APPENDIX C

FY2005 DRAFT
PRIORITY-SETTING DATA SHEETS
FOR "NON-COVERED" PRODUCTS

(Appendix C products were considered in FY2003 but did not become part of the program. Appendix C data sheets have not been updated since the FY2003 priority-setting process.)

APPLIANCE STANDARDS
BUILDING TECHNOLOGIES PROGRAM
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

April 2004

Table of Contents (Non-Covered Products)

Table of Contents (Non-Covered Products)

Standards Consideration

Product: Ice Machines[1]

Factors for Consideration	Assessment
Potential Energy Savings from Regulatory Action; Cumulative (Quad) 2008-2030	Combination of Energy Savings Technologies: 0.18[2] Canadian Standards: 0[3] FEMP Recommended/ Best Available: 0.16 / 0.31[4]
Product / Technology Availability (Including Price/Cost information):	Technology / Payback Period[2] / Tech. Maturity / Peak Load Impact High-Effcy Compressor / 1.8 years / New / High Reduced Evap Therm Cyc / 1.2 years / New / High
Cumulative Burden	$ The industry dealt with the phase out of CFC's in the mid-1990's. $ If the Kyoto protocol were ratified, the industry would possibly have to convert to refrigerants with reduced global warming potential. $ Some of the companies involved in manufacturing this equipment have parent companies, which own divisions that have been subject to energy standards of other products.
Status of Test Procedures	$ ASHRAE 29 $ ARI 810-2000: Based on ASHRAE 29 $ CSA C742-98: Based on ASHRAE 29
Other Regulatory Actions	Canadian Regulations and availability of ARI Data.
Evidence of Market-Driven or Voluntary Efficiency Improvements	FEMP Recommendations
Issues	Significant product variety.

[1] See priority-setting FY2003 Technical Support Document (TSD).
[2] Based on "Energy Savings Potential for Commercial Refrigeration Equipment", ADL for DOE, June 1996. Table 5-17, Row 12. Includes High-Efficiency Compressor and Brushless DC Evaporator Fan Motor. Payback period in years based on medium energy cost locations (7.82¢/kWh).
[3] See plot of Standards vs. ARI data. Nearly all units comply with the current standard.
[4] Based on ARI average consumption for air-cooled ice makers with 401 to 500 lb/day capacity (7.05 kWh/100lb) and water-cooled ice makers with 301 to 500lb/day capacity (5.62kWh/100lb) compared with FEMP recommended and "best available" data for these ranges.

Background Material

Description	Value	Comments/Source
Total Energy Use (quad, 1995)	0.10	ADL/DOE Refrigeration Study, 1996
Unit Energy Consumption (kWh)	7,900	Divide energy use by installed base.
Annual Shipments (millions, 1998)	0.296	Census data for 1998.
Installed Base (millions, 1995)	1.2	ADL/DOE Refrigeration Study, 1996
Product Lifetime (years)	7 to 10	ADL/DOE Refrigeration Study, 1996
Minimum Efficiency Standard	N/A	
Stock Efficiency	7 kWh/100 lb	Assumed same as typical new.
Typical New Efficiency	7 kWh/100 lb	Average of efficiencies for 500 lb/day air-cooled units – ARI data.
Best Available Efficiency	5.8 kWh/100 lb	Best available 500 lb/day air-cooled unit – ARI data.
Energy Star Efficiency	N/A	
Maximum Efficiency (Future Technology)	N/A	

Test Procedure Summary

Product: Ice Machines

Factors	Assessment
Test Procedure Overview	ASHRAE Standard 29 has been adopted for performance and energy evaluation for Ice Machines. Both ARI and Canadian test procedures are based on the ASHRAE standard. Although the ASHRAE standard does not specify temperatures, the ARI test is based on the following: $ 90^{o}F Ambient Temperature $ 70^{o}F Supply Water Temperature and/or Cooling Water Temperature for water-cooled Ice Machines $ Ice machine runs at full capacity during test.
Future/Potential Test Procedure(s)	It is unlikely any new test procedure will be developed. However, a test procedure with more typical ambient and supply water temperatures would be more representative of actual energy use.
How effectively do test procedure(s) and metric(s) represent actual annual energy consumption and potential savings?	$ The ambient and water temperatures are higher than typical temperatures for ice machines in most applications. The test procedure uses higher temperatures because it was initially developed to test primarily ice machine capacity. $ In addition, the testing of ice machines at full capacity overestimates duty cycle of machines used in many applications.
Product Peak Load Impact and Correlation with Test Procedure and Metric, by Technology	The current test procedure involving high ambient and water temperatures and 100% duty cycle is an ideal indicator of peak load and peak load impact.

Standards Consideration

Product: Supermarket Refrigeration Systems

<table>
<tr><th>Factors for Consideration</th><th>Assessment</th></tr>
<tr><td>Potential Energy Savings from Regulatory Action;

Cumulative (Quad) 2008-2030</td><td>
<table>
<tr><td>Brushless DC Evaporator <u>Fan Motors</u></td><td>Other Options with less <u>than 5-year payback</u></td></tr>
<tr><td>0.44</td><td>0.39[5]</td></tr>
</table>
</td></tr>
<tr><td>Product / Technology Availability (Including Price/Cost information):</td><td>Most of the technologies and design options noted in the data sheet are currently available.
<table>
<tr><th><u>Technology</u></th><th><u>Payback Period</u>[5]</th><th><u>Tech. Maturity</u></th><th><u>Peak Load Impact</u></th></tr>
<tr><td>Brushless DC Fan Motors</td><td>1.6 years</td><td>New</td><td>High</td></tr>
<tr><td>Hot Gas Defrost</td><td>1.4 years</td><td>Current</td><td>High</td></tr>
<tr><td>Antisweat Heater Control</td><td>1.6 years</td><td>Current</td><td>High</td></tr>
<tr><td>Defrost Control</td><td>3 to 7 years</td><td>Advanced</td><td>High</td></tr>
<tr><td>Liq-Suct. Heat Exchangers</td><td>4 to 14 years</td><td>Current</td><td>High</td></tr>
<tr><td>Evaporative Condensers</td><td><1 year</td><td>Current</td><td>High</td></tr>
<tr><td>Floating Head Pressure</td><td>2.5 years</td><td>Current</td><td>Low</td></tr>
<tr><td>Heat Reclaim</td><td>2.5 years</td><td>Current</td><td>Low</td></tr>
<tr><td>Mechanical Subcooling</td><td>4.9 years</td><td>Current</td><td>High</td></tr>
</table>
</td></tr>
<tr><td>Cumulative Burden</td><td>$ The industry dealt with the phaseout of CFC’s in the mid-1990’s. HFC and HFC blend replacements for traditional refrigerants R-502 and R-12 have been developed and are now generally established.

$ There is continued concern regarding the level of potential emissions associated with leakage and service in supermarket refrigeration systems. Since most systems are now using non-ozone-depleting refrigerants, the environmental concern focuses on global warming. If the Kyoto protocol were ratified, this would be a significant issue for the supermarket refrigeration industry.

$ Some of the companies involved in manufacturing this equipment have parent companies that own divisions that have been subject to energy standards of other products.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Status of Test Procedures</td><td>$ Separate Test Procedures for display cases and compressors and/or condensing units.

$ Display Cases: CRS-S1-96 (ARI CRMD), ASHRAE 72, CSA C657-95

$ Compressors and Condensing Units: Many different test standards depending on compressor and heat rejection type.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Other Regulatory Actions</td><td>None known.</td></tr>
</table>

[5] “Energy Savings Potential for Commercial Refrigeration Equipment”, ADL for DOE, June 1996. Includes Hot Gas Defrost, Antisweat Heater Control, Defrost Control, Liquid-Suction Heat Exchangers for Low Temperature applications, Evaporative Condenser, Floating Head Pressure, Heat Reclaim, and Mechanical Subcooling. Payback period in years based on medium energy cost locations ($0.0782/kWh).

Evidence of Market-Driven or Voluntary Efficiency Improvements	Market penetration of energy-saving technologies (ADL/DOE Study) $ Floating Head Pressure 62% $ Mechanical Subcooling 65% $ Liquid-Suction Heat Exchanger 25% (MT), 50% (LT) $ Antisweat Heater controls 69%
Issues	$ Many system types $ Systems are engineered and built on-site (not factory-completed) $ Interaction between air-conditioning and refrigeration systems

Background Material

Description	Value	Comments/Source
Total Energy Use (quad, 1995)	0.329	ADL/DOE Refrigeration Study, 1996
Unit Energy Consumption (kWh)	1,000,000	Divide energy use by installed base.
Annual Shipments (millions, 1995)	0.055	Compressor shipments for Supermarkets, ADL/DOE Refrigeration Study, 1996
Installed Base (millions, 1995)	0.03	ADL/DOE Refrigeration Study, 1996, CBECS 1995
Product Lifetime (years)	10	Compressors, Condensers: ADL/DOE Ref Study, '96
	5 to 15	Display Cases: ADL/DOE Refrigeration Study, 1996
Minimum Efficiency Standard	N/A	No suitable efficiency definitions have been established for Supermarket Refrigeration systems, since they are complex systems composed of many components.
Stock Efficiency	N/A	
Typical New Efficiency	N/A	
Best Available Efficiency	N/A	
Energy Star Efficiency	N/A	
Maximum Efficiency (Future Technology)	N/A	

Test Procedure Summary

Product: Supermarket Refrigeration Systems

Factors	Assessment
Test Procedure Overview	$ No applicable test procedures for complete supermarket refrigeration systems. $ Test procedures for separate components of supermarket refrigeration systems (i.e. display cases, condensing units, condensers, compressors) generally focus on capacity at design conditions rather than energy use, although energy input may be measured during the test. $ An example of a test standard for a refrigeration system component is ARI Standard 460-2000, “Remote Mechanical-Draft Air-Cooled Refrigerant Condensers”. Reporting for this standard includes reporting of condenser fan power. The standard’s focus is evaluation of capacity and power input during 100% run of an air-cooled condenser. The standard rating condition for this test procedure involves 95°F entering air temperature.
Future/Potential Test Procedure(s)	$ Application of energy standards to supermarket refrigeration systems is extremely complicated due to the wide range of system architecture utilized. $ Energy test procedures might focus on individual components, such as display cases.
How effectively do test procedure(s) and metric(s) represent actual annual energy consumption and potential savings?	$ Typical standard rating conditions apply to operating conditions that are more energy intensive than average typical conditions. For example, the 95°F entering air temperature for ARI Standard 460 mentioned above certainly exceeds a typical average condition. $ Furthermore, the standard does not take into consideration that the system does not operate at 100% capacity at all times. A condenser fan would cycle to maintain a head pressure, thus resulting in less fan power. Or, the condenser fan would run continuously, thus allowing very low condensing conditions at low ambient temperatures. This latter scenario would result in significant reduction in compressor power.
Product Peak Load Impact and Correlation with Test Procedure and Metric, by Technology	Correlation of peak load impact with typical test procedures would be desirable, since test procedures generally do not address part load operation.

Standards Consideration

Product: Walk-In Coolers

Factors for Consideration	Assessment
Potential Energy Savings from Regulatory Action; **Cumulative (Quad) 2008-2030**	Combination of Energy Saving Options = 0.37[6]
Product / Technology Availability (Including Price/Cost information):	<u>Technology</u> / <u>Payback Period</u>[6] / <u>Tech. Maturity</u> / <u>Peak Load Impact</u> Floating Head Pressure / 0.3 year / New / Low Ambient Subcooling / 1.7 years / New / Medium Evap Fan Shutdown / 0.7 to 2 years / New / Medium Brushless DC Fan Motors / ~1 year / New / High External Heat Rejection / 7 years / New / High Hot Gas Defrost / 1.8 years / Current / High
Cumulative Burden	$ The industry dealt with the phaseout of CFC's in the mid-1990's. $ If the Kyoto protocol were ratified, the industry would possibly have to convert to refrigerants with reduced global warming potential. • Some of the companies involved in manufacturing this equipment have parent companies that own divisions that have been subject to energy standards of other products.
Status of Test Procedures	Various Test Procedures for Compressors and Condensing Units, depending on compressor and heat rejection type.
Other Regulatory Actions	Not known.
Evidence of Market-Driven or Voluntary Efficiency Improvements	Not known.
Issues	$ Significant product variety. $ Systems are often engineered and built on-site (not factory-completed). • Standards for compressors and/or condensing units?

[6] "Energy Savings Potential for Commercial Refrigeration Equipment", ADL for DOE, June 1996. Table 5-23, row 13. Includes Floating Head Pressure, Ambient Subcooling, Evaporator Fan Shutdown, Brushless DC Evaporator and Condenser Fan Motors. Payback period in years based on medium energy cost locations (7.82¢/kWh).

