 1 December 2012 according to Annex I.1.(1) of the Commission Regulation (EU) No 1015/2010 and confirmed by Commission communication dated 13.7.2012.

Proposed remedy actions:

- revised booklet of instructions including missing information.
- Accepted once the evidence was provided.

Conclusions:

after remedy action the model is still non-compliant for the missing identification of the standard cotton 60°C and 40°C programmes on the programme selection device or the machines display, mandatory from 1 December 2012 according to Annex I.1.(1) of the Commission Regulation (EU) No 1015/2010 and confirmed by Commission communication dated 13.7.2012.

Status as of June 2014: Communicated as compliant, since remedy action on new models.

		Formal co	ompliance		
MODEL	TESTING LABORATORY	Generic requirement compliance		Technical compliance	
		Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010	Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010
WHIRLPOOL DLC8000	IMQ (Italy), ISO 17025-accredited	yes	yes	yes	yes

Country of availability: Italy

		Formal co	ompliance	
MODEL	TESTING LABORATORY	Generic requirement compliance	Documentation compliance	Technical compliance





	Ecodesign	E. Labelling	Ecodesign	E. Labelling EU
	EU 1015/2010	EU 1061/2010	EU 1015/2010	1061/2010
BOMANN WA VDE (Germany), ISC 9310 17025-accredited	no	yes	yes	yes

Country of availability: Germany, Italy, Slovenia

Formal non-compliance:

- missing information in the booklet of instructions (mandatory since 1 July 2012) about
- indication that the actual water temperature may differ from the declared cycle temperature
- indicative information about remaining moisture content and water consumption for the main washing programmes at full or partial load, or both

Proposed remedy actions:

- Proposed change of the booklet of instructions not sufficient.

Conclusions:

- after remedy action the model is still non-compliant for the missing information in the booklet of instructions.

		Formal co	ompliance		
MODEL	TESTING	Generic requirement compliance		Technical compliance	
	LABORATORY	Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010	Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010
BOSCH WAQ24461GB	INTERTEK (United Kingdom), ISO 17025-accredited	no	yes	yes	yes

Country of availability: Great Britain

Formal non-compliance:

- missing information in the booklet of instructions (mandatory since 1 July 2012) about
 - indication that the standard cotton programmes are suitable to clean normally soiled cotton laundry
 - indication that they are the most efficient programmes in terms of combined energy and water consumptions for washing that type of cotton laundry
 - indication that the actual water temperature may differ from the declared cycle temperature
 - indication of the power consumption of the off-mode and of the left-on mode
 - recommendation on the type of detergents suitable for the various washing temperatures
 - indicative information about remaining moisture content for the main washing programmes at full or partial load, or both;
- no identification of the standard cotton 60°C and 40°C programmes on the programme selection device or the machines display, mandatory from 1 December 2012 according to Annex I.1.(1) of the Commission Regulation (EU) No 1015/2010 and confirmed by Commission communication dated 13.7.2012.

Proposed remedy actions:





- revised booklet of instructions including missing information Accepted once the evidence was provided.

Conclusions:

after remedy action the model is still non-compliant for the missing identification of the standard cotton 60°C and 40°C programmes on the programme selection device or the machines display, mandatory from 1 December 2012 according to Annex I.1.(1) of the Commission Regulation (EU) No 1015/2010 and confirmed by Commission communication dated 13.7.2012.

		Formal co	ompliance		
MODEL	TESTING LABORATORY	Generic requirement compliance		Technical compliance	
		Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010	Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010
BEKO WM622W	INTERTEK (United Kingdom), ISO 17025-accredited	yes	yes	yes	yes

Country of availability: Great Britain

		Formal co	ompliance		
MODEL	TESTING LABORATORY	Generic requirement compliance		Technical compliance	
		Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010	Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010
INDESIT IWD7145	INTERTEK (United Kingdom), ISO 17025-accredited	yes	yes	yes	yes

Country of availability: France, Great Britain, Ireland

		Formal compliance			
MODEL	TESTING LABORATORY	Generic requirement compliance	Documentation compliance	Technical	compliance
	LADORATORI	Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010	Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010







Country of availability: Poland, Romania, France, Germany, Slovenia, Austria, Czech Republic, Hungary, Slovakia

Technical non-compliance:

- Step 1: suspect non-compliance for the annual water consumption: measured value outside the tolerance
- Step 1: suspect non-compliance for remaining moisture content: measured value outside the tolerance

Formal non-compliance:

- missing information in the booklet of instructions (mandatory since 1 July 2012) about
 - recommendation on the type of detergents suitable for the various washing temperatures
 - indicative information about: programme time and remaining moisture content for the main washing programmes at full or partial load, or both
- no identification of the standard cotton 60°C and 40°C programmes on the programme selection device or the machines display, mandatory from 1 December 2012 according to Annex I.1.(1) of the Commission Regulation (EU) No 1015/2010 and confirmed by Commission communication dated 13.7.2012.

Proposed remedy actions:

- Energy labelling: revised label and product fiche
- Ecodesign:
 - revised booklet of instructions including missing information
 - identification of the standard programmes on the programme selection device or the machines display for new units of the same model (picture provided)

Accepted once the evidence was provided for actions against non-compliance: new label and product fiche with updated figures for water consumption and remaining moisture content based on test reports of three new units, and picture of the front of the machines of the same model

Note: the production of the model GORENJE WA 70129 has been stopped before spring 2013.

