

SUMMARY OF WRITTEN SUBMISSION

We have carefully examined all the submissions received and views collected during the public consultation. Out of the 37 written submissions, majority (26), including trade associations, green groups, professional and educational institution, Consumer Council, power utility, product suppliers, expressed support to the mandatory EELS and agreed that the scheme is in the correct direction for achieving the efficient use of energy. While nine submissions did not explicitly indicate their overall views on the proposal, most of them offered specific comments for the smooth implementation of the mandatory scheme. One submission (an individual) disagreed with the proposed mandatory EELS and another (equipment supplier) noted that the mandatory scheme should not be implemented.

2. The specific comments on various aspects of the proposed mandatory EELS are summarized as follows:

A. Coverage of Products

(18 submissions expressed views on this issue.)

- Five submissions including green groups, a professional institution, Consumer Council and a product supplier agreed to the selection of the three specified products (i.e. air conditioners, refrigerators and compact fluorescent lamps) for inclusion in the initial phase of the mandatory EELS.
- Having no objection to regulating the three specified products, eight submissions (mainly the trade associations, product suppliers and individuals) suggested that in order to minimize the impact to the trade, the technical scope (e.g. cooling capacity, volume capacity, mounting designs, etc) of air conditioners and refrigerators should be confined to ranges/types that are widely used in households and should exclude those with small sale volume.
- Two submissions (a green group and an educational institution) suggested that more products should be considered for inclusion in the

mandatory EELS.

- One submission (an individual) considered that compact fluorescent lamps should not be covered by the mandatory EELS. Another (an equipment supplier) queried on the necessity to include the three specified products into mandatory EELS in view of their high penetration in the voluntary EELS.
- One submission (a testing laboratory) suggested that clear definitions of the three specified products should be stated.

B. Product Registration

(18 submissions expressed views on this issue.)

- Nine submissions including trade associations, product suppliers and individuals considered that the product registration should be free of charge. One submission (a trade association) noted that the level of registration fee should be reasonable and affordable. Another (a professional institution) considered it reasonable for the Administration to charge a registration fee to recover the administrative cost.
- For the product information updating period, five submissions including green groups, professional institution, Consumer Council and educational institution considered that the proposed updating period of five years should be shortened to reflect the rapidly changing market.
- One submission agreed to the registration procedures but another (an equipment supplier) did not support the requirement of product registration.

C. Testing Requirement

(Nine submissions expressed views on this issue.)

- Six submissions (including an educational institution, a professional institution, a green group and a testing laboratory) noted that the energy efficiency information should be supported by results of tests

which are conducted by qualified laboratories.

- Two submissions (product suppliers) commented that self declaration or test reports issued by manufacturers should be allowed.
- One submission (Consumer Council) suggested the testing criteria should be reviewed regularly.

D. Labelling Requirement

(10 submissions expressed views on this issue.)

- Three submissions including green groups and individual considered that more information (e.g. energy saving amount and product description, etc) should be provided on the energy labels.
- Three submissions (mainly professional institutions) considered that the format of the mandatory labels should be clearly distinguishable from the voluntary labels.
- Two submissions considered that more stringent grading criteria should be set for mandatory EELS to reflect the models with top energy efficiency performance. Another submission proposed benchmarking to similar products in other countries when establishing the grading of energy efficiency performance.
- One submission (a product supplier) considered that retailers should be allowed to provide energy labels, and another (an equipment supplier) preferred putting energy performance information in product manuals instead of labelling the products.

E. Transitional Arrangement

(15 submissions expressed views on this issue.)

- 15 submissions including trade associations, suppliers, professional institution, testing laboratory and individuals considered that the proposed one-year grace period is not long enough for the trade to make preparations.

- Eight submissions including suppliers, a trade association and individuals noted that the old stocks should be allowed to be sold out after the grace period.

F. Enforcement

(10 submissions expressed views on this issue.)

- Seven submissions including a professional institution, green groups, a trade association and individuals expressed concern on the adequacy of enforcement of the mandatory EELS. Five of them suggested that to upkeep the credibility of the scheme, regular product sample tests should be conducted and appropriate penalties should be imposed for offences.
- Two submissions expressed concern on the obligation of consumers under the mandatory EELS, while another submission agreed with the enforcement duties of EMSD.

G. Other Comments

- Six submissions including Consumer Council, a trade association, a professional institution and individuals suggested that the mandatory EELS should be widely publicized to allow consumers to understand its benefits and make use of the energy label as a guide to choose energy-efficient products.
- Four submissions including educational institution, professional institution, green group and trade association suggested that the financial burden incurred to the suppliers should be minimized so as to avoid increase in the product price. Six submissions including a product supplier and individuals considered that the mandatory scheme may lead to increase in the product price and products of small sale volume may be driven out of the market, resulting less choices for consumers. On the other hand, one submission (an individual) considered that in view of the potential benefits, it is worth implementing the mandatory EELS even though the product cost may increase.