Background Material

Description	Value	Comments/Source
Total Energy Use (quad, 1995)	0.096	ADL/DOE Refrigeration Study, 1996
Unit Energy Consumption (kWh)	16,200	Divide Energy Use by Installed Base
Annual Shipments (millions, 1995)	0.02	30,000 Walk-In Sales [ADL/DOE Refrigeration Study, 1996] Distribution of sales by type proportional to installed base distributions. A larger number of Walk-In refrigeration systems are sold for replacement.
Installed Base (millions, 1995)	0.54	ADL/DOE Refrigeration Study, 1996
Product Lifetime (years)	12 to 25	Insulated Box: ADL/DOE Refrigeration Study, 1996
	8 to 12	Refrigeration Systems: ADL/DOE Ref. Study, 1996
Minimum Efficiency Standard	N/A	Appropriate Efficiency Definitions have not been defined for Walk-In Coolers.
Stock Efficiency	N/A	
Typical New Efficiency	N/A	
Best Available Efficiency	N/A	
Energy Star Efficiency	N/A	
Maximum Efficiency (Future Technology)	N/A	
Other Notable Efficiency Level	N/A	

Standards Consideration

Product: Walk-In Freezers and Combination Cooler/Freezers

Factors for Consideration	Assessment
Potential Energy Savings from Regulatory Action; **Cumulative (Quad) 2008-2030**	Combination of Energy Saving Options = 0.35[7]
Product / Technology Availability (Including Price/Cost information):	<u>Technology</u> / <u>Payback Period</u>[7] / <u>Tech. Maturity</u> / <u>Peak Load Impact</u> Floating Head Pressure / 0.3 year / New / Low Ambient Subcooling / 1.7 years / New / Medium Evap Fan Shutdown / 0.7 to 2 years / New / Medium Brushless DC Fan Motors / ~1 year / New / High External Heat Rejection / 7 years / New / High Hot Gas Defrost / 1.8 years / Current / High
Cumulative Burden	$ The industry dealt with the phaseout of CFC's in the mid-1990's. $ If the Kyoto protocol were ratified, the industry would possibly have to convert to refrigerants with reduced global warming potential. • Some of the companies involved in manufacturing this equipment have parent companies that own divisions that have been subject to energy standards of other products.
Status of Test Procedures	Various Test Procedures for Compressors and Condensing Units, depending on compressor and heat rejection type.
Other Regulatory Actions	Not known.
Evidence of Market-Driven or Voluntary Efficiency Improvements	Not known.
Issues	$ Significant product variety. $ Systems are often engineered and built on-site (not factory-completed). • Standards for compressors and/or condensing units?

[7] "Energy Savings Potential for Commercial Refrigeration Equipment", ADL for DOE, June 1996. Table 5-24, row 13. Includes External Heat Rejection, Hot Gas Defrost, Evaporator Fan Shutdown, Brushless DC Evaporator and Condenser Fan Motors. Payback period in years based on medium energy cost locations (7.82¢/kWh).

Background Material

Description	Value	Comments/Source
Total Energy Use (quad, 1995)	0.086	ADL/DOE Refrigeration Study, 1996
Unit Energy Consumption (kWh)	21,400 Freezers 30,200 Combo	Divide energy use by installed base.
Annual Shipments (millions, 1995)	0.02	30,000 Walk-In Sales [ADL/DOE Refrigeration Study, 1996] Distribution of sales by type proportional to installed base distributions.
Installed Base (millions, 1995)	0.275 Freezers 0.065 Combo	ADL/DOE Refrigeration Study, 1996
Product Lifetime (years)	12 to 25	Insulated Box: ADL/DOE Refrigeration Study, 1996
	8 to 12	Refrigeration Systems: ADL/DOE Ref. Study, 1996
Minimum Efficiency Standard	N/A	Appropriate Efficiency Definitions have not been defined for Walk-In Freezers and Combination Freezer/Coolers.
Stock Efficiency	N/A	
Typical New Efficiency	N/A	
Best Available Efficiency	N/A	
Energy Star Efficiency	N/A	
Maximum Efficiency (Future Technology)	N/A	
Other Notable Efficiency Level	N/A	

Test Procedure Summary

Product: Walk-In Coolers, Freezers, and Combination Cooler/Freezers

Factors	Assessment
Test Procedure Overview	$ No applicable test procedures for complete walk-in refrigeration systems $ Test procedures for condensing units, which would serve walk-in refrigeration, generally focus on capacity at design conditions rather than energy use. $ An example of a test standard for a refrigeration system component is ARI Standard 460-2000, "Remote Mechanical-Draft Air-Cooled Refrigerant Condensers". Reporting for this standard includes reporting of condenser fan power. The standard's focus is evaluation of capacity and power input during 100% run of an air-cooled condenser. The standard rating condition for this test procedure involves 95^{o}F entering air temperature.
Future/Potential Test Procedure(s)	$ Application of energy standards to walk-in refrigeration is complicated by (1) the range of combinations of insulated box and condensing unit actually used in the field, and (2) the importance of field installation to overall energy use. $ Energy test procedures should focus on individual components, such as the condensing units and/or the insulated boxes.
How effectively do test procedure(s) and metric(s) represent actual annual energy consumption and potential savings?	$ Typical standard rating conditions apply to operating conditions more energy intensive than average typical conditions. For example, the 95^{o}F entering air temperature for ARI Standard 460 mentioned above certainly exceeds a typical average. $ Furthermore, the standard does not take into consideration the fact that the system is not operating at 100% capacity at all times. A condenser fan would cycle to maintain a head pressure, thus resulting in less fan power. Or, the condenser fan would run continuously, thus allowing very low condensing conditions during low ambient temperatures. This latter scenario would result in significant reduction in compressor power.
Product Peak Load Impact and Correlation with Test Procedure and Metric, by Technology	Correlation of peak load impact with typical test procedures would be good, since test procedures generally do not address part load operation.

Standards Consideration

Product: Water Coolers[8]

Factors for Consideration	Assessment
Potential Energy Savings from Regulatory Action; **Cumulative (Quad) 2008-2030**	Combination of Energy Saving Options = 0.26[9] Energy Star = 0.24
Product / Technology Availability (Including Price/Cost information):	Payback Period Ranges for High Insulation Value, Energy Efficient Compressors, Better Thermal Bond between coil and evaporator, and Storage Coil Redesign range from 2 to 10 years.[9]
Cumulative Burden	$ The industry dealt with the phaseout of CFC's in the mid-1990's. $ If the Kyoto protocol were ratified, the industry would possibly have to convert to refrigerants with reduced global warming potential.
Status of Test Procedures	$ ASHRAE 18-1987 (R1997) $ Canadian Standards Association C815-99, based on ASHRAE 18, includes both pulldown and standby impacts.
Other Regulatory Actions	Not known.
Evidence of Market-Driven or Voluntary Efficiency Improvements	Energy Star Program, Penetration for first year of program will be reported to EPA shortly.
Issues	

[8] See priority-setting FY2003 Technical Support Document (TSD).
[9] "Characterization of Commercial Building Appliances", ADL, June 1993, Table 5-28 Includes High Insulation Value, Energy Efficient Compressors, Better Thermal Bond between coil and evaporator, Improved motor efficiencies, and Storage Coil Redesign. Payback period in years based on medium energy cost locations (7.82¢/kWh).

Background Material

Description	Value	Comments/Source
Total Energy Use (quad, 1992)	0.043	ADL/DOE Commercial Appliance Study, 1993
Unit Energy Consumption (kWh)	657	Divide Energy Use by Installed Base
Annual Shipments (millions, 1998)	1.0	Census Data (1998)
Installed Base (millions, 1992)	6.03	ADL/DOE Commercial Appliance Study, 1993
Product Lifetime (years)	10	
Minimum Efficiency Standard	N/A	
Stock Efficiency	2.19 kWh/day	Assume same as typical new.
Typical New Efficiency	2.19 kWh/day	Hot/Cold bottle units. Based on EPA data.
Best Available Efficiency	N/A	
Energy Star Efficiency	1.2 kWh/day	Hot/Col bottle units. (www.EnergyStar.com)
Maximum Efficiency (Future Technology)	N/A	
Other Notable Efficiency Level	N/A	

Test Procedure Summary

Product: Water Coolers

Factors	Assessment
Test Procedure Overview	$ ASHRAE Standard 18-1987 (R1997) is the basis of water cooler test standards. However, this standard does not provide much detail regarding test conditions (ambient and water inlet and outlet temperatures are not specified), and is focused on capacity testing rather than energy testing. $ The EPA Energy Star test is based on ASHRAE 18 with the following clarifications. $ Only energy use to maintain water temperatures is measured. No draw of water during the test. $ Test period 24 hours $ Ambient temperature 75 +/- 2°F $ Cold Water Temperature not more than 50°F, Hot water not less than 165°F $ The proposed Canadian test standard, also based on ASHRAE 18, includes both energy associated with water cooling/heating and standby loss. This standard also uses different temperatures and specifies water inlet temperatures for water coolers connected to city water lines.
Future/Potential Test Procedure(s)	It is not very likely that alternative test procedures will be developed. In any case, all future test procedures will likely be based on the ASHRAE procedure.
How effectively do test procedure(s) and metric(s) represent actual annual energy consumption and potential savings?	$ The EPA test procedure's emphasis on just standby energy use probably captures most of the energy use associated with water coolers. $ The ambient temperature of 75°F used in the EPA test is appropriate for most applications.
Product Peak Load Impact and Correlation with Test Procedure and Metric, by Technology	$ Peak load impact of Energy Efficient Compressors, Better Thermal Bond Between Coil and Evaporator, and Storage Coil Redesign are high, while peak load impact of High Insulation Value is Low. $ The EPA Energy Star test procedure is not a good indicator of peak load, because it includes only standby energy use. The test's ambient temperature of 75°F is only slightly lower than expected typical temperatures for water coolers for peak load conditions. $ The ARI test procedure correlates better with peak power demand, as the 90°F ambient air temperature and the 90°F inlet water temperature both correspond to a hot, summer day.

Standards Consideration

Product: Commercial Clothes Dryers, Gas

Factors for Consideration	Assessment
Potential Energy Savings from Regulatory Action; **Cumulative (Quad) 2008-2030**	$ Humidity Sensor = 0.40 $ Modulating = 0.81
Potential Economic Benefits/Burdens	Not available.
Potential Environmental or Energy Security Benefits	Specific estimates of emission reductions have not been developed however, estimated energy savings indicated above are indicative of the comparative emission benefits that are likely to be possible.
Status of Test Procedures	Energy Factor (EF) measure according to CFR Pt. 430, Subpt. B App D
Other Regulatory Actions	Not known.
Evidence of Market-Driven or Voluntary Efficiency Improvements	$ There is no Energy Star program for clothes dryers. $ Due to lack of standards, market-driven efficiency gains occur when coincident with convenience and quality improvements (e.g., shorter cycle time resulting from modulation).
Issues	$ CFR EF test does not accurately account for sensor systems (e.g. humidity) $ Humidity sensors are rare in laundromats because coin-operated dryer operating times depend upon the amount of operating time purchased rather than dryness (humidity) of the clothing.

Background Material

Description	Value	Comments/Source
Total Energy Use (quad, 1990)	0.122	ADL/DOE Commercial Appliance Study, 1993
Unit Energy Consumption (MMBtu)	72	ADL/DOE Commercial Appliance Study, 1993
Annual Shipments (millions)	0.113	ADL/DOE Commercial Appliance Study, 1993
Installed Base (millions)	1.7	ADL/DOE Commercial Appliance Study, 1993
Product Lifetime (years)	15	ADL/DOE Commercial Appliance Study, 1993
Minimum Efficiency Standard	N/A	No federal minimum.
Stock Efficiency	Unknown	
Typical New Efficiency	1.0	Normalized to typical new, per BTS (2000)
Best Available Efficiency	Unknown	Small efficiency differences expected for commercial gas clothes dryers.
Energy Star Efficiency	N/A	No Energy Star program
Maximum Efficiency (Future Technology)	1.43	Modulation burner (ADL, 2001) with performance normalized to "typical new" per BTS (2000)
Other Notable Efficiency Level	N/A	

Test Procedure Summary

Product: Commercial Clothes Dryers, Gas

Factors	Assessment
Test Procedure Overview	Clothes dryer efficiency is measured as Energy Consumed / load as follows: Energy Consumed (kWh) = [66 / moisture removed (lbs.)] x FU x **[** Electric Energy Supplied (kW-hr) + Gas Energy Consumed / 3412 + Total Annual Pilot Energy Consumed / (416 x 3412) **]** Where: • 66 is an experimentally established value for the percent reduction in the moisture content; FU is the Field Use factor, equaling 1.18 for Time Termination and 1.04 for Automatic Termination; 416 is the number of cycles per year; 3412 converts from Btu to kWh. • A standard load consists of 7 lbs. of test cloth; a compact size dryer uses 3 lbs. of test cloth. • Test cloth is moistened with 100°F water containing 0-17 ppm hardness water is extracted until the moisture content is between 66.5 and 73.5 % of the bone-dry weight. • Bone dry is defined as the weight of the cloth after it has not changed weight more then 1% following a ten-minute dry cycle. • The ambient test conditions must be 75°F and 50% relative humidity.
Future/Potential Test Procedure(s)	• A test procedure to compare automatic termination control is needed since most new products include such devices. $ Pilot light energy consumption may not be accounted for correctly in current standard (for older machines; current machines cannot have a pilot).
How effectively do test procedure(s) and metric(s) represent actual annual energy consumption and potential savings?	$ The accuracy of the annual energy consumption is dependent on the accuracy of the estimate of 419 dryer loads per year and the assumptions made in the derivation of the constant 66 in the formula. $ Test procedure requires the use of Time Termination if it is available. Clothes are dried until the moisture content is between 2.5-5% of the bone dry weight. It is unrealistic to measure actual energy consumption by drying clothes to a precise condition. $ The Field Use factor is general and does not indicate variations in automatic cycle termination controls, i.e. not all moisture sensors work the same yet they all qualify for an FU of 1.04.
Product Peak Load Impact and Correlation with Test Procedure and Metric, by Technology	$ Test procedure does not identify design impact on peak demand $ Automatic cycle termination does not impact peak load of the device, but does reduce the amount of time spent at peak load by reducing over-drying. $ Modulation increases the peak load; however it reduces the duration of the peak load as well as the overall drying time.