		Formal co	ompliance		
MODEL	TESTING LABORATORY	Generic requirement compliance	Documentation compliance	Technical	compliance
		Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010	Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010
MIELE W 5873 WPS EDITION 111	SLG (Germany), ISO 17025-accredited	yes	yes	yes	yes

Country of availability: Germany, Austria, Belgium, Greece, Slovakia, Czech Republic, Netherlands





MODEL TESTING LABORATO		Formal co	ompliance		
	TESTING	Generic requirement compliance	Documentation compliance	Technical	compliance
	LABORATORY	Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010	Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010
LG F1091QD	IMQ (Italy), ISO 17025-accredited	yes, but after remedy action	yes, but after remedy action	yes	yes

Country of availability: Italy, Poland, Romania, Portugal, Hungary, Czech Republic, Slovakia, Greece, Lithuania

Formal non-compliance:

- Energy labelling: no indication of standard cotton 60°C and 40°C programmes are the most efficient programmes
- Ecodesign: missing information in the booklet of instructions (mandatory since 1 July 2012):
 - indication of the standard 60 °C and 40 °C cotton programmes, referred to as 'standard 60 °C cotton programme' and 'standard 40 °C cotton programme'
 - indication that they are suitable to clean normally soiled cotton laundry
 - indication of the power consumption of the off-mode and of the left-on mode
 - recommendation on the type of detergents suitable for the various washing temperatures.

Proposed remedy actions:

- Energy labelling: revised product fiche issued by manufacturer
- Ecodesign: revised booklet of instructions including missing information.

Accepted once the evidence was provided of the corrective actions.

		Formal co	ompliance		
MODEL	TESTING LABORATORY	Generic requirement compliance	Documentation compliance	Technical	compliance
		Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010	Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010
BRANDT WFA1217F	CTTN (France), ISO9000-certified	no	yes, but after remedy action	yes	yes

Country of availability: France

Formal non-compliance:

- Energy labelling: declaration of the weighted power consumption of the off-mode and of the left-on mode are given as "<0,5W" while the values should be given with rounded to two decimal places
 - Ecodesign: missing information in the booklet of instructions (mandatory since 1 July 2012) about:
 - indication of the standard cotton programmes
 - indications that they are suitable to clean normally soiled cotton laundry
 - indication that they are the most efficient programmes





- recommendation on the type of detergents suitable for the various washing temperatures
- indicative information about: programme time, remaining moisture content, energy and water consumption for the main washing programmes at full or partial load or both
- Ecodesign: no identification of the standard cotton 60°C and 40°C programmes on the programme selection device or the machines display, mandatory from 1 December 2012 according to Annex I.1.(1) of the Commission Regulation (EU) No 1015/2010 and confirmed by Commission communication dated 13.7.2012.

Proposed remedy actions:

- Energy labelling: remedy actions accepted.
- Ecodesign: revised booklet of instructions including missing information. Accepted.

Conclusions:

after remedy action the model is still non-compliant for the missing identification of the standard cotton 60°C and 40°C programmes on the programme selection device or the machines display, mandatory from 1 December 2012 according to Annex I.1.(1) of the Commission Regulation (EU) No 1015/2010 and confirmed by Commission communication dated 13.7.2012.

Note: The production of the model BRANDT WFA1217F has been stopped on 30/04/2013.

		Formal compliance			
MODEL	TESTING LABORATORY	Generic requirement compliance	Documentation compliance	Technical	compliance
		Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010	Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010
CANDY GOF662	CTTN (France), ISO9000-certified	yes, but after remedy action	yes	yes, but after remedy action	yes

Country of availability: Great Britain, Ireland

Formal non-compliance:

- Missing information in the booklet of instructions (mandatory since 1 July 2012):
 - power consumption in off-mode and left-on mode
 - no indicative information about programme time, remaining moisture content, energy and water consumption for the main washing programmes at full or partial load, or both.

Proposed remedy actions:

- missing information added via a revised sheets for existing booklets of instructions.
 - Accepted once the evidence was provided of the corrective action for the units still on the market: revised sheet was sent to distributors and retailers for the English and Irish market asking them to add it to the available units in stock. Evidence of this communication has been provided

Note: the production of the model Candy GOF662/L80 has been stopped on December 2012.

			Formal compliance		
м	ODEL	TESTING LABORATORY	Generic requirement compliance	Documentation compliance	Technical compliance





		Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010	Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010
AEG L77484AFL	LCOE (Spain), ISO 17025-accredited	yes, but after remedy action	yes	yes, but after remedy action	yes, but after remedy action

Country of availability: Germany, Austria, Belgium, Finland, Netherlands

Technical non-compliance:

- Step 1: suspect non-compliance for the annual water consumption: measured value outside the tolerance

Formal non-compliance:

 Missing information in the booklet of instructions (mandatory since 1 July 2012) about indication that the actual water temperature may differ from the declared cycle temperature.

Proposed remedy actions:

- revised booklet of instructions including missing information
- issue of a new label with the correct water consumption indication.

Accepted once the evidence was provided for actions against non-compliance for the units still on the market, evidence that retailers are informed about these changes was delivered as well.

Note: the production of the model AEG L77484AFL has been stopped on <date to be added>.