Standards Consideration

Product: Commercial Clothes Washers

Factors for Consideration	Assessment	
	Family Sized	**Industrial Sized**
Potential Energy Savings from Regulatory Action; **Cumulative (Quad) 2008-2030**	$ Energy Star (MEF=1.26) = 0.27[10] $ Horz. Axis, MEF=2.0 = 0.46[10] $ Soil Sensor = Insufficient Data[10, 11]	$ Soil Sensor = Insufficient Data[11] $ Ozone = 0.26
Product / Technology Availability (Including Price/Cost information):	$ Horizontal-axis family-sized washers have come to market. Five (5) family-sized commercial washer models have an MEF >=2.0; more than 25 have an MEF>1.80.	Many large-capacity commercial clothes washers are horizontal axis machines, as the high utilization makes the first-cost premium affordable.
Cumulative Burden	$ No minimum energy efficiency standard exists for large capacity commercial clothes washers. $ Many commercial clothes washer manufacturers make other "white" goods that have minimum energy efficiency standard: Residential refrigeration standards were set in 1990,1993, and in 2001.	
Status of Test Procedures	$ Energy Factor (EF) test changed to the Modified Energy Factor (MEF) test to account for remaining moisture content at end of cycle. $ EF and MEF measured according to CFR Pt. 430, Subpt. B, App J & J1	
Other Regulatory Actions	California standard.	
Evidence of Market-Driven or Voluntary Efficiency Improvements	Energy Star minimum MEF=1.26 and is only for family sized units.	No Energy Star Program or Federal Minimum.
Issues	$ No federal standards exist. Energy Star program applied to family-sized commercial units only. $ Accounting for remaining moisture content (RMC) has been resolved. $ CFR Test does not account for energy savings resulting from soil sensors because CFR test uses clean	

[10] Data is based on commercial family sized units only. Savings based on baseline MEF = 1.0.

[11] Soil sensor effectiveness under all conditions is unclear (Meier, 1998).

Background Material

Description	Value		Comments/Source	
	Family	Industrial	Family Sized	Industrial Sized
Total Energy Use (quad, 1990)	0.35	0.019	ADL/DOE Commercial Appliance Study, 1993	
Unit Energy Consumption (kWh)	2451	Unknown	ADL/DOE 1993	
Annual Shipments (millions)	0.265	Unknown	CEE (1998)	
Installed Base (millions)	1.3	Unknown	ADL/DOE 1993	
Product Lifetime (years)	10	8	CEE (1998)	ADL/DOE 1993
Minimum Efficiency Standard	N/A	N/A	No federal minimum.	
Stock Efficiency	Unknown	1		Assumed same as typical new.
Typical New Efficiency	MEF=1.04	1	Vertical Axis; FEMP (2000)	Horizontal Axis (performance normalized to “typical new”); BTS (2000)
Best Available Efficiency	MEF=2.0	Unknown	Horizontal Axis; FEMP (2000)	Little room for improvement over horz. axis machine expected
Energy Star Efficiency	MEF=1.26	N/A	www.EnergyStar.gov	
Maximum Efficiency (Future Technology)	MEF=2.0	3.2	Horizontal Axis; FEMP (2000)	Ozone washers (performance normalized to “typical new”); ADL/DOE (1993)

Test Procedure Summary

Product: Commercial Clothes Washers

Factors	Assessment
Test Procedure Overview	*Modified Energy Factor MEF = Capacity [ft³] / (Machine Electrical Energy Consumption (weighted per cycle) [kW-hr] + Water Energy Consumption (weighted per cycle) [kW-hr] + Energy Consumption for removal of Remaining Moisture Content RMC (per cycle) [kW-hr]* $ A test load is determined based on the capacity of the test unit $ Modified Energy Factor accounts for remaining moisture content (RMC) $ Energy test cloth is used for no more than 25 cycles. • Measurements are made over full arrange of operation temperatures (extra hot, hot, warm, and cold) and fill levels (maximum, average, and minimum fill). $ Temperature Use Factors (TUF) and Load Use Factors account for various water temperatures and fill levels as well as manual and adaptive fill control systems.
Future/Potential Test Procedure(s)	$ CFR 10 Pt. 430, Subpt. B, App. J1 will be used for determining compliance with standards set beginning 1/1/2004.
How effectively do test procedure(s) and metric(s) represent actual annual energy consumption and potential savings?	$ App. J1 is more realistic since it incorporates test procedures to include different water temperatures. $ There are many factors in the calculations and derived results from test measurements that are estimated for means of product comparison. Estimates may effect annual usage figures. $ For Family-Sized washers only, DOE accepts waivers for systems that cannot be tested appropriately under the J1 guidelines. The manufacturer must supply an acceptable test procedure for that clothes washer.
Product Peak Load Impact and Correlation with Test Procedure and Metric, by Technology	$ Test procedure does not identify design impact on peak demand, only total energy consumption; furthermore, water heating energy consumption often occurs off-peak and/or via non-electric water heating means (oil, gas) which do not impact peak electric demand. $ The MEF metric of the test procedure takes into account additional moisture extracted by the washers that reduces the energy consumed by the dryer, also reducing the peak demand impact of electric dryers.

Standards Consideration

Product: Oil Unit Heaters

Factors for Consideration	Assessment
Potential Energy Savings from Regulatory Action; **Cumulative (Quad) 2008-2030**	$ Power Vent (E_t = 84%) = 0.006[12, 13] $ Pulse Combustion (E_t = 90%) = 0.008[12, 13] $ Condensing (E_t = 93%) = 0.015[12, 13]
Product / Technology Availability (Including Price/Cost information):	$ Oil unit heaters cost between 8-10$US/MBtu depending on capacity (GRI, 1997) $ Currently, only standard gravity vented ("low-tech") models are available for oil-fired unit heaters. No manufacturer was found that markets a "higher-efficiency" model.
Cumulative Burden	Oil unit heater manufacturers often make other products (gas duct furnace, gas unit heaters), that fall under many building codes (e.g., via ASHRAE 90.1); some manufacturers also make commercial roof-top air-conditioning products, which have minimum energy efficiency levels.
Status of Test Procedures	Efficiency is primarily stated as steady-state thermal efficiency (see UL Standard 731). Any references to seasonal efficiencies use AFUE (see ANSI/ASHRAE Standard 103).
Other Regulatory Actions	Not known.
Evidence of Market-Driven or Voluntary Efficiency Improvements	Market share of power vented, pulse combustion, and condensing units approaches 0%.
Issues	Oil Unit heaters currently fall under ASHRAE 90.1-1999.

[12] E_t is steady-state thermal efficiency. Savings based on baseline typical efficiency (E_t) of 82%.
[13] Without existing oil-fired unit heaters in these categories, the thermal efficiency values for potential improvements are estimated to be the same as for gas-fired unit heaters.

Background Material

Description	Value	Comments/Source
Total Energy Use (quad, 1998)	0.006	GRI-97/0100 and ADL (2001)
Unit Energy Consumption (MMBtu)	215	Divided total energy use by installed base.
Annual Shipments (millions, 1995)	0.001	GRI-97/0100
Installed Base (millions, 1995)	0.03	GRI-97/0100
Product Lifetime (years)	13.7	GRI-97/0100; estimated average accounting for capacity variations.
Minimum Efficiency Standard	81% / 81% *	Steady-state thermal efficiency at Min./Max. capacity (ASHRAE 90.1-1999)
Stock Efficiency	82%	Steady-state thermal efficiency; Same as typical new efficiency.
Typical New Efficiency	82%	Steady-state thermal efficiency; Average of six available models (Modine and Reznor)
Best Available Efficiency	84%	Steady-state thermal efficiency; Modine model POR-100
Energy Star Efficiency	N/A	
Maximum Efficiency (Future Technology)	N/A	
Other Notable Efficiency Level	N/A	

* As of 29 October, 2001, ASHRAE 90.1-1999 indicates a minimum combustion efficiency (i.e., 100%minus flue losses) of 80%.

Test Procedure Summary

Product: Oil Unit Heaters

Factors	Assessment
Test Procedure Overview	All measurements are taken during standardized, full-load, steady-state operation of the heater. $ Measure inlet and outlet air temperatures. $ Measure flue gas temperature, carbon dioxide concentration, and condensate rate. $ Based on the above measurements and the measured heating value in the fuel, calculate percent of energy lost (in the form of water vapor, unburned fuel, and warm air) through the flue to the outdoor air (called "%flue loss"). $ Calculate the thermal efficiency of the duct furnace, equal to 100% - %flue loss. $ For unit heaters installed indoors, jacket losses are not considered since the energy "lost" by the jacket goes into the space being heated.
Future/Potential Test Procedure(s)	There are no known new test procedures being developed for oil unit heaters.
How effectively do test procedure(s) and metric(s) represent actual annual energy consumption and potential savings?	The test procedure accurately measures thermal (or combustion) efficiency for unit heaters operating under full-load and steady-state conditions. However, thermal efficiency measured under these conditions does not fully indicate the actual annual energy consumption of unit heaters. Firstly, unit heaters have fans (or some other type of air-mover) built in to the unit that consume electricity but are not covered under the current testing procedure. Secondly, the test procedure only measures a unit heater's full-load steady-state efficiency and does not indicate how well the heater performs during "warm-up" and "cool-down" operation nor during part-load operation (when the dampers are partially closed or if the fan operates at partial speeds). Lastly, unit heaters are primarily used to heat air in an occupied space to temperatures that are comfortable, but "thermal efficiency" does not indicate how effectively the heater distributes its warm air to keep the space comfortable.
Product Peak Load Impact and Correlation with Test Procedure and Metric, by Technology	Negligible (oil energy dominates gas unit heater annual energy consumption, and the heaters almost never operate during periods of peak electricity demand).

Standards Consideration

Product: Compact Audio[14]

Factors for Consideration	Assessment
Potential Energy Savings from Regulatory Action; Cumulative (Quad) 2008-2030	Current Energy Star (2 Watt standby) = 0.49[15] Energy Star Year 2003 (1 Watt standby) = 0.55[15] Best Available (0.25 Watt standby) = 0.60[15]
Product / Technology Availability (Including Price/Cost information):	Presently, about 50 compact audio models draw 1W or less in standby mode.
Cumulative Burden	This and related products have not been regulated for energy efficiency; insufficient data for other regulation.
Status of Test Procedures	"ENERGY STAR Program Requirements for Consumer Audio and DVD Products"
Other Regulatory Actions	Not known.
Evidence of Market-Driven or Voluntary Efficiency Improvements	$ 54% Energy Star Market Penetration Target (Y2000) $ ~50 Different Models Consume 1W or Less Standby
Issues	

Background Material

Description	Value	Comments/Source
Total Energy Use (quad, 1998)	0.057	Average based on UEC and installed base.
Unit Energy Consumption (kWh)	110	Rosen and Meier, 1999
Annual Shipments (millions, 2000)	11.8	Appliance Magazine, May 2001
Installed Base (millions, 1998)	47	Rosen and Meier, 1999
Product Lifetime (years)	7	Appliance Magazine, September 2000
Minimum Efficiency Standard	N/A	
Stock Efficiency	9.8 W Standby	Rosen and Meier, 1999
Typical New Efficiency	9.8 W Standby	Rosen and Meier, 1999
Best Available Efficiency	0.25 W Standby	www.EnergyStar.gov
Energy Star Efficiency	2 W Standby	Phase I (2002) - www.EnergyStar.gov
Maximum Efficiency (Future Technology)	N/A	
Other Notable Efficiency Level	1 W Standby	Phase II (2003) - www.EnergyStar.gov

[14] See priority-setting FY2003 Technical Support Document (TSD).
[15] Savings based on a baseline consumption of 10-Watt standby.

Standards Consideration

Product: Component Stereo and RACK Audio[16]

Factors for Consideration	Assessment
Potential Energy Savings from Regulatory Action; **Cumulative (Quad) 2008-2030**	Current Energy Star (2 Watt standby) = 0.10[17] Energy Star Year 2003 (1 Watt standby) = 0.20[17] Best Available (0.26 Watt standby) = 0.27[17, 18]
Product / Technology Availability (Including Price/Cost information):	Presently, more than 25 RACK/Component audio models draw 1W or less in standby mode.
Cumulative Burden	This and related products have not been regulated for energy efficiency; insufficient data for other regulation.
Status of Test Procedures	"ENERGY STAR Program Requirements for Consumer Audio and DVD Products"
Other Regulatory Actions	Not known.
Evidence of Market-Driven or Voluntary Efficiency Improvements	$ 54% Energy Star Market Penetration Target (Y2000) • Numerous (>25) Receiver Models Meet or Falls Below 1W standby
Issues	

Background Material

Description	Value	Comments/Source
Total Energy Use (quad, 1998)	0.105	Average based on UEC and installed base.
Unit Energy Consumption (kWh)	129	Rosen and Meier (LBNL, 1999)
Annual Shipments (millions)	10.6	Average based on installed base and lifetime. (Rosen and Meier (LBNL, 1999) estimate shipments of ~5 million in 1998.)
Installed Base (millions, 1998)	74	Rosen and Meier (LBNL, 1999)
Product Lifetime (years)	7	Appliance Magazine, September 2000
Minimum Efficiency Standard	N/A	
Stock Efficiency	3 W Standby	Rosen and Meier (LBNL, 1999)
Typical New Efficiency	3 W Standby	Rosen and Meier (LBNL, 1999)
Best Available Efficiency	0.26 W Standby	www.EnergyStar.gov
Energy Star Efficiency	2 W Standby	Phase I (2002) - www.EnergyStar.gov
Maximum Efficiency (Future Technology)	N/A	
Other Notable Efficiency Level	1 W Standby	Phase II (2003) - www.EnergyStar.gov

[16] See priority-setting FY2003 Technical Support Document (TSD).
[17] Savings based on a baseline consumption of 6-Watt standby.
[18] Only for receiver; 1.1W was the lowest standby Rack system power draw measured by Rosen and Meier (LBNL, 1999).

Test Procedure Summary

Product: Compact Audio, Component Stereo, and RACK Audio

Factors	Assessment
Test Procedure Overview	$ In accordance with Energy Star guidelines, units are tested under the following conditions: Total Harmonic Distortion (Voltage) <3% THD, Ambient Temperature of 22°C, and within Market-Specific Ranges for Voltage and Frequency. $ Test equipment is set up and the test unit connected properly. The unit is brought to standby mode, then allowed to reach operating temperature and stabilize (approximately 90 minutes). $ Test conditions and test data, defined as the true standby power requirements of the product (in Watts), are recorded within a time measurement that is long enough to measure the correct average value within a +10% - 0% error range.
Future/Potential Test Procedure(s)	The testing procedure does not change with the implementation of Energy Star Phase II requirements on January 1, 2003.
How effectively do test procedure(s) and metric(s) represent actual annual energy consumption and potential savings?	The test procedure correlates mildly with the energy consumption of compact audio devices, as standby energy consumption currently accounts for about 50% of compact audio energy consumption. On the other hand, standby power is a poor proxy for RACK/Component audio energy consumption; only about 10% of RACK/Component audio energy consumption occurs in the standby mode.
Product Peak Load Impact and Correlation with Test Procedure and Metric, by Technology	The current test procedure likely fails to evaluate peak load conditions, as the test procedure only considers standby power draw but many units operate during peak load times.

Standards Consideration

Product: Dehumidifiers

Factors for Consideration	Assessment
Potential Energy Savings from Regulatory Action; **Cumulative (Quad) 2008-2030**	EnergyStar Level (1.5 L/kWh) = 0.19[19] Best Available (1.85 L/kWh) = 0.53[19]
Product / Technology Availability (Including Price/Cost information):	As of August 30, 2001, 2 high-capacity dehumidifiers (36<L/day<57) and 10 standard capacity dehumidifiers (up to 35 L/day) meet Energy Star requirements.
Cumulative Burden	The major manufacturers of dehumidifiers also make other household appliances which have been regulated for energy efficiency, such as room AC units (Fedders, Frigidaire, Whirlpool) and other major white goods (Frigidaire, Whirlpool make dryers, washers, dishwashers, etc., all of which have been regulated in the past). Insufficient data for other regulation.
Status of Test Procedures	$ “ENERGY STAR Program Requirements for Dehumidifiers” $ ANSI/AHAM DH-, for Test Methodology. • CAN/CSA-C749-94 (Section 4.2), for Energy Factor Calculation
Other Regulatory Actions	Not known.
Evidence of Market-Driven or Voluntary Efficiency Improvements	12 Models Meet or Exceed Energy Star Performance Levels
Issues	Different sized dehumidifiers

Background Material

Description	Value	Comments/Source
Total Energy Use (quad, 1997)	0.118	Average based on UEC and installed base.
Unit Energy Consumption (kWh)	970	Zogg and Alberino, 1998
Annual Shipments (millions, 2000)	1	Appliance Magazine, May 2001
Installed Base (millions)	11	Average based on shipments and lifetime.
Product Lifetime (years)	11	Appliance Magazine, September 2000
Minimum Efficiency Standard	N/A	
Stock Efficiency	N/A	
Typical New Efficiency	1.35 L/kWh	For mid-sized units (25-35 L/day) www.EnergyStar.gov
Best Available Efficiency	1.85 L/kWh	For mid-sized units (25-35 L/day) www.EnergyStar.gov
Energy Star Efficiency	1.50 L/kWh	For mid-sized units (25-35 L/day) www.EnergyStar.gov
Maximum Efficiency (Future Technology)	N/A	
Other Notable Efficiency Level	N/A	

[19] Savings based on a baseline consumption of 1.35 L/kWh. Energy Star level and best available efficiencies vary with size. Values given are for mid-sized units, 25 - 35 L/day.

Test Procedure Summary

Product: Dehumidifiers

Factors	Assessment
Test Procedure Overview	$ Tests are conducted in accordance with ANSI/AHAM Standard DH-1 and Canadian standard CSA-C749-94. $ Air entering the dehumidifier must be at 80°F dry bulb/70°F wet bulb (standard conditions). $ Energy Factor is calculated according to section 4.2 of CAN/CSA-C749-94, by dividing the mass of the condensate collected by the energy consumption. That result is divided by the density of water at the test temperature (1 kg/litre at standard conditions) and expressed in terms of L/kWh.
Future/Potential Test Procedure(s)	There are no indications of imminent changes in the test procedure.
How effectively do test procedure(s) and metric(s) represent actual annual energy consumption and potential savings?	The testing procedure closely models the UEC, as dehumidifiers typically operate at steady-state conditions approaching similar dry-to-wet bulb temperature ratios.
Product Peak Load Impact and Correlation with Test Procedure and Metric, by Technology	The test procedure correlates well with performance during peak demand periods, as a dehumidifier typically run around the clock and under similar dry-to-wet bulb conditions.

Standards Consideration

Product: Set-Top Boxes[20]

Factors for Consideration	Assessment	
	Analog/Digital	**Wireless**
Potential Energy Savings from Regulatory Action; Cumulative (Quads) 2008-2030	$ Current Energy Star (15W standby) = 0.45[21] $ Energy Star 2004 (7 Watt standby) = 0.95[21] $ Best Available (1 Watt standby) = 1.3[21]	$ Current Energy Star (15 Watt standby) = 0.02[22] $ Energy Star 2004 (7 Watt standby) = 0.15[22] $ Best Available (1 Watt standby) = 0.25[22]
Product / Technology Availability (Including Price/Cost information):	As of February, 2002, only two set-top box models meet Energy Star requirements, both digital boxes made by Pace Micro Technology. These two units became available in June, 2001. Once Tier 2 limits take effect on January 1, 2004, analog boxes will have an easier time fulfilling Energy Star requirements, as allowable power draw levels will rise from 3 W to 7W for all categories.	
Cumulative Burden	This and related products have not been regulated for energy efficiency; insufficient data for other regulation.	
Status of Test Procedures	$ "ENERGY STAR Program Requirements for Set-Top Boxes" $ "Testing Guidelines for ENERGY STAR Qualified Set-Top Boxes"	
Other Regulatory Actions	Not known.	
Evidence of Market-Driven or Voluntary Efficiency Improvements	No products meet Energy Star levels for Analog Cable TV	Only two products, both for Digital Cable TV, satisfy Energy Star Criterion (Category 2); they came to market in June, 2001.
Issues	$ Wide range of products covered under ENERGY STAR Program including: Cable TV (analog and digital), digital TV, satellite TV, wireless TV, personal VCF, video game console, internet access devices, videophone, multifunction devices. $ 1W Standby feasibility unclear. $ Market moving away from Analog towards Digital cable boxes (no analog boxes expected by 2008).	

[20] See priority-setting FY2003 Technical Support Document (TSD).
[21] Savings based on a baseline consumption of 197 kWh/yr, i.e. all analog units become digital by 2008.
[22] Savings based on a baseline consumption of 16.2-Watt standby.

Background Material

Description	Value			Comments/Source	
	Digital	Analog	Wireless	Digital	Wireless
Total Energy Use (quad, 1999)	0.08	.047	0.02	Average based on UEC and installed base	
Unit Energy Consumption (kWh)	197	---	143	Rosen, Meier, and Zandelin. (LBNL, 2001)	
Annual Shipments (millions)	0.4	4.5	1.3	Average based on installed base and lifetime.	
Installed Base (millions, 1999)	3.8	45	13	Rosen, Meier, and Zandelin. (LBNL, 2001)	
Product Lifetime (years)	10	10	10	Rosen, Meier, and Zandelin. (LBNL, 2001)	
Minimum Efficiency Standard	N/A	N/A	N/A		
Stock UEC (kWh/yr)	197	---	140	Rosen, Meier, and Zandelin. (LBNL, 2001)	
Typical New UEC (kWh) or Efficiency	197	---	140	Rosen, Meier, and Zandelin. (LBNL, 2001)	
Best Available UEC (kWh) or Efficiency	140	---	78	www.EnergyStar.gov and Rosen, Meier, and Zandelin. (LBNL, 2001)	
Energy Star Efficiency	15 W standby	---	15 W standby	www.EnergyStar.gov	
Maximum Efficiency (Future Technology)	N/A	---	N/A		
Other Notable Efficiency Level	7 W standby	---	7 W standby	Proposed for 2003 EnergyStar (www.EnergyStar.gov)	

Test Procedure Summary

Product: Set-Top Boxes

Factors	Assessment
Test Procedure Overview	Refer to "Testing Guidelines for Energy Star Qualified Set-top Boxes" $ In accordance with Energy Star guidelines, units are tested under the following conditions: Total Harmonic Distortion (Voltage) <3% THD, Ambient Temperature of 22°C, and within Market-Specific Ranges for Voltage and Frequency. $ Test equipment is set up and the test unit connected properly. The unit is brought to standby mode, then allowed to reach operating temperature and stabilize (approximately 90 minutes). $ Test conditions and test data, defined as the true standby power requirements of the product (in Watts), are recorded within a time measurement that is long enough to measure the correct average value within a +10% - 0% error range.
Future/Potential Test Procedure(s)	There are currently no indications of an imminent change in the testing procedure.
How effectively do test procedure(s) and metric(s) represent actual annual energy consumption and potential savings?	The lack of active mode testing does not make a significant difference in evaluating set-top box energy consumption, as analog and digital boxes consume more than three times more energy annually in standby mode than in active mode. In addition, the boxes consume little additional energy in active mode (relative to standby): analog boxes require an average of 1.4W (13%) more to operate in the active mode, digital boxes 0.7W (3%). If the difference between active and standby mode power draw increased in the future, then the test procedure would not correlate as strongly with device annual energy consumption.
Product Peak Load Impact and Correlation with Test Procedure and Metric, by Technology	The test procedure closely models the impact on peak load, since the standby power draw measured during testing is does not vary significantly from the active power draw. The correlation between peak power draw and the test method will decrease if standby power draw decreases, as many set-top boxes operate in the active mode during the peak demand periods.

Standards Consideration

Product: Televisions[23]

Factors for Consideration	Assessment
Potential Energy Savings from Regulatory Action; Cumulative (Quads) 2008-2030	$ Current Energy Star (3 Watt standby) = 0.80[24] $ Future Energy Star (1 Watt standby) = 1.4[24] $ Best Available (0.1 Watt standby) = 1.7[24] $ LCD = 1.1[24]
Potential Economic Benefits/Burdens	Not available.
Cumulative Burden	This and related products have not been regulated for energy efficiency; insufficient data for other regulation.
Potential Environmental or Energy Security Benefits	Specific estimates of emission reductions have not been developed however, estimated energy savings indicated above are indicative of the comparative emission benefits that are likely to be possible.
Status of Test Procedures	"ENERGY STAR Program Requirements for TVs, VCRs, TV/VCRs, TV/DVDs, and TV/VCR/DVDs"; currently under revision (www.EnergyStar.gov)
Other Regulatory Actions	Not known.
Evidence of Market-Driven or Voluntary Efficiency Improvements	$ 40% Energy Star Market Penetration Target (Y2000; Webber et al., 2000) $ Numerous (>50) Models Consume 1W or Less Standby (www.energystar.gov) $ LCD Televisions Commercialized; 2.7% market share in Y2000 based on distributor unit sales. (Appliance Magazine, May 2001) $ Impact of Electronic Programming Guides and HDTV can significantly change standby and active power consumption
Issues	

[23] See priority-setting FY2003 Technical Support Document (TSD).
[24] Savings based on a baseline consumption of 5-Watt standby. Used 25-inch and 27-inch TVs for savings estimates.

Background Material

Description	Value	Comments/Source
Total Energy Use (quad, 1998)	0.35	Average based on UEC and installed base.
Unit Energy Consumption (kWh)	150	Rosen and Meier (LBNL, 1999)
Annual Shipments (millions, 2000)	31.4	Appliance Magazine, May, 2001
Installed Base (millions, 1998)	212	Rosen and Meier (LBNL, 1999)
Product Lifetime (years)	9	Appliance Magazine, September 2000
Minimum Efficiency Standard	N/A	
Stock Efficiency	4.9 W Standby	Rosen and Meier (LBNL, 1999) – 27" screens
Typical New Efficiency	5.7 W Standby	Rosen and Meier (LBNL, 1999)
Best Available Efficiency	0.1 W Standby	www.EnergyStar.gov
Energy Star Efficiency	1 W Standby	Future Energy Star level. (www.EnergyStar.gov)
Maximum Efficiency (Future Technology)	Same minimum standby, with significantly lower active draw.	Rosen and Meier (LBNL, 1999); ADL 2001 LCD technology

Test Procedure Summary

Product: Televisions

Factors	Assessment
Test Procedure Overview	DOE Test Procedure: It calls for the measurement of standby and active power draw levels; see Technical Support Document for additional details (Appendix B). Energy Star Test Procedure (for MOU Version 1.0, current through April, 2001): $ Details: Standby mode is when the TV is connected to a power source but is not communicating sound nor picture. In this mode the device can be switched to active with a remote control (some power is being drawn). Off mode is when the device is plugged in but drawing no power. Typically the TV is unable to turn on with the use of a remote control. Current draw is blocked with a hard on/off switch. $ Plug the unit in and allow it to come to temperature and stabilize (~90 minutes). $ Using a calibrated (performed yearly) power meter, measure the power draw of the TV in the standby mode - turned off with remote. Measurement should account for inconstancy in current draw, i.e.. perform a time averaged measurement. $ Test must be performed under the following conditions: 1) <3% total harmonic distortion (voltage) 2) Ambient Temperature = 22 deg C +/- 4 deg C 3) 115 V RMS (+/- 3 V), 60 Hz. (+/- 3 Hz.)
Future/Potential Test Procedure(s)	Version 2.0 of the Energy Star MOU for Televisions and VCRs
How effectively do test procedure(s) and metric(s) represent actual annual energy consumption and potential savings?	The DOE test procedure measures active and standby power draw, giving it the potential for high correlation with actual energy consumption and savings; however, the specification for making the measurements appears to be out of date and in need of revision. Neither the original nor the revised Energy Star test procedures effectively model the majority of TV energy consumption or potential energy savings. The Energy Star test procedure measures only standby power, while active power dominates (89%) TV energy consumption. Consequently, the test procedures will not account for potential energy savings from approaches that decrease the active power draw of TVs (such as LCD).
Product Peak Load Impact and Correlation with Test Procedure and Metric, by Technology	1) If updated, the DOE test procedure would correlate well with TV peak demand impact (assuming a representative model for TV usage patterns). 2) The Energy Star test procedure correlates minimally with the peak load impact of TVs because the procedure measures standby power draw but many TVs are active during peak demand periods. 3) LCD technology would realize significant peak load reductions because LCD TVs operate at substantially lower active power levels than conventional CRT devices.