• Batch 2 testing results:

		Formal co	ompliance	-	
MODEL	TESTING LABORATORY	Generic requirement compliance	Documentation compliance	Technical compliance	2
		Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010	Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010
CONTINENT WM 5100 (14)	SLG (Germany), ISO 17025-accredited	по	no	no	no

Country of availability: Germany

Formal non-compliance Ecodesign:

1.indication of the power consumption of the off-mode and of the left-on mode are given as "<1W and <2W" while the values should be given with rounded to two decimal places

2.no recommendation on the type of detergents suitable for the various washing temperatures

3.no indicative information for the main washing programmes at full or partial load, or both about remaining moisture content

4. no indication of the standard cotton 60°C and 40°C programmes on the programme selection device or the machines display, if any, or both





Formal non-compliance Energy labelling:

1. declaration of the weighted power consumption of the off-mode and of the left-on mode are given as "<1W and <2W" while the values should be given with rounded to two decimal places

Technical non-compliance:

Remaining moisture content exceeding declared and allowed values

Remedy actions: no

Conclusions: The model is considered non-compliant.

		Formal co	ompliance		
MODEL	TESTING LABORATORY	Generic requirement compliance	Documentation compliance	Technical	compliance
		Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010	Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010
BEKO WMI 71641 (15)	SLG (Germany), ISO 17025-accredited	yes, but after remedy action	yes	yes	yes

Country of availability: Great Britain, Ireland

Formal non-compliance Ecodesign:

1. no indicative information for the main washing programmes at full or partial load, or both, about programme time and remaining moisture content

Remedy actions done, verified and accepted.

Conclusions: After remedy actions, the model is considered compliant.

MODEL		Formal co	ompliance		
	TESTING LABORATORY	Generic requirement compliance	Documentation compliance	Technical	compliance
		Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010	Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010
WHIRLPOOL AWE 5105 (16)	SLG (Germany), ISO 17025-accredited	yes, but after remedy action	yes	yes	yes

Country of availability: Germany, Austria

Formal non-compliance Ecodesign:

1.no indicative information for the main washing programmes at full or partial load, or both about remaining moisture content





2. no indication of the standard cotton 60°C and 40°C programmes on the programme selection device or the machines display, if any, or both

Remedy actions done, verified and accepted.

Conclusions: After remedy actions, the model is considered compliant.

MODEL		Formal co	ompliance		
	TESTING LABORATORY	Generic requirement compliance	Documentation compliance	Technical	compliance
		Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010	Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010
BOSCH WLX20160PL (17)	VDE (Germany), ISO 17025-accredited	по	yes	yes	yes

Country of availability: Poland

Formal non-compliance:

1. no indicative information for the main washing programmes at full or partial load, or both, about remaining moisture content

2. no indication of the standard cotton 60° C and 40° C programmes on the programme selection device or the machines display, if any, or both

Proposed remedy actions by the manufacturer:

1. missing information on residual moisture content – manufacturer convinced that the general requirements of Regulation 1015/2010 on remaining moisture content are well covered in the user manual, but will take remedy actions for the future; however not for this specific model

2. identification of the standard programmes on the machine front/display - no remedy actions

Conclusions:

- after remedy action the model is still non-compliant for the missing information in the booklet of instructions and for identification of the standard programmes on the machine front/display.

		Formal compliance			
MODEL	TESTING LABORATORY	Generic requirement compliance	Documentation compliance	Technical	compliance
	LADOKATOKI	Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010	Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010





EDESA ZEN L8212 (18) L8212 (18) L8212 (18) LCOE (Spain), ISO 17025-accred	ted N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
--	---------	-----	-----	-----

Formal and technical non-compliance after step 1. 3 additional models not available on the market; manufacturer went bankrupt.

Conclusions: Machine is un-decidable, because it was not possible to reach a final verdict about this machine.

		Formal co	ompliance		
MODEL TESTING LABORATORY	Generic requirement compliance	Documentation compliance	Technical	compliance	
	LADORATORY	Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010	Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010
DAEWOO DWD NT1011 (19)	LCOE (Spain), ISO 17025-accredited	yes, but after remedy action	yes, but after remedy action	yes, but after remedy action	yes, but after remedy action

Country of availability: Spain

Formal non-compliance Ecodesign:

1. no indications that standard programmes are suitable to clean normally soiled cotton laundry

2. no indication that they are the most efficient programmes

3. no indication that the actual water temperature may differ from the declared cycle temperature

4. no recommendation on the type of detergents suitable for the various washing temperatures

5. no indicative information about: programme time, remaining moisture content, energy and water consumption for the main washing programmes at full or partial load both

Formal non-compliance Energy labelling:

missing information on the energy consumption of the standard 60°C cotton programme at full load and at partial load and of the standard 40°C cotton programme at partial load, and the programme time of the 'standard 60 °C cotton programme' at partial load, and the airborne acoustical noise emissions (washing)

Technical non-compliance:

Programme time exceeding declared values

Remedy actions done, verified and accepted.

Conclusions: After remedy actions, the model is considered compliant.

		Formal compliance		
MODEL	TESTING LABORATORY	Generic requirement compliance	Documentation compliance	Technical compliance





		Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010	Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010
HOTPOINT- ARISTON ECO 8D 1492 K (20)	CTTN (France), ISO9000-certified	yes	yes	yes	yes

Country of availability: France, Belgium, Portugal, Netherlands

		Formal compliance			
MODEL	MODEL TESTING LABORATORY	Generic requirement compliance	Documentation compliance	Technical	compliance
	LABORATORI	Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010	Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010
WHIRLPOOL DLC6010 (21)	CTTN (France), ISO9000-certified	yes, but after remedy action	yes	yes	yes

Country of availability: Italy

Formal non-compliance Ecodesign:

'1. no indication that standard programmes are the most efficient programmes in terms of combined energy and water consumptions for washing normally soiled cotton laundry

2. no indicative information for the main washing programmes at full or partial load, or both about remaining moisture content

3. no indication of the standard cotton 60° C and 40° C programmes on the programme selection device or the machines display, if any, or both

Remedy actions done, verified and accepted.