Standards Consideration

Product: Video Cassette Recorders

Factors for Consideration	Assessment
Potential Energy Savings from Regulatory Action; Cumulative (Quad) 2008-2030	New Energy Star Compliant Level (2 Watt standby) = 0.25[25] 1 Watt standby = 0.38[25]
Product / Technology Availability (Including Price/Cost information):	Many VCRs in the market meet Energy Star standards, I.e., the Energy Star website lists 45 models by 8 different manufacturers, available as of September, 2001, that satisfy the Phase I requirements.
Cumulative Burden	This and related products have not been regulated for energy efficiency; insufficient data for other regulation.
Status of Test Procedures	"ENERGY STAR Program Requirements for TVs, VCRs, TV/VCRs, TV/DVDs, and TV/VCR/DVDs"; currently under revision (www.EnergyStar.gov)
Other Regulatory Actions	Not known.
Evidence of Market-Driven or Voluntary Efficiency Improvements	$ 55% Energy Star Market Penetration Target (Y2000; Webber et al., 2000) $ ~5 Different Models Consume 1W or Less Standby (www.energystar.gov)
Issues	1-Watt Standby power proposed for Y2003 Energy Star criterion (www.energystar.gov)

Background Material

Description	Value	Comments/Source
Total Energy Use (quad, 1998)	0.1	Rosen and Meier (LBNL, 1999)
Unit Energy Consumption (kWh)	71	Rosen and Meier (LBNL, 1999)
Annual Shipments (millions, 2000)	24	Appliance Magazine, May, 2001
Installed Base (millions, 1998)	129	Rosen and Meier (LBNL, 1999)
Product Lifetime (years)	7	Rosen and Meier (LBNL, 1999)
Minimum Efficiency Standard	N/A	
Stock Efficiency	5.9 W Standby	Rosen and Meier (LBNL, 1999)
Typical New Efficiency	4 W Standby	Rosen and Meier (LBNL, 1999)
Best Available Efficiency	0.85 W Standby	www.EnergyStar.gov
Energy Star Efficiency	2 W Standby	www.EnergyStar.gov
Maximum Efficiency (Future Technology)	N/A	
Other Notable Efficiency Level	1 W Standby	Proposed for 2003 Energy Star (www.EnergyStar.gov)

[25] Savings based on a baseline consumption (typical new) of 4-Watt standby. Baseline consumption extrapolated for year 2000 from Rosen and Meier (LBNL, 1999).

Test Procedure Summary

Product: Video Cassette Recorders

Factors	Assessment
Test Procedure Overview	No testing procedures exist for VCRs as of June 19, 2001; the Energy Star program expects to develop a test procedure in the near future.
Future/Potential Test Procedure(s)	Future revisions of "Energy Star Program Requirements for TVs, VCRs, TV/VCRs, TV/DVDs, and TV/VCR/DVDs" will include test procedures. While the details of the test procedure are not known, it will call for using a power meter to measure VCR power draw while the VCR is in standby mode.
How effectively do test procedure(s) and metric(s) represent actual annual energy consumption and potential savings?	Assuming that the future test procedure is similar to that used to evaluate RACK and Compact Audio equipment, i.e., to measure standby power draw, the Energy Star program would have a low correlation with VCR energy consumption; standby mode accounts for ~35% of VCR energy consumption.
Product Peak Load Impact and Correlation with Test Procedure and Metric, by Technology	The degree of correlation between stand-by power and VCR peak power impact depends upon the (unknown) distribution of VCR operational mode during peak power demand periods and cannot be readily determined.

Standards Consideration

Product: Copy Machines

Factors for Consideration	Assessment	
	Commercial	**Residential**
Potential Energy Savings from Regulatory Action; **Cumulative (Quad) 2008-2030**	$ Copier of the future, 100% Power management = 0.1[26] • Conversion to Inkjet Technology = 0.7[26]	$ Copier of the future = 0.08[27] $ Conversion to Inkjet Technology = 0.11[27]
Product / Technology Availability (Including Price/Cost information):	$ Copier of the Future (CotF): Two companies, Canon and Ricoh, offer mid-speed range machines that fulfill the CotF criteria. The CotF cost premium is most likely minimal because the CotF devices have replaced previously existing product models (based on speed performance). A cost premium is unlikely due to effort of keeping products competitive. • Inkjet printer substitution: Inkjet copiers are not available commercially.	
Cumulative Burden	This and related products have not been regulated for energy efficiency; insufficient data for other regulation.	
Status of Test Procedures	$ Energy Star test procedure document. $ Copier of the Future.	
Evidence of Market-Driven or Voluntary Efficiency Improvements	$ 90% of Copy machine stock Y2000 is Energy Star Compliant $ 34% of Copiers in stock are Power management enabled $ 52.3% of the Copy machine Stock is Energy Star Compliant. (Webber et al., 1999) $ Federal government must purchase E*-compliant Copy Machines $ Best in class Copiers with low power capability, Panasonic 60 cpm (FP-D605), 15 Watts in sleep, Canon imageRUNNER 3300 (33 cpm) - less than 10 W in sleep (CotF award)	$ 52% Energy Star Market Penetration target for Y2000 (Webber et al., 2000) $ 34% of Copiers in stock are Power management enabled $ Best in class Copiers with low power capability, Panasonic 60 cpm (FP-D605), 15 Watts in sleep, Canon imageRUNNER 3300 (33 cpm) - less than 10 W in sleep (Copier of the Future award)
Issues	$ Energy savings depend on the technical abilities to lower sleep power $ Power Management enablement is the key to limiting electricity use. $ Power management, although prevalent in new copier sales, is not at enabled in the majority of machines. $ Longer-term feasibility of 1 Watt sleep unclear; however lower requirement than that defined by CotF may be possible.	

[26] Savings based on a baseline consumption that corresponds to typical new technology.
[27] Savings based on a baseline consumption that corresponds to typical new technology, 100% power management-enabled.

Background Material

Description	Value		Comments/Source	
	Comm	Resid	Commercial	Residential
Total Energy Use (quad, 2000)	0.10	0.01	ADL, 2002	Kawamoto et al., 2001
Annual Shipments (millions, 2000)	2.0		ADL, 2002	ADL, 2002
Stock (millions, 2000)	9	3.8	ADL, 2002	ADL, 2002
Product Lifetime (years)	6	6	ADL, 2002	Kawamoto et al., 2001
Current UEC (kWh/year)	1000	315	34% Power management enabled (ADL, 2002)	Current low level machine (ADL, 2002; Kawamoto et al., 2001)
Typical New UEC (kWh/year)	602	165	100% Power management enabled (ADL, 2002)	100% Power management enabled , (ADL, 2002; Kawamoto et al., 2001)
Best Available UEC (kWh/year)	546	190	Copier of the future, 100% power management enabled (ADL, 2002)	Copier of the future requirements , (ADL, 2002; Kawamoto et al., 2001; Nordman et al., 1998)
Energy Star UEC (kWh/year)	602	165	100% Power management enabled , (ADL, 2002)	100% Power management enabled (ADL, 2002; Kawamoto et al., 2001)
Minimum UEC (kWh/year) Future Technology	216	27	Conversion to Inkjet processes (ADL, 2002)	Conversion to Inkjet processes (ADL, 2002; Kawamoto et al., 2001)

Test Procedure Summary

Product: Copy Machines

Factors	Assessment	
	Commercial	**Residential**
Test Procedure Overview	From the Energy Star Copier MOU - Version 2.0 1) The test conditions for all copiers are: $ Line Impedance <0.25 ohm $ Total Harmonic Distortion (Voltage) <3% $ Ambient Temperature = 21 deg C +/- 3 C $ Relative Humidity = 40-60% $ Minimum distance of 2 feet from a wall $ Voltage/Frequency = 115 VRMS +/- 5V, 60 Hz. +/-3Hz. 2) Prior to Off-mode and Low-power testing the devices must be plugged in, then turned off, and allowed to stabilize for at least 12 hours. 3) All copier speed bands are subjected to Off-mode testing $ Turn on copier and let it warm up. $ wait exactly the amount of time specified (based on copier speed) for the copier to switch into Off mode. Begin recording energy consumption. $ Continue for one hour and compute the time average power draw. 4) For the mid and high copier speed range, the copier is subjected to sleep-mode testing $ Turn on the copier and make on copy. $ Let the machine sit for exactly 15 minutes. $ Record energy consumption for one hour. $ Compute the time-average power draw. 5) Testing details: All watt meters must be calibrated,at least every year and have a resolution of 0.1 W. The measurements recorded must be accurate within +/-0.5 W.	
Future/Potential Test Procedure(s)	No future/potential test procedures identified. CotF procedure is more strict.	
How effectively do test procedure(s) and metric(s) represent actual annual energy consumption and potential savings?	The testing metrics do not correlate closely with the UEC and potential energy savings because the "standby" mode, not the "sleep" mode measured by the test procedure, accounts for the majority of device UEC. Improvements in the Power management enabled rate will increase the amount of time in and percentage of device UEC accounted for by the "sleep" and "off" modes, increasing the relevance of test procedure to copier energy consumption.	The test procedure does not capture a significant portion of the possible energy savings. A 100% Power management enabled rate would realize about a 60% reduction in energy consumption. The current Power management enabled rate (68%) limits the magnitude of the potential gains.

Product Peak Load Impact and Correlation with Test Procedure and Metric, by Technology	$ Copiers can have a substantial peak load impact, as higher-end devices can draw up to a few kilowatts while copying. In addition, most commercial copiers spend most of the peak demand period in "standby" mode. As a result, copiers infrequently enter the "sleep" mode power draw measured by the test procedure, resulting in a low correlation between the test method and copier peak load impact. $ The Copier of the Future criteria would decrease peak loads somewhat by decreasing the "standby" power draw and the amount of time spent in "standby" mode during peak demand periods. $ Conversion to inkjet copiers would certainly reduce the peak loads in both the sleep (regulated by test procedure) and active modes.	• Presumably, most residential copiers reside in home offices. The "standby" mode power draw has the greatest impact upon peak period power draw; thus a weak correlation exists between actual operating patterns and the "sleep" mode considered in the current test procedure. $ The CotF criteria would reduce the "standby" energy consumption duration and limit any peak load impact. $ Conversion to inkjet technology will reduce the peak loads in both the Off (covered by test procedure) and active modes.

Standards Consideration

Product: Desktop Computers[28]

Factors for Consideration	Assessment	
	Commercial	**Residential**
Potential Energy Savings from Regulatory Action; **Cumulative (Quads) 2008-2030**	$ 50% Power Management Enabled = .89[29] $ 100% Power management enabled, Pentium III = 1.9[29] $ 1 Watt Sleep (Current Power management enabled rate) with a Pentium III = 0.16[29] $ Laptop Computer = 3.8[29] • Low-Power Design = 3.6[29]	$ 100% Power management enabled, Pentium III = 0.08[29] $ 1 Watt Sleep (Current Power management enabled rate) with a Pentium III = 0.11[29] $ Laptop Computer = 0.35[29] $ Low-Power Design = 0.48[29]
Product / Technology Availability (Including Price/Cost information):	$ Desktop PCs with a 1 watt sleep levels are not yet available; the lowest power desktop PC listed on the Energy Star website draws ~1.5W. • Many of the low-power strategies used in commercially-available laptop computers technology (low-power microprocessors, spinning the hard drive down, sleep modes, etc.) often command a price premium.	
Cumulative Burden	This and related products have not been regulated for energy efficiency; insufficient data for other regulation.	
Status of Test Procedures	Energy Star test procedure document.	
Evidence of Market-Driven or Voluntary Efficiency Improvements	$ 90% of Desktop Computers sold in Y2000 were Energy Star Compliant (Webber et al., 2000) $ 25% of Desktops in stock are Power management enabled (Nordman et al., 2000) $ 85% Energy Star Market Penetration target for Y2000 (Webber et al., 2000) $ 17% of the Personal Computer (i.e., desktop + laptop) stock are computers of laptop design $ Federal government must purchase E*-compliant computers • Executive order mandates that the Federal Government purchase of devices with <1 W/sleep power draw where available and cost-effective (7/31/01)	$ 25% of Desktop Computers in stock are Power management enabled (Nordman et al., 2000) $ 85% Energy Star Market Penetration target for Y2000 (Webber et al., 2000) $ ~17% of the personal computer stock (i.e., desktop + laptop) in Y2000 is of Laptop design $ Current best market performer: SCENIC L.i815, draws 2.3W in sleep
Issues	$ Energy savings depend in large part upon increasing Power management enabled rate, a software option $ E*, although prevalent in new computer sales, is often disabled by user; increasing Power management enabled rate may require software modification, e.g., permanent enabling of power-down features $ 1-Watt sleep may not be technically feasible. • Low-power designs may encounter resistance in non-portable machines due to the necessity of manufacturer re-design and demand for faster CPUs.	

[28] See priority-setting FY2003 Technical Support Document (TSD).
[29] Savings based on a baseline consumption that corresponds to typical new Pentium III technology (25% Power management enabled).

Background Material

Description	Value		Comments/Source	
	Comm	Resid	Commercial	Residential
Total Energy Use (quad, 2000)	0.19	0.03	ADL, 2002	Kawamoto et al., 2001
Annual Shipments (millions, 2000)	44		ADL, 2002	ADL, 2002
Stock (millions, 2000)	59	51	ADL, 2002	ADL, 2002
Product Lifetime (years)	3	3	ADL, 2002	ADL, 2002
Current UEC (kWh/year)	297	52	ADL, 2002	Pentium II, 25% power enabled (Kawamoto et al., 2001; ADL, 2002)
Typical New UEC (kWh/year)	325	56	25% Power management enabled, using Pentium III (ADL, 2002; Intel, 2001)	Pentium III, 25% power enabled (Kawamoto et al., 2001; ADL, 2002; Intel , 2001)
Best Available UEC (kWh/year)	35	27	Laptop Computer (ADL, 2002)	Laptop Technology (Kawamoto et al., 2001; ADL, 2002)
Energy Star UEC (kWh/year)	178	50	100% Power management enabled, Pentium III (ADL, 2002; Intel, 2001)	100% Power management enabled (Kawamoto et al., 2001; ADL, 2002)
Minimum UEC (kWh/year) Future Technology	35	27	Laptop Computer (ADL, 2002)	Laptop Computer (ADL, 2002)
Other Notable UEC (kWh/year)	56	15	Low-power design, Current power management enabled rate (ADL, 2002)	Low-power design, Current power management enabled rate (ADL, 2002)
Additional Notable UEC (kWh/year)	313	47	1 Watt Sleep Pentium III, Current power management enabled rate (ADL, 2002)	1 Watt Sleep Pentium III, Current power management enabled rate (ADL, 2002)

Test Procedure Summary

Product: Desktop Computers

Factors	Assessment	
	Commercial	**Residential**
Test Procedure Overview	***For Tier II Models*** *(manufactured after July 1, 2000) - only considering guideline A* $ System must adhere to energy star sleep mode levels which are measured in the following manner: $ The system must go into sleep mode after a period of inactivity, default time set to less than 30 minutes. $ Any system that consumes less than 15 W in the active mode is not required to have a sleep mode. $ Detailed Energy Star Test Conditions (from the Computer MOU Version 3.0, EPA - Attachment C) $ Power source must be 115 VAC RMS (+/- 5 V RMS) $ Measure the True power consumption using a traceably calibrated NBS true RMS Watt-meter with resolution to 0.1 Watts. $ Test conditions: line impedance <0.25 ohm, Total harmonic distortion <5%, Input AC frequency = 60 Hz (+/- 3 Hz.), and an ambient temperature of 25 degrees C. $ Under the above conditions the power level in the sleep mode is then measured. • Product meets Energy Star criteria if 95% or more of the products sold are able to meet the criteria.	
Future/Potential Test Procedure(s)	No future/potential test procedures identified.	
How effectively do test procedure(s) and metric(s) represent actual annual energy consumption and potential savings?	The Energy Star test procedure does not correlate closely with actual energy consumption and potential savings because it only measures sleep-mode power draw and, due to the low Power management enabled rate (25%) of actual computers, the "active" mode energy consumption dominates the UEC. If the Power management enabled rate increases appreciably (to 100%), the sleep mode energy consumption would account for a majority of the UEC and strengthen the correlation between the Energy Star test procedure and UEC.	The Energy Star test procedure is not capturing the majority of energy savings because of the low Power management enabled rate and the measurement of only the sleep power draw. In the current PC model (25% Power management enabled) the active energy consumption dominates the total energy consumption. Even if the Power management enabled rate is raised to 100% the active mode will dominate the UEC.
Product Peak Load Impact and Correlation with Test Procedure and Metric, by Technology	$ The computer active mode dominates the peak power impact of desktop computers, because many computers are active during the work day. The Energy Star test procedure does not address active power draw. However, increasing the Power management enabled rate, which the test procedure directly addresses, would reduce the aggregate peak demand of desktop PCs by increasing the number of PCs that power down during peak demand periods $ A PC of laptop or low-power design directly reduces peak power draw by about 80%. $ Reducing the sleep mode Energy Star power level will achieve a small reduction in peak electrical power draw.	Most likely, desktop PCs do not have a substantial peak power impact, as residential computer use is more common at night than during the day. Research shows that the majority PCs and monitors not "active" are in the "off" mode instead of "sleep". Thus during the peak-load sensitive times of the day, PC's and monitors draw minimal power, in modes not measured under the test procedure.

Standards Consideration

Product: Fax Machines

Factors for Consideration	Assessment	
	Commercial	**Residential**
Potential Energy Savings from Regulatory Action; Cumulative (Quad) 2008-2030	$ Enhanced Laser Technology = 0.12[30] $ Inkjet 1 Watt Sleep (Current Power management enabled rate) = 0.24[30]	$ Inkjet 1 Watt Sleep = 0.07[30] $ Enhanced Laser Technology = 0.04[30]
Product / Technology Availability (Including Price/Cost information):	$ Inkjet facsimile machines account for a plurality (but not a majority) of new product sales. $ An existing laserjet device consumes 2 Watts in the standby mode.	
Cumulative Burden	This and related products have not been regulated for energy efficiency; insufficient data for other regulation.	
Status of Test Procedures	Energy Star test procedure document.	
Evidence of Market-Driven or Voluntary Efficiency Improvements	$ 95% Energy Star Market Penetration Target for Y2000 (Webber et al., 2000) $ 38% of Faxes sold in Y2000 are of Inkjet technology (30% are laser; ADL, 2001) $ Federal government must purchase E*-compliant fax machines $ 2W sleep power is lowest for device currently on the market (FAX5000L, a laser jet); inkjet fax machines attain similar levels (e.g., the Savin F3615 draws 2W in sleep mode; see: www.energystar.gov). $ Executive order mandates that the Federal Government purchase of devices with <1 W/sleep power draw where available and cost-effective (7/31/01)	
Issues	$ Design changes to achieve 1 W sleep levels. $ A significant amount of faxes are laser technology	$ Energy savings are largest with implementation of 1-Watt sleep mode with an inkjet facsimile machine; 1-Watt sleep devices currently do not exist.

[30] Savings based on a baseline consumption that corresponds to typical new inkjet technology.

Background Material

Description	Value		Comments/Source	
	Comm	Resid	Commercial	Residential
Total Energy Use (quad, 2000)	0.03	0.01	ADL, 2002	Kawamoto et al (LBNL, 2001)
Annual Shipments (millions, 2000)	7.4		ADL, 2002	ADL, 2002
Stock (millions, 2000)	23.2	11.6	ADL, 2002	ADL, 2002
Product Lifetime (years)	5	5	ADL, 2002	ADL, 2002
Current UEC (kWh/year)	132	77.5	Laser, 100% power management enabled rate (ADL, 2002)	Laser Technology (ADL, 2002; Kawamoto et al., 2001)
Typical New UEC (kWh/year)	57	33.6	Inkjet, 100% power management enabled rate (ADL, 2002)	Inkjet Technology (ADL, 2002; Kawamoto et al., 2001)
Best Available UEC (kWh/year)	57	33.6	Inkjet, 100% power management enabled rate (ADL, 2002)	Inkjet Technology (ADL, 2002; Kawamoto et al., 2001)
Energy Star UEC (kWh/year)	57	N/A	Inkjet, 100% power management enabled rate (ADL, 2002)	All new equipment satisfy Energy Star criteria, (Webber et al., 2000)
Minimum UEC (kWh/year) Future Technology	9	5.4	Inkjet, with 1 Watt Sleep (ADL, 2002)	Inkjet, with 1 Watt Sleep
Other Notable UEC (kWh/year)	33	19.4	Enhanced Laser Technology (Canon, 2001)	Enhanced Laser Technology (Canon, 2001)

Test Procedure Summary

Product: Fax Machines

Factors	Assessment	
	Commercial	**Residential**
Test Procedure Overview	*From the Printer, Fax, Printer/Fax, and mailing machine MOU, version 3.0* $ Power measurement of devices in the sleep mode. $ Test conditions: $ Power source must be 115 VAC RMS (+/- 5 V RMS) $ Measure the true power consumption using a traceably calibrated NBS true RMS Watt-meter. $ Line impedance <0.25 ohm, Total harmonic distortion <5%, Input AC frequency = 60 Hz (+/- 3 Hz.), and an ambient temperature of 25 degrees C. $ Test procedure: $ Measure the average power drawn by the fax machine in the sleep mode. $ Record the energy consumed for one hour and divide by one. $ This ensures that variations in current draw are accounted for. $ This method is recommended in order to gain accurate results but is not essential for equipment that draws constant power.	
Future/Potential Test Procedure(s)	No future/potential test procedures identified.	
How effectively do test procedure(s) and metric(s) represent actual annual energy consumption and potential savings?	Testing procedures and metrics accurately capture the essence of energy consumption and savings tactics for this device, because standby energy consumption represents the vast majority of the UEC.	
Product Peak Load Impact and Correlation with Test Procedure and Metric, by Technology	Because facsimile machines operate in active mode infrequently, the standby power draw measured by the test procedure correlates closely to the peak impact (and reduction potential) of facsimile machines.	

Standards Consideration

Product: Laser Printers

Factors for Consideration	Assessment	
	Commercial	**Residential**
Potential Energy Savings from Regulatory Action; **Cumulative (Quad) 2008-2030**	$ Copier of the Future Criteria = 0.2[31, 32] $ Conversion to Inkjet Technology = 0.5[31]	Inkjet Printer = 0.0[31]
Product / Technology Availability (Including Price/Cost information):	$ For Commercial only, Copier of the Future (CofF) criteria exist and could be applied to laser printers. Meeting power draw levels of the sleep-mode for higher-speed laser printers (e.g.,Large Office band) may be difficult. However, commercially-available laser printers that fulfill the Copier of the Future criteria do not exist. $ Laser printer manufacturers continue to investigate high-throughput inkjet technology heavily. In general, inkjet printers could more readily displace low-end laser printers, at a lower first cost (assuming print quality concerns can be overcome).	
Cumulative Burden	This and related products have not been regulated for energy efficiency; insufficient data for other regulation.	
Status of Test Procedures	$ Energy Star test procedure document.	
Evidence of Market-Driven or Voluntary Efficiency Improvements	$ 99% of the Laser Printer stock in Y2000 are Energy Star Compliant (CCAP_office2.xls) $ 54% of Lasers in stock are Power management enabled $ 99% of Printer stock is energy star compliant (Webber 1999) $ Federal government must purchase E*-compliant laser printers. $ 1 watt sleep implementation is unclear. Best marketed product currently draws 3.5 Watts in low power mode. Xerox Laserjet Docucolor 2060 (60 ppm). $ Executive order mandates that the Federal Government purchase of devices with <1 W/sleep power draw where available and cost-effective (7/31/01)	
Issues	$ Energy savings depend in large part upon increasing Power management enabled rate. Power management enabled rate is less than 99% for Y2000 stock. $ Change to inkjet technology might not be consumer acceptable due to beliefs of laser technology superiority.	Energy savings are largest with a transition to inkjet printers. Because of the small size (slower printing rate) these devices, inkjet technology is a sensible alternative. However, improvement of inkjet performance equality is necessary.

[31] Savings based on a baseline consumption that corresponds to typical new technology, 100% Power management enabled.

[32] Copier of the Future technology scenario is defined as requirement of printers to meet the Target 1 copier requirements. It specifies a maximum of 10 Watts in sleep mode.

Background Material

Description	Value		Comments/Source	
	Comm	Resid	Commercial	Residential
Total Energy Use (quad, 2000)	0.05	0.003	ADL (2002)	Kawamoto et al., 2001
Annual Shipments (millions, 2000)	4.4		ADL (2002)	ADL (2002)
Stock (millions, 2000)	6.8		ADL (2002)	ADL (2002)
Product Lifetime (years)	4	4	ADL (2002)	ADL (2002)
Current UEC (kWh/year)	670	33	Average of all Equipment, 54% Power management enabled Rate (ADL, 2002)	ADL, 2002; Kawamoto et al., 2001
Typical New UEC (kWh/year)	483	30	100% Power management enabled Rate (ADL, 2002)	100% Power management enabled (ADL, 2002; Kawamoto et al., 2001)
Best Available UEC (kWh/year)	483	28	100% Power management enabled Rate, (ADL, 2002)	Conversion to inkjet printer (ADL, 2002; Kawamoto et al., 2001)
Energy Star UEC (kWh/year)	483	30	100% Power management enabled Rate (ADL, 2002)	100% Power management enabled (ADL, 2002; Kawamoto et al., 2001)
Minimum UEC (kWh/year) Future Technology	163	28	Conversion to Inkjet Technology (ADL, 2002)	Conversion to inkjet printer (ADL, 2002; Kawamoto et al., 2001)
Other Notable UEC (kWh/year)	372		Copier of the Future Requirements, Current power management enabled rate, (Nordman et al., 1998; ADL, 2001)	

Test Procedure Summary

Product: Laser Printers

Factors	Assessment	
	Commercial	**Residential**
Test Procedure Overview	*From the Printer, Fax, Printer/Fax, and mailing machine MOU, version 3.0* $ Power measurement of devices in the sleep mode. $ Test conditions: $ Power source must be 115 VAC RMS (+/- 5 V RMS) $ Measure the true power consumption using a traceably calibrated NBS true RMS Watt-meter. $ Line impedance <0.25 ohm, Total harmonic distortion <5%, Input AC frequency = 60 Hz (+/- 3 Hz.), and an ambient temperature of 25 degrees C. $ Test procedure: $ Measure the average power drawn by the fax machine in the sleep mode. $ Record the energy consumed for one hour and divide by one. $ This ensures that variations in current draw are accounted for. • This method is recommended in order to gain accurate results but is not essential for equipment that draws constant power.	
Future/Potential Test Procedure(s)	No future/potential test procedures identified.	
How effectively do test procedure(s) and metric(s) represent actual annual energy consumption and potential savings?	Test procedures do not correlate well with energy consumption and savings potential, because the Energy Star program only measures the low power level (it also defines the maximum time period to before entering “sleep” mode). Laser printers have a 60% Power management enabled rate, and the “active” and “standby” modes account for most (~80%) energy consumption. A higher Power management enabled rate would increase the relevance of the test procedure to the UEC and energy savings potential by decreasing the amount of time and energy consumed in the “standby” mode.	The Energy Star test procedures correlate weakly with actual energy consumption energy savings, as it measures only the low (or sleep) power draw. The standby (ready-to-print) mode accounts for a majority of energy consumption.
Product Peak Load Impact and Correlation with Test Procedure and Metric, by Technology	$ The test procedures do not correspond closely with the peak load impact of laser printers, as laser printers operate in “active” and “standby” modes during much of the peak period portion of the day. The test procedure only measures “sleep” mode power draw. $ CotF criteria would reduce the peak load impact by decreasing the standby draw and increasing the amount of time in “sleep” mode (I.e., by reducing the “warm-up” period for the printer). $ Displacing laser printers with inkjet printers would dramatically reduce peak loads due to much lower “active” and “standby” power draw levels.	Peak load is not an important issue for these devices because residential laser printers are estimated to spend >95% of their time in the Off mode.