Conclusions: After remedy actions, the model is considered compliant.

		Formal compliance			
MODEL	TESTING LABORATORY	Generic requirement compliance	Documentation compliance	Technical	compliance
LABORATO	LADORATORI	Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010	Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010





AMICA NAVIGATOR PLUS AWN610D (22) VDE (Germany), ISO 17025-accredited	yes, but after remedy action	yes	yes	yes
--	------------------------------------	-----	-----	-----

Country of availability: Poland

Formal non-compliance Ecodesign:

1. no indication that the standard programmes are suitable to clean normally soiled cotton laundry (indication given only for the 40°C cycle)

2. no indication that standard programmes are the most efficient programmes in terms of combined energy and water consumptions for washing normally soiled cotton laundry

3. no indication that the actual water temperature may differ from the declared cycle temperature

4. no indication of the power consumption of the off-mode and of the left-on mode

5. no recommendation on the type of detergents suitable for the various washing temperatures

6. no indicative information for the main washing programmes at full or partial load both about: remaining moisture content, energy and water consumption

Remedy actions done, verified and accepted.

Conclusions: After remedy actions, the model is considered compliant.

		Formal co	ompliance		
MODEL	TESTING LABORATORY	Generic requirement compliance	Documentation compliance	Technical	compliance
	LABORATORY	Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010	Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010
SAMSUNG WM WF1704WSV (23)	VDE (Germany), ISO 17025-accredited	yes	yes	yes	yes

Country of availability: France, Denmark, Sweden, Finland, Hungary, Czech Republic, Netherlands, Romania, Slovenia

	Formal compliance				
MODEL	TESTING	Generic requirement compliance	Documentation compliance	Technical compliance	compliance
LABORATORY	Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010	Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010	





Country of availability: Germany, Netherlands, Belgium, Czech Republic, Austria, Latvia, Lithuania, Slovenia

		Formal co	ompliance	-	
MODEL		Generic requirement compliance	Documentation compliance	Technical	compliance
	LADORATORI	Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010	Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010
BOSCH WAQ2832Z (25)	VDE (Germany), ISO 17025-accredited	yes, but after remedy action	yes	yes, but after remedy action	yes, but after remedy action

Country of availability: Germany, Austria

Formal non-compliance Ecodesign:

1. no indicative information for the main washing programmes at full or partial load, or both about remaining moisture content

Technical compliance Ecodesign and Energy labelling:

1. Measured power consumption in left-on mode higher that declared on fiche.

Remedy actions done, verified and accepted.

Conclusions: After remedy actions, the model is considered compliant.

		Formal co	ompliance		
MODEL	TESTING LABORATORY	Generic requirement compliance	Documentation compliance	Technical	compliance
		Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010	Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010
PANASONIC NA 148 VG4 (26)	INTERTEK (United Kingdom), ISO 17025-accredited	yes, but after remedy action	yes	yes	yes

Country of availability: Great Britain





Formal non-compliance Ecodesign:

1. no indicative information for the main washing programmes at full or partial load, or both about programme time

Remedy actions done, verified and accepted.

Conclusions: After remedy actions, the model is considered compliant.

MODEL	TESTING LABORATORY	Formal compliance			
		Generic requirement compliance	Documentation compliance	Technical compliance	
		Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010	Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010
LG F1291QD (27)	INTERTEK (United Kingdom), ISO 17025-accredited	yes, but after remedy action	yes	yes	yes

Country of availability: Italy, Poland, Great Britain, Sweden, Finland

Formal non-compliance Ecodesign:

1. no indication of the power consumption of the off-mode and of the left-on mode

2. no indication of the standard cotton 60°C and 40°C programmes on the programme selection device or the machines display, if any, or both

Remedy actions done, verified and accepted.

Conclusions: After remedy actions, the model is considered compliant.

MODEL	TESTING LABORATORY	Formal compliance			
		Generic requirement compliance	Documentation compliance	Technical compliance	
		Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010	Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010
HOOVER CANDY DYN8164D (28)	INTERTEK (United Kingdom), ISO 17025-accredited	yes, but after remedy action	yes, but after remedy action	yes	yes

Country of availability: Great Britain

Formal non-compliance Ecodesign:

1. no indication of the power consumption of the off-mode and of the left-on mode

2. no indicative information for the main washing programmes at full or partial load both about: programme time, remaining moisture content, energy and water consumption

3. no indication of the standard cotton 60°C and 40°C programmes on the programme selection device or the machines display, if any, or both





Formal non-compliance Energy labelling:

1. missing energy consumption of the standard 40°C cotton programme at partial load

2. no indication of standard cotton 60°C and 40°C programmes are the most efficient programmes

3. no indication of the programme time of the standard 60 °C cotton programme at full and partial load and of the standard 40

°C cotton programme at partial load

4. information are not shown in the correct order.

Remedy actions done, verified and accepted.

Conclusions: After remedy actions, the model is considered compliant.

MODEL	TESTING LABORATORY	Formal compliance			
		Generic requirement compliance	Documentation compliance	Technical compliance	
		Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010	Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010
CYLINDA FT 352 (29)	INTERTEK (United Kingdom), ISO 17025-accredited	yes, but after remedy action	yes	yes	yes

Country of availability: Sweden

Formal non-compliance Ecodesign:

1. no indicative information for the main washing programmes at full or partial load, or both about remaining moisture content

Remedy actions done, verified and accepted.

Conclusions: After remedy actions, the model is considered compliant.

MODEL	TESTING LABORATORY	Formal compliance			
		Generic requirement compliance	Documentation compliance	Technical compliance	
		Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010	Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010
INDESIT IWUD 4105 (30)	IMQ (Italy), ISO 17025-accredited	yes	yes	yes	yes

Country of availability: Poland, Italy, Czech Republic, Romania, Hungary, Slovenia, Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania




		Formal c	ompliance		
MODEL	TESTING LABORATORY	Generic requirement compliance	Documentation compliance	Technical	compliance
	LADOKATOKY	Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010	Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010
ELECTROLUX- REX RWP 105205W (31)	IMQ (Italy), ISO 17025-accredited	yes	yes, but after remedy action	yes	yes

Country of availability: Italy

Formal non-compliance Energy labelling:

1. no indication that the standard cotton 60°C and 40°C programmes are the most efficient programmes

Remedy actions done, verified and accepted.

Conclusions: After remedy actions, the model is considered compliant.

• Batch 3 testing results:

		Formal co	ompliance		
MODEL	TESTING LABORATORY	Generic requirement compliance	Documentation compliance	Technical con	compliance
	LABORATORY	Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010	Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010
CONSTRUCTA CWF14E24 (32)	CTTN (France), ISO9000-certified	yes, partially, after remedy action	yes	yes	yes

Country of availability: Germany

Formal non-compliance Ecodesign:

- missing information in booklet of instructions

- 1. no indication of the standard 60°C cotton programme and of the 40°C standard cotton programme (there is an indication, but with wrong information for the button because "eco perfect" doesn't exist for this machine).
- 2. no indicative information for the main washing programmes at full or partial load both about remaining moisture content
- no indication of the standard cotton 60°C and 40°C programmes on the programme selection device or the machines display, if any, or both

Remedy actions done, partially verified and accepted.





Conclusions: after remedy actions, the model is considered partially compliant. For the booklet of instruction, the remedy action has been applied to new washing machines, but has not been extended to the units of the same model already placed on the market.

Status as of June 2014: Communicated as partly compliant, yellow colour

		Formal co	ompliance		
MODEL	TESTING	Generic requirement compliance	Documentation compliance	Technical c	compliance
	LABORATORI	LABORATORY Ecodesign E. Labelling EU 1015/2010 EU 1061/2010		Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010
HAIER HW60- 1203D-F (33)	CTTN (France), ISO9000-certified	yes	yes	yes	yes

Country of availability: France

			Formal compliance		
MODEL	TESTING LABORATORY	Generic requirement compliance	Documentation compliance	Technical o	compliance
	LABORATORI	EcodesignE. LabellingEU 1015/2010EU 1061/2010	Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010	
ZANUSSI ZWG6100K (34)	CTTN (France), ISO9000-certified	yes	yes	yes	yes

Country of availability: Spain, Hungary, Ireland, Portugal, Czech Republic, Romania, Estonia, Slovakia, Latvia, Greece, Lithuania, Finland

		Formal co	Formal compliance		
MODEL	TESTING LABORATORY	Generic requirement compliance	Documentation compliance	Technical	compliance
	LADORATORI	Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010	Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010







Country of availability: Poland, Slovenia, Czech Republic, Slovakia, Romania, Hungary, Austria

Formal non-compliance Ecodesign:

- No indication of the standard cotton 60°C and 40°C programmes on the programme selection device or the machines display, if any, or both

Technical non-compliance

Annual water consumption and spin speed exceeding declared values

Remedy actions done, verified and accepted.

Conclusions: After remedy actions, the model is considered compliant.

		Formal co	ompliance		
MODEL	TESTING LABORATORY	STING requirement compliance	Documentation compliance	Technical	compliance
	LABORATORY	Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010	Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010
HEC HW50- 1010W (36)	INTERTEK (United Kingdom), ISO 17025-accredited	yes, but after remedy action	yes	yes	yes

Country of availability: Germany

Formal non-compliance Ecodesign:

- No indicative information for the main washing programmes at full or partial load about remaining moisture content

Note: the model is not in production anymore and has disappeared from the market, therefore the remedy action could not be applied to the models in stock.

Remedy actions done, verified and accepted (will be implemented for all new products on the market).

		Formal compliance		
MODEL	TESTING LABORATORY	Generic requirement compliance	Documentation compliance	Technical compliance





		Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010	Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010
BEKO WMB 51032 PL PTY (37)	VDE (Germany), ISO 17025-accredited	yes, but after remedy action	yes	yes	yes

Country of availability: Poland

Formal non-compliance Ecodesign:

- No indicative information for the main washing programmes at full or partial load both about programme time and remaining moisture content

Remedy actions done, verified and accepted.

Conclusions: After remedy actions, the model is considered compliant.

		Formal compliance			
MODEL	TESTING LABORATORY	Generic requirement compliance	Documentation compliance	Technical c	compliance
	LABORATORI	Ecodesign E. Labelling EU 1015/2010 EU 1061/2010	Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010	
MIELE W 5821 WPS (38)	VDE (Germany), ISO 17025-accredited	yes	yes	yes	yes

Country of availability: Germany, Belgium, Austria, Italy, Hungary

			Formal compliance			
MODEL	TESTING LABORATORY	Generic requirement compliance	Documentation compliance	Technical	compliance	
	LABORATORI	CRATORY Ecodesign EU 1015/2010 EU 1061/2010	Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010		
INDESIT IWSE 61251 C ECO(EU) (39)	VDE (Germany), ISO 17025-accredited	yes	yes	yes	yes	