Standards Consideration

Product: Low-End Servers, Commercial

Factors for Consideration	Assessment
Potential Energy Savings from Regulatory Action; Cumulative (Quad) 2008-2030	$ Energy Star / Power Management (PM) = 0.19[33, 34] $ Low-power Server (15 W on, 7 W sleep), No PM = 0.88[33, 35] $ Low-power Server with 1 W sleep and PM scheme = 0.92[33]
Product / Technology Availability (Including Price/Cost information):	$ Low-power and power-management capable servers came to market in 2001; unknown cost premium.
Cumulative Burden	This and related products have not been regulated for energy efficiency; insufficient data for other regulation.
Status of Test Procedures	$ No test standards known. $ Gubler & Peters have data upon which PM time schemes can be based
Evidence of Market-Driven or Voluntary Efficiency Improvements	$ Low-power/PM servers have just entered the market (0% market share). $ Implementation of power management schemes is possible (Gubler & Peters; RLX) $ RLX Technologies and Amphus products are examples of energy efficient low-end server computer design
Issues	$ Integration of PM schemes could impact server performance.

[33] Savings based on a baseline consumption that corresponds to typical new technology, 0% Power management enabled.
[34] Based on the low power level similarity of Desktop computers and server usage from Gubler & Peters (2000).
[35] RLX Technologies uses a transmetta chip and a PM scheme.

Background Material

Description	Value	Comments/Source
Total Energy Use (quad, 2000)	0.049	ADL (2002)
Annual Shipments (millions, 2000)	1.6	ADL (2002)
Stock (millions, 2000)	4.1	ADL (2002)
Product Lifetime (years)	3	Same as a PC (ADL, 2002)
Current UEC (kWh/year)	1095	Typical Server (ADL, 2002)
Typical New UEC (kWh/year)	1095	Typical Server (ADL, 2002)
Best Available UEC (kWh/year)	107	Low-power server (w/ power management, e.g., RLX (Hipp, 2001)
Energy Star UEC (kWh/year)	N/A	No Energy Star program
Minimum UEC (kWh/year) Future Technology	87	Low-power server, 1 Watt sleep and Power management (ADL, 2002)
Other Notable UEC (kWh/year)	131	Low-power server without Power Management (ADL, 2002)
Additional Notable UEC (kWh/year)	869	Current design with Power Management

Test Procedure Summary

Product: Low-End Servers, Commercial

Factors	Assessment
Test Procedure Overview	No test procedure exists.
Future/Potential Test Procedure(s)	None are available.
How effectively do test procedure(s) and metric(s) represent actual annual energy consumption and potential savings?	Not applicable.
Product Peak Load Impact and Correlation with Test Procedure and Metric, by Technology	Not applicable.

Standards Consideration

Product: Monitors[36]

Factors for Consideration	Assessment	
	Commercial	**Residential**
Potential Energy Savings from Regulatory Action; Cumulative (Quads) 2008-2030	$ 100% Power management enabled, 17-inch CRT = 2.5[37] $ 1 Watt sleep, Current Power management enabled rate, 17-inch CRT = 0.44[37] • 17-inch LCD, Current Power management enabled rate = 3.6[37]	$ 100% Power management enabled = 0.1[38] $ 1 Watt sleep, Current Power management enabled rate = 0.32[38] $ LCD, Current Power management enabled rate = 0.84[38]
Product / Technology Availability (Including Price/Cost information):	$ LCD - commercially available, costs are decreasing. In late 2001, an LCD monitor had a cost premium of 85% (relative to CRT), down from up to 300% in preceding years. The payback period for a 15-inch LCD with commercial and residential patterns is ~11 and ~33 years, respectively, as compared to a 17-inch CRT monitor (assuming $0.08/kWh; in practice, a 15-inch LCD effectively replaces a 17-inch CRT due to the LCD's more efficient use of screen space for viewing and higher display resolution.) $ Organic LED technology is under development but not commercially available in monitors. • As of 1 January, 2002, 90 17-inch or larger monitors listed on the Energy Star website consume 1W or less in their lowest power sleep mode.	
Cumulative Burden	This and related products have not been regulated for energy efficiency; insufficient data for other regulation.	
Status of Test Procedures	Energy Star test procedure document; no DOE test procedure.	
Evidence of Market-Driven or Voluntary Efficiency Improvements	$ 95% Energy Star Market Penetration target for Y2000 (Webber et al.) $ 60% of monitors in stock are Power management enabled (Nordman et al., 2000) $ 3% of monitors sold in Y2000 were LCD (ADL, 2002) $ Executive order mandates that the Federal Government purchase of devices with <1 W/sleep power draw where available and cost-effective (7/31/01) • Federal government must purchase of E*-compliant monitors	$ 59% of monitors in stock are Power management enabled (ADL, 2002) $ 95% Energy Star Market Penetration target for Y2000 (Webber et al., 2000) $ 3% of residential monitors sold in Y2000 were LCD (ADL, 2002)
Issues	$ Energy savings depend in large part upon increasing Power management enabled rate, a software option $ E*, although prevalent in new monitor sales, is often disabled by user; increasing Power management enabled rate may require software modification, e.g., permanent enabling of power-down features • LCD technology is expensive (ADL, 2002)	$ High LCD cost premium impedes LCD market penetration, with higher barriers expected in the residential market than the commercial market. $ Strict enforcement of energy star configuration will save energy • Electronics efficiency optimization (for 1-Watt sleep) can save much energy at little additional cost to consumer and no interruption of performance

[36] See priority-setting FY2003 Technical Support Document (TSD).
[37] Savings based on a baseline consumption that corresponds to typical new 17-inch CRT technology, 60% Power management enabled.
[38] Savings based on a baseline consumption that corresponds to typical new technology, 60% Power management enabled. Energy Star category is defined as having a low power level of 8 Watts.

Background Material

Description	Value		Comments/Source	
	Comm	Resid	Commercial	Residential
Total Energy Use (quad, 2000)	0.20	0.05	ADL, 2002	Kawamoto et al., 2001
Annual Shipments (millions, 2000)	38		ADL, 2002	ADL, 2002
Stock (millions, 2000)	63	51	ADL, 2002	ADL, 2002
Product Lifetime (years)	3	3	ADL, 2002	ADL, 2002
Current UEC (kWh/year)	333	92	17-inch CRT, 60% Power management enabled Rate, (ADL, 2002)	17-inch CRT, 60% Power management enabled Rate (ADL, 2002; Kawamoto et al., 2001)
Typical New UEC (kWh/year)	333	92	17-inch CRT, 60% Power management enabled Rate, (ADL, 2002)	17-inch CRT, 60% Power management enabled Rate (ADL, 2002; Kawamoto et al., 2001)
Best Available UEC (kWh/year)	51	17	Liquid Crystal Display, 15-inch, Current power management enabled rate (ADL, 2002)	Liquid Crystal Display, 15-inch, Current power management enabled rate (Kawamoto et al., 2001; ADL, 2002)
Energy Star UEC (kWh/year)	149	84	17-inch CRT, 100% Power management enabled (ADL, 2002)	17-inch CRT, 100% power management enabled (Kawamoto et al., 2001; ADL, 2002)
Minimum UEC (kWh/year) Future Technology	4.5	2	Cholesteric LCD, 15-inch panel, Current power management enabled rate Technology (Kent State, 200; ADL, 2002)	Cholesteric LCD, 15-inch panel, Current power management enabled rate, (Kent State, 2001; Kawamoto et al., 2001)
Other Notable UEC (kWh/year)	17	11	OLED at 100% Power management enabled rate (ADL, 2002)	OLED at 100% Power management enabled rate (ADL, 2002; Kawamoto et al., 2001)
Additional Notable UEC (kWh/year)	301	64	17-inch CRT with 1 Watt sleep, Current Power management enabled rate (ADL, 2002)	17-inch CRT with 1 Watt sleep and Current power management enabled rate (Kawamoto et al., 2001; ADL, 2002)

Test Procedure Summary

Product: Monitors

Factors	Assessment	
	Commercial	**Residential**
Test Procedure Overview	*For Tier II models - (test standard for equipment shipped after July 1, 2000)* $ Monitor into 1st sleep mode within 30 min of inactivity, deep sleep after 60 min - controlled by computer $ Testing procedure is the same for that of the computer except power is measured at the two mentioned stages instead of only one sleep level. System must adhere to Energy Star sleep mode levels which are measured in the following manner: $ The system must go into sleep mode after a period of inactivity. $ Detailed Energy Star Test Conditions (from the Computer MOU Version 3.0, EPA - Attachment C) $ Power source must be 115 VAC RMS (+/- 5 V RMS) $ Measure the True power consumption using a traceably calibrated NBS true RMS Watt-meter with resolution to 0.1 Watts. $ Test conditions: line impedance <0.25 ohm, Total harmonic distortion <5%, Input AC frequency = 60 Hz (+/- 3 Hz.), and an ambient temperature of 25 degrees C. $ Under the above conditions the power level in the sleep mode is then measured. $ Product meets Energy Star criteria if 95% or more of the products sold are able to meet the criteria.	
Future/Potential Test Procedure(s)	No future/potential test procedures identified.	
How effectively do test procedure(s) and metric(s) represent actual annual energy consumption and potential savings?	$ The Energy Star test procedure does not capture much of the energy savings because of the actual (field-measured) Power management enabled rate. $ Depending on the Power management enabled rate, the influence of the active and standby energy consumption, relative to total UEC, changes. Currently, CRT monitors realize a 60% Power management enabled rate and active energy consumption dominates energy consumption. This suggests that effort into active power draw reduction (which is not measured by the test procedure) would realize higher energy savings than decreasing the sleep power draw. As the Power management enabled rate approaches 100%, the sleep mode energy consumption becomes more significant but the active energy use still accounts for a majority of energy consumption.	
Product Peak Load Impact and Correlation with Test Procedure and Metric, by Technology	The "active" power draw and Power management enabled rate dominate the peak load impact of commercial monitors. The test procedure effectively captures the ability of monitors to power down during peak periods, but does not capture the peak power draw of "active" monitors during peak periods.	Residential monitors probably do no impact peak loads because residential computers and monitors operate more frequently at night than during the day. In addition, the majority PCs and monitors not "active" are in the "off" mode rather than "standby" mode. Thus, during the peak-load sensitive times of the day, PC's and monitors likely draw power in modes that do not fall under the test procedure.

Standards Consideration

Product: Pool Pumps

Factors for Consideration	Assessment
Potential Energy Savings from Regulatory Action; Cumulative (Quad) 2008-2030	$ Best available (best pump and best motor) = 0.09 $ Optimum technology (best pump and best motor technology) = 0.21
Product / Technology Availability (Including Price/Cost information):	$ Brushless DC motors available.
Cumulative Burden	Manufacturers of motors of >1HP have been regulated for energy efficiency (EPACT). The same manufacturers make lower horsepower motors for use in pool pumps.
Status of Test Procedures	$ No pool pump specific test procedure is available. $ Motor Test Procedure: Rotating Electrical Machines - Methods for Determining Losses and Efficiency of Rotating Electrical Machinery from Tests. This is a general procedure - not solely aimed at pump motors.
Evidence of Market-Driven or Voluntary Efficiency Improvements	$ Southern California Edison lists efficient pool pumps and gives rebates for purchasing such equipment. The efficiency of this equipment was not included in the analysis due to inconsistencies in the data. $ Some equipment is marketed for its energy efficiency (e.g., Pentair, Speck, and Sta-rite). $ GE ECM motors are available.
Issues	

Background Material

Description	Value	Comments/Source
Total Energy Use (quad, 2000)	0.04	(ADL, 1998)
Annual Shipments (millions, 2000)	N/A	
Stock (millions, 2000)	5.5	(ADL, 1998)
Product Lifetime (years)	10	(ADL, 2001)
Current UEC (kWh/year)	725	(ADL, 1998)
Typical New UEC (kWh/year)	725	(ADL, 1998)
Best Available UEC (kWh/year)	635	(ADL, 2001)
Energy Star UEC (kWh/year)	N/A	
Minimum UEC (kWh/year) Future Technology	517	(ADL, 2001)
Other Notable UEC (kWh/year)	N/A	
Additional Notable UEC (kWh/year)	N/A	

Test Procedure Summary

Product: Pool Pumps

Factors	Assessment
Test Procedure Overview	No product specific test procedures.
Future/Potential Test Procedure(s)	National Pool and Spa Institute may be trying to implement a test procedure for pool pump manufacturers, says David Nibbler of Waterpik Technologies/Jandy Pool Products. Detailed information was not known.
How effectively do test procedure(s) and metric(s) represent actual annual energy consumption and potential savings?	Not applicable.
Product Peak Load Impact and Correlation with Test Procedure and Metric, by Technology	These devices operate several hours per day. This period may or may not coincide with peak load sensitive times. Pool pumps can operate at any time as long as the National Sanitation Foundation requirement of one water change every 8 hours is met.