Country of availability: Romania, Czech Republic, Denmark, Latvia, Germany, Lithuania, Belgium, Sweden, Slovakia, Hungary, Austria





		Formal co	ompliance		
MODEL	TESTING LABORATORY	Generic requirement compliance	Technical	compliance	
	LABORATORY	Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010	Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010
BAUKNECHT WA PLUS 634 A+++ (40)	VDE (Germany), ISO 17025-accredited	yes, but after remedy action	yes	yes	yes

Country of availability: Germany, Austria

Formal non-compliance Ecodesign:

- Missing information in booklet of instructions:
- 1. no indication of the standard programmes at 40°C and 60°C
- 2. no indication that the actual water temperature may differ from the declared cycle temperature
- 3. no indcation of the power consumption of the off-mode and of the left-on mode
- 4. no indicative information for the main washing programmes at full or partial load both about: remaining moisture content
- No indication of the standard cotton 60°C and 40°C programmes on the programme selection device or the machines display, if any, or both

Remedy actions done, verified and accepted.

Conclusions: After remedy actions, the model is considered compliant.

		Formal co	ompliance		
MODEL	TESTING LABORATORY	Generic requirement compliance	Documentation compliance	Technical co	compliance
	LABORATORI	FORY Ecodesign EU 1015/2010 EU 1061/2010	Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010	
AEG L6469AFL (41)	SLG (Germany), ISO 17025-accredited	yes	yes	yes	yes

Country of availability: Germany, Austria

			ompliance	
MODEL	TESTING LABORATORY	Generic requirement compliance	Documentation compliance	Technical compliance





	Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010	Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010
	yes, but after remedy action	yes	yes	yes

Country of availability: Italy, Finland, Romania, Sweden, Spain, Hungary, Czech Republic, Great Britain, Slovakia, Denmark, Austria

Formal non-compliance Ecodesign:

- No indication of the standard cotton 60°C and 40°C programmes on the programme selection device or the machines display, if any, or both

Remedy actions done, verified and accepted.

Conclusions: After remedy actions, the model is considered compliant.

		Formal co	ompliance		
MODEL	MODEL TESTING LABORATORY	Generic requirement compliance	Documentation compliance	Technical	compliance
		Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010	Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010
EXQUISIT WM 6810 (43)	SLG (Germany), ISO 17025-accredited	no	no	yes	no

Country of availability: Germany, Austria

Formal non-compliance Ecodesign:

- Missing information in booklet of instructions:
 - 1. no recommendation on the type of detergents suitable for the various washing temperatures
 - 2. the indication of the power consumption of the off-mode and of the left-on mode is <0,X instead of the figure with the correct digit number
- No indication of the standard cotton 60°C and 40°C programmes on the programme selection device or the machines display, if any, or both

Formal non-compliance Energy labelling:

- Missing information in the product fiche:
 - 1. no indication of standard cotton 60°C and 40°C programmes are the most efficient programmes

Technical non-compliance Energy Labelling:

- Remaining moisture content exceeding declared values (confirmed after Step 2 on 3 additional units).

Remedy actions: no remedy action.

Conclusions: the model is considered non-compliant.





		Formal co	ompliance		
MODEL	MODEL LABORATORY		Documentation compliance	Technical	compliance
	LABORATORY	Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010	Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010
SAMSUNG WF70F5E0W2W (44)	SLG (Germany), ISO 17025-accredited	yes	yes	yes	yes

Country of availability: Poland, Spain, Romania, Hungary

			ompliance		
MODEL	TESTING LABORATORY	Generic requirement compliance	Documentation compliance	Technical	compliance
	LABORATORY	Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010	Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010
CANDY EVO 1072D/1-S (45)	IMQ (Italy), ISO 17025-accredited	yes, but after remedy action	yes	yes, but after remedy action	yes, but after remedy action

Country of availability: Italy, Greece

Formal non-compliance Ecodesign:

Missing information in booklet of instructions:

- 1. no indication of the power consumption of the off-mode and of the left-on mode
- 2. no recommendation on the type of detergents suitable for the various washing temperatures
- 3. no indicative information for the main washing programmes at full or partial load both about: programme time, remaining moisture content, energy and water consumption
- No indication of the standard cotton 60°C and 40°C programmes on the programme selection device or the machines display, if any, or both

Technical non-compliance:

Power consumption exceeding declared values

Remedy actions done, verified and accepted.

		Formal compliance		
MODEL	TESTING LABORATORY	Generic requirement compliance	Documentation compliance	Technical compliance





	Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010	Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010
	yes, t after nedy action	yes	yes	yes

Country of availability: Great Britain, Ireland

Formal non-compliance Ecodesign:

- No indication of the standard cotton 60°C and 40°C programmes on the programme selection device or the machines display, if any, or both

Remedy actions done, verified and accepted

Conclusions: after remedy actions, the model is considered compliant.

			ompliance		
MODEL	MODEL TESTING LABORATORY	Generic requirement compliance	Documentation compliance	Technical	compliance
		Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010	Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010
TEKA TKM- 1069 (47)	LCOE (Spain), ISO 17025-accredited	yes, but after remedy action	yes	yes	yes

Country of availability: Spain

Formal non-compliance Ecodesign:

- Missing information in booklet of instructions:

1. no recommendation on the type of detergents suitable for the various washing temperatures

2. no indicative information for the main washing programmes at full or partial load both about: remaining moisture content

No indication of the standard cotton 60°C and 40°C programmes on the programme selection device or the machines display, if any, or both

Remedy actions done, verified and accepted.

		Formal compliance		
MODEL	TESTING LABORATORY	Generic requirement compliance	Documentation compliance	Technical compliance





		Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010	Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010
INDESIT IWC 61251 (48)	LCOE (Spain), ISO 17025-accredited	yes	yes	yes	yes

Country of availability: France, Italy, Portugal

			ompliance		
MODEL	TESTING LABORATORY	Generic requirement compliance	Documentation compliance	Technical	compliance
LABORAI	LABORATORI	Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010	Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010
WHIRLPOOL AWE 6762 (49)	LCOE (Spain), ISO 17025-accredited	yes, but after remedy action	yes, but after remedy action	yes	yes

Country of availability: France

Formal non-compliance Ecodesign:

- no indicative information for the main washing programmes at full or partial load both about remaining moisture content

Formal non-compliance Energy labelling:

-no indication on fiche that standard cotton 60°C and 40°C programmes are the most efficient programmes

Remedy actions done, verified and accepted.

		Formal co	ompliance		
MODEL	TESTING LABORATORY	Generic requirement compliance	Documentation compliance	Technical	compliance
	LADORATORY	Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010	Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010
TECHWOOD WB 91042 Y (50)	LCOE (Spain), ISO 17025-accredited	yes, but after remedy action	yes	yes	yes





Country of availability: Germany

Formal non-compliance Ecodesign:

Missing information in booklet of instructions:

1. no indication that standard programmes are the most efficient programmes in terms of combined energy and water consumptions for washing normally soiled cotton laundry

2 no indication that the actual water temperature may differ from the declared cycle temperature

3. no indication of the power consumption of the off-mode and of the left-on mode

4. no recommendation on the type of detergents suitable for the various washing temperatures

5. no indicative information for the main washing programmes at full or partial load both about remaining moisture content, energy and water consumption

Remedy actions done, verified and accepted.

Conclusions: after remedy actions, the model is considered compliant.

MODEL	TESTING LABORATORY	Formal co	ompliance		
		Generic requirement compliance	Documentation compliance	Technical compliance	
		Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010	Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010
SMEG WMI12C7 (51)	INTERTEK (United Kingdom), ISO 17025-accredited	yes, partially, after remedy action	yes	yes	yes

Country of availability: Great Britain

Formal non-compliance Ecodesign:

Missing information in booklet of instructions:

1. no indication that the standard programmes are suitable to clean normally soiled cotton laundry

2. no indication that standard programmes are the most efficient programmes in terms of combined energy and water consumptions for washing normally soiled cotton laundry

3. no indication of the power consumption of the off-mode and of the left-on mode

4. no indicative information for the main washing programmes at full or partial load both about remaining moisture content

Remedy actions done, partially verified and partially accepted.

Conclusions: after remedy actions, the model is considered partially compliant. For the booklet of instruction, the remedy action has been applied to new washing machines for points 1 to 3, but has not been extended to the units of the same model already placed on the market. No remedy action has been done for point 4.

Status as of June 2014: Communicated as partly compliant, yellow colour.







Annex 2 Questionnaire to MSAs

ATLETE II questionnaire on the usage of the project washing machine test results

Dear MSA representative,

We are sending this questionnaire to you following the activities of the ATLETE II project. Your opinion and input is very important!

Please fill in directly in this document, save and return to karolina.petersson@energimyndigheten.se

Thank you very much,

Yours sincerely,

Karolina Petersson, Swedish Energy Agency

Use of the ATLETE II results

(please write your answer after the question!)

1. The ATLETE II-project has sent out e-mail communications including test results on washing machines that are available on your national market. (sender Karolina Petersson, Swedish MSA).

Are you aware of these test results?

- 2. Where you the right person who should get it? Did you forward them to another responsible person or organisation? What was your organisation's reaction to ATLETE II's test results (in general or concerning the models available in your country)?
- 3. Have you been able to use the test results of ATLETE II? In what way? (please, specify it both regarding the compliant and non-compliant models)
- 4. The test results showed that the majority of the tested models from your market were compliant (at least after a certain remedy action by the manufacturer).





How do you think you would have used the results in case of stated technical non-compliance?

5. Has the ATLETEII test results led to any enforcement activity in your country?

Test data and the use of third party test data

- 1. Do you have any previous experience of using test results from a third party (obtained for example by another fellow MSA?)?
- 2. Do you see any obstacles to use test data from a third party (such as EU projects ATLETE II, CompliantTV, ECOPLIANT)?
- 3. What conditions need to be fulfilled in order for you to be able to use this kind of test results and documentation? (regarding e.g. model specification, sampling, language, laboratory requirements, other accompanying information...)
- 4. What criteria are important for you as a MSA when using test data for enforcement actions? (Please put "x" in appropriate square)

	l Not import- ant	2	3	4	5 Very import- ant	I don't know
Test ordered by my own organisation						
<i>Test done at a laboratory</i> <i>within my country</i>						
<i>Test done at a laboratory within EU</i>						
<i>Test ordered by another</i> <i>MSA</i>						
<i>Test done at a lab accredited to e.g. ISO17025</i>						





Test done at a lab accredited to e.g. ISO17025 and accredited according to relevant test methods			
Test data in a specific language			

Appropriateness of EU-funded project

- 1. How do you see the role of projects such as ATLETEII, i.e. non-MSA actors monitoring the market and verifying products according to legislative requirements?
- 2. Do you believe that the European Commission should continue to finance actions to assess the technical and formal pan-EU compliance of products and equipment covered by the energy labelling and the ecodesign requirements (such as the ATLETE, ComplianTV, MarketWatch, projects)?
 - a. if yes, on which products/equipment
 - b. if yes, under which conditions
 - c. if no, why?