Standards Consideration

Product: Well Pumps

Factors for Consideration	Assessment
Potential Energy Savings from Regulatory Action; Cumulative (Quad) 2008-2030	$ Best available (best pump and best motor) = 0.17 $ Optimum technology (best pump and best motor technology) = 0.24
Product / Technology Availability (Including Price/Cost information):	$ Brushless DC motors are available.
Cumulative Burden	Manufacturers of motors >1HP have been regulated for energy efficiency (EPACT). It is unknown if pump industry has ever been regulated for other applications and also unknown if companies who manufacture pumps have been subject to regulations for other equipment they manufacture.
Status of Test Procedures	$ No specific water well pump test procedure. $ Motor Test Procedure: Rotating Electrical Machines - Methods for Determining Losses and Efficiency of Rotating Electrical Machinery from Tests.
Evidence of Market-Driven or Voluntary Efficiency Improvements	$ High efficiency pumps are commercially available; however, they do not appear to be marketed as such (inferred from viewing product literature) $ Brushless DC motors are available (e.g., from GE) but are not marketed as motors for well pumps.
Issues	$ Lifetime and durability are important factors for this equipment. $ Submersible pump motors have unique geometry - narrow design and must fit into a well hole. Technical challenges may exist in applying energy efficient motor designs to this application.

Background Material

Description	Value	Comments/Source
Total Energy Use (quad, 2000)	0.03	(ADL, 1998) and (ADL, 2001)
Annual Shipments (millions, 2000)	N/A	
Stock (millions, 2000)	14.3	(ADL, 1998) and (RECS, 1997)
Product Lifetime (years)	17.5	GWP (2001, personal communication)
Current UEC (kWh/year)	173	(ADL, 2001) and (ADL, 1998)
Typical New UEC (kWh/year)	173	(ADL, 2001) and (ADL, 1998)
Best Available UEC (kWh/year)	90.9	(ADL, 2001) and (ADL, 1998)
Energy Star UEC (kWh/year)	N/A	
Minimum UEC (kWh/year) Future Technology	60.2	(ADL, 2001) and (ADL, 1998)
Other Notable UEC (kWh/year)	N/A	
Additional Notable UEC (kWh/year)	N/A	

Test Procedure Summary

Product: Well Pumps

Factors	Assessment
Test Procedure Overview	No product specific test procedures.
Future/Potential Test Procedure(s)	Nothing under development. A submersible pump test (not specifically for well water pumps) will be available at the end of 2001, says the Hydraulic Institute.
How effectively do test procedure(s) and metric(s) represent actual annual energy consumption and potential savings?	Not applicable.
Product Peak Load Impact and Correlation with Test Procedure and Metric, by Technology	This product most likely has a limited affect on peak load. Equipment is most heavily used in the morning and operates for a minimal amount of time each day (19 minutes/household-day).

Standards Consideration

Product: Broilers

Factors for Consideration	Assessment
Potential Energy Savings from Regulatory Action; Cumulative (Quad) 2008-2030	0.044[39]
Product / Technology Availability (Including Price/Cost information):	
Cumulative Burden	Most commercial cooking equipment manufacturers do not make other equipment that has seen prior energy efficiency regulation; insufficient data for other regulation.
Status of Test Procedures	All equipment types have ASTM Test Standards.
Evidence of Market-Driven or Voluntary Efficiency Improvements	
Issues	

Background Material

Description	Value	Comments/Source
Total Energy Use (quad)	0.033	"Characterization of Commercial Building Appliances" (ADL, 1993)
Unit Energy Consumption (MMBtu)	282	"Characterization of Commercial Building Appliances" (ADL, 1993)
Annual Shipments (millions, 1997)	6,500 gas 2,250 elec	FE&S (1997)
Installed Base (million, 1995)	0.157	NAFEM (ADL, 1995)
Product Lifetime (years)	15 - 20	ADL Estimate (2001)
Minimum Efficiency Standard	N/A	
Stock Efficiency	20 - 40% gas 40 - 60% elec	"Characterization of Commercial Building Appliances" (ADL, 1993)
Typical New Efficiency	30% gas 60% elec	Year 2000 estimates based on "Characterization of Commercial Building Appliances" (ADL, 1993)
Best Available Efficiency		
Energy Star Efficiency	N/A	
Maximum Efficiency (Future Technology)		
Comments		Installed Base is 91% gas / 9% electric (NAFEM & Food Management; c. 1990)

[39] All calculations based upon difference between "Best Available" and "Typical New" **gas** equipment. This will tend to overstate savings of electric devices, which typically have significantly higher efficiencies than gas devices.

Standards Consideration

Product: Fryers

Factors for Consideration	Assessment
Potential Energy Savings from Regulatory Action; Cumulative (Quad) 2008-2030	0.27[40]
Product / Technology Availability (Including Price/Cost information):	
Cumulative Burden	Most commercial cooking equipment manufacturers do not make other equipment that has seen prior energy efficiency regulation; insufficient data for other regulation.
Status of Test Procedures	All equipment types have ASTM Test Standards.
Evidence of Market-Driven or Voluntary Efficiency Improvements	
Issues	

Background Material

Description	Value	Comments/Source
Total Energy Use (quad)	0.060	"Characterization of Commercial Building Appliances" (ADL, 1993)
Unit Energy Consumption (MMBtu)	62	"Opportunities and Competition in the Food Service Equipment Industry" (ADL, 1995)
Annual Shipments (millions, 1997)	117,000	Appliance (May 2000) About 70% gas/30% elec. FE&S (1997)
Installed Base (million, 1995)	0.97	NAFEM & Food Management (c. 1990)
Product Lifetime (years)	7 - 10	ADL Estimate (2001)
Minimum Efficiency Standard	N/A	
Stock Efficiency	40 - 50% gas 55 - 65% elec	"Characterization of Commercial Building Appliances" (ADL, 1993)
Typical New Efficiency	50 - 60% gas 95% elec	Year 2000 estimates based on "Characterization of Commercial Building Appliances" (ADL, 1993)
Best Available Efficiency	80% gas 98% elec	Large increase in fryer-liquid heat exchange surface area (ADL, 2001)
Energy Star Efficiency	N/A	
Maximum Efficiency (Future Technology)		
Comments		Installed Base is 58% gas / 42% electric (NAFEM & Food Management; c. 1990)

[40] All calculations based upon difference between "Best Available" and "Typical New" **gas** equipment. This will tend to overstate savings of electric devices, which typically have significantly higher efficiencies than gas devices.

Standards Consideration

Product: Griddles

Factors for Consideration	Assessment
Potential Energy Savings from Regulatory Action; Cumulative (Quad) 2008-2030	0.14[41]
Product / Technology Availability (Including Price/Cost information):	
Cumulative Burden	Most commercial cooking equipment manufacturers do not make other equipment that has seen prior energy efficiency regulation; insufficient data for other regulation.
Status of Test Procedures	All equipment types have ASTM Test Standards.
Evidence of Market-Driven or Voluntary Efficiency Improvements	
Issues	

Background Material

Description	Value	Comments/Source
Total Energy Use (quad)	0.039	"Characterization of Commercial Building Appliances" (ADL, 1993)
Unit Energy Consumption (MMBtu)	125	"Characterization of Commercial Building Appliances" (ADL, 1993)
Annual Shipments (millions, 1997)	34,455	FE&S (1997)
Installed Base (million, 1995)	0.312	NAFEM (ADL, 1995)
Product Lifetime (years)	10 - 15	ADL Estimate (2001)
Minimum Efficiency Standard	N/A	
Stock Efficiency	35 - 45% gas 50 - 65% elec	"Characterization of Commercial Building Appliances" (ADL, 1993)
Typical New Efficiency		
Best Available Efficiency	55% gas 65% elec	Year 2000 estimates based on "Characterization of Commercial Building Appliances" (ADL, 1993)
Energy Star Efficiency	N/A	
Maximum Efficiency (Future Technology)		
Comments		Installed Base is 50% gas / 50% electric (NAFEM & Food Management; c. 1990)

[41] All calculations based upon difference between "Best Available" and "Typical New" **gas** equipment. This will tend to overstate savings of electric devices, which typically have significantly higher efficiencies than gas devices.

Standards Consideration

Product: Ovens

Factors for Consideration	Assessment
Potential Energy Savings from Regulatory Action; Cumulative (Quad) 2008-2030	0.28[42]
Product / Technology Availability (Including Price/Cost information):	
Cumulative Burden	Most commercial cooking equipment manufacturers do not make other equipment that has seen prior energy efficiency regulation; insufficient data for other regulation.
Status of Test Procedures	All equipment types have ASTM Test Standards.
Evidence of Market-Driven or Voluntary Efficiency Improvements	
Issues	

Background Material

Description	Value	Comments/Source
Total Energy Use (quad)	0.24	"Characterization of Commercial Building Appliances" (ADL, 1993)
Unit Energy Consumption (MMBtu)	282	"Characterization of Commercial Building Appliances" (ADL, 1993)
Annual Shipments (millions, 1997)	89,000 gas 67,000 elec	Appliance May, 2000
Installed Base (million, 1995)	0.85	NAFEM (ADL, 1995)
Product Lifetime (years)	15 - 20	ADL Estimate
Minimum Efficiency Standard	N/A	
Stock Efficiency	35 - 45% gas 65% elec	"Characterization of Commercial Building Appliances" (ADL, 1993)
Typical New Efficiency	45% gas 65% elec	ADL Estimate (2001)
Best Available Efficiency		
Energy Star Efficiency	N/A	
Maximum Efficiency (Future Technology)		
Comments		Installed Base is 55% gas / 45% electric (NAFEM & Food Management; c. 1990)

[42] All calculations based upon difference between "Best Available" and "Typical New" **gas** equipment. This will tend to overstate savings of electric devices, which typically have significantly higher efficiencies than gas devices.

Standards Consideration

Product: Ranges

Factors for Consideration	Assessment
Potential Energy Savings from Regulatory Action; Cumulative (Quad) 2008-2030	0.18[43]
Product / Technology Availability (Including Price/Cost information):	
Cumulative Burden	Most commercial cooking equipment manufacturers do not make other equipment that has seen prior energy efficiency regulation; insufficient data for other regulation.
Status of Test Procedures	All equipment types have ASTM Test Standards.
Evidence of Market-Driven or Voluntary Efficiency Improvements	
Issues	

Background Material

Description	Value	Comments/Source
Total Energy Use (quad)	0.090	"Characterization of Commercial Building Appliances" (ADL, 1993)
Unit Energy Consumption (MMBtu)	138	"Characterization of Commercial Building Appliances" (ADL, 1993)
Annual Shipments (millions, 1997)	81,300	FE&S (1997)
Installed Base (million, 1995)	0.65	NAFEM (ADL, 1995)
Product Lifetime (years)	15 - 20	ADL Estimate
Minimum Efficiency Standard	N/A	
Stock Efficiency	40 - 50% gas 65 - 75% elec	"Characterization of Commercial Building Appliances" (ADL, 1993)
Typical New Efficiency		
Best Available Efficiency	60% gas 80% elec	Year 2000 estimates based on "Characterization of Commercial Building Appliances" (ADL, 1993)
Energy Star Efficiency	N/A	
Maximum Efficiency (Future Technology)		
Comments		Installed Base is 91% gas / 9% electric (NAFEM & Food Management; c. 1990)

[43] All calculations based upon difference between "Best Available" and "Typical New" **gas** equipment. This will tend to overstate savings of electric devices, which typically have significantly higher efficiencies than gas devices.

Standards Consideration

Product: Steamers

Factors for Consideration	Assessment
Potential Energy Savings from Regulatory Action; Cumulative (Quad) 2008-2030	0.11[44]
Product / Technology Availability (Including Price/Cost information):	
Cumulative Burden	Most commercial cooking equipment manufacturers do not make other equipment that has seen prior energy efficiency regulation; insufficient data for other regulation.
Status of Test Procedures	All equipment types have ASTM Test Standards.
Evidence of Market-Driven or Voluntary Efficiency Improvements	
Issues	

Background Material

Description	Value	Comments/Source
Total Energy Use (quad)	0.056	"Characterization of Commercial Building Appliances" (ADL, 1993)
Unit Energy Consumption (MMBtu)	329	"Characterization of Commercial Building Appliances" (ADL, 1993)
Annual Shipments (millions, 1997)	9,800	FE&S (1997)
Installed Base (million, 1995)	0.17	NAFEM (ADL, 1995)
Product Lifetime (years)	10 - 15	ADL Estimate (2001)
Minimum Efficiency Standard	N/A	
Stock Efficiency	40 - 60% gas 60 - 70% elec	"Characterization of Commercial Building Appliances" (ADL, 1993)
Typical New Efficiency		
Best Available Efficiency	70% gas 90% elec	Year 2000 estimates based on "Characterization of Commercial Building Appliances" (ADL, 1993)
Energy Star Efficiency	N/A	
Maximum Efficiency (Future Technology)		
Comments		Installed Base is 33% gas / 67% electric (NAFEM & Food Management; c. 1990)

[44] All calculations based upon difference between "Best Available" and "Typical New" **gas** equipment. This will tend to overstate savings of electric devices, which typically have significantly higher efficiencies than gas devices.

Test Procedure Summary

Product: All Commercial Cooking

Factors	Assessment
Test Procedure Overview	All equipment types have ASTM Test Standards.
Future/Potential Test Procedure(s)	
How effectively do test procedure(s) and metric(s) represent actual annual energy consumption and potential savings?	
Product Peak Load Impact and Correlation with Test Procedure and Metric, by Technology	Unknown; only electric appliances contribute to peak loads, and they account for only ~19% of all site cooking energy consumption (ADL, 1993).