Annex 3 MSA Communication protocol templates

Washing Machines sold on the National Market will shortly be tested within the ATLETE II-project

Dear Market Surveillance Authority representative,

ATLETE II (Appliance Testing for Energy Label and Ecodesign Evaluation) is a project co-financed by the European Commission within the "Intelligent Energy Europe" programme. The ATLETE II project is organised between 2012 and 2014 with 11 consortium partners from around the EU.

The ATLETE II-project is carrying out a pan-European assessment of the compliance of 50 washing machines, randomly selected on the European market on the basis of agreed criteria, in the framework of the new energy labelling / ecodesign regulations through the verification of the:

- formal compliance
- compliance of the declared values through laboratory tests

For further, detailed information about the ATLETE project and the agreed procedures and criteria for selection referred to in this communication, please visit the project web-site <u>www.atlete.eu</u>.

By this communication, the Swedish Energy Agency, as a partner in the ATLETE II-project as well as a national market surveillance authority for ecodesign and energy labelling, wants to inform you that the washing machine(s) stated below have been selected randomly for testing within the ATLETE II-project. According to market data, these machines are available for purchase on the Nationality market.

Brand and model number Brand and model number

The tests will be carried out by independent laboratories selected according to the procedures of the project and high standard requirements. A common test report template will be used by all laboratories. At the Atlete II-website, you are able to learn more about the selected laboratories. After the tests have been carried out, you will receive a summary of the test results and test reports for the tested model(s) available on the Nationality market.

We hope that these test results can be of use to you in your market surveillance activities. We appreciate your feedback on if and how these tests could be useful for you in your national surveillance activities, or, what other information you would need from us in order to be able to use them.

Best regards,

Karolina Petersson Swedish Energy Agency Telephone: +46 (0) 16 544 2065 Email:karolina.petersson@energimyndigheten.se





Test Result from the ATLETE II-project on Washing Machines sold on the [Nationality] Market

Dear Market Surveillance Authority representative,

ATLETE II (Appliance Testing for Energy Label and Ecodesign Evaluation) is a project co-financed by the European Commission within the "Intelligent Energy Europe" programme.

The ATLETE II-project is carrying out a pan-European assessment of the compliance of 50 washing machines, randomly selected on the European market on the basis of agreed criteria, in the framework of the new energy labelling / ecodesign regulations through the verification of the:

- formal compliance:
 - energy labelling documentation: presence of the label and the product fiche and reported information
 - ecodesign generic requirements: information to be provided in the booklet of instructions and other requirements
- <u>technical compliance</u> of the declared values both energy labelling and ecodesign specific requirements through laboratory tests

Before models were selected from the market, all manufacturers have been offered the possibility to sign a Voluntary Protocol for Remedy Actions by which they can decide, in case of suspected technical non-compliance after the first or the second step of testing procedure or proven formal non-compliance, to take all the remedy actions necessary to correct their declarations in accordance with the results of the testing procedure and/or to solve the identified formal non-compliant elements.

For the technical compliance verification, the applied procedure follows the two-step testing procedure defined in the EU energy labelling and ecodesign Regulations: Step 1, one unit tested; if suspected non-compliant and no voluntary remedy actions taken, Step 2 with three additional units tested. Provided the measured values for the model are within the allowed verification tolerances, the model is considered compliant. If even one measured parameter is outside the allowed verification tolerance, either remedy action is taken by the manufacturer or three additional units have been tested. The formal compliance is assessed only on one unit of the models during Step 1.

For further, detailed information about the ATLETE II project and the agreed procedures and criteria for selection referred to in this communication, please visit the project web-site www.atlete.eu.

In March 2013, we informed you about the project plans and circulated a list of product models, available on your national market, which would be subject to our testing activities.

By this communication, the Swedish Energy Agency, as a partner in the ATLETE II-project as well as a national market surveillance authority for ecodesign and energy labelling, wants to inform you that washing machine($\frac{s}{s}$):

• [yyy]





have been tested within the ATLETE II-project. The tests have been carried out by independent laboratories selected according to the procedures of the project.

Below you find the final compliance verification outcome for each model that includes laboratory test results and formal compliance analysis. When a washing machine manufacturer has taken a voluntary remedy action after Step 1 in order to correct possible declaration mistakes or make the product compliant, this is also indicated in the table. Remedy actions effectiveness has been checked as much as possible.

		Formal co	ompliance		
MODEL	TESTING LABORATORY	Generic requirement compliance		Technical compliance	
		Ecodesign EU 1015/2010		Ecodesign EU 1015/2010	E. Labelling EU 1061/2010
ууу	xxx, ISO 17025-accredited	no	yes	yes	yes

Formal non-compliance:

- xyxy

Proposed remedy actions: Conclusions:

All the details are in the attached full test report(s). All tests reports will also be made publically available on the project website www.atlete.eu at the end of the project. In case of remedy actions taken by the manufacturer, these are also available upon request.

The testing procedure of these models is deemed concluded. The tested units will eventually be donated to a charity (if compliant with the ecodesign requirements) or scraped in one of the recycling plants in Europe (if non-compliant with the ecodesign requirements, since the model is not allowed at the Community market).

We appreciate your feedback and information if and how you would be able to use these tests results in your own market surveillance activities.

Sincerely Yours,

Karolina Petersson Swedish Energy Agency Telephone: +46 (0) 16 544 2065 Email: <u>karolina.petersson@energimyndigheten.se</u>