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Overview
DLC Mission

*Drive efficient lighting*

- Maintaining Technical Requirements to define minimum performance
- Facilitating thought leadership and information sharing
- Delivering tools and resources to the lighting market through open dialogue and collaboration
Stakeholder Engagement

• Lamp and Luminaire Manufacturers
• Component Manufacturers
• Testing Labs
• Efficiency Administrators
• Procurement Agents
• Designers and Specifiers
• Experts and Consultants
Stakeholder Engagement

- Provide input into policy development
- Inquire about requirements
- Submit product applications
- Confirm listing status
- Verify performance
- Compare products
- Perform aggregate data analysis

Rely on DLC data for accuracy
Testing Labs’ Play Critical Role

- DLC product evaluation is focused on documented performance in test reports, spec sheets, installation instructions, and additional technical justification

- **Testing Labs are the backbone of this process**

- DLC relies on labs to
  - Maintain appropriate accreditations
  - Conduct testing in accordance with test procedures
  - Report accurate test results
DLC Qualification Process

• Publicly Available Requirements
  – Eligibility rules and technical requirements are publicly available
  – Testing lab requirements specific to each test
    ▪ Developed through a process driven by the testing community!

• Application Submission Prompts
  – Agreements and prompts to ensure submitted data is accurate, test reports are final, and data accurately represents the performance of submitted products

• Objective Evaluation
  – No component of DLC evaluation can be subjective or a judgment call
    ▪ Results in delays, terminates application, results in failed status
Laboratory Involvement

**LM-79**
- Nearly 100 approved labs for LM-79
- Have received reports from nearly all approved labs*

**ISTMT**
- Over 200 approved labs
- Have received reports from over 100 unique labs*

**LM-80**
- Over 80 approved labs for LM-80
- Have received reports from over 60 unique labs*

*Based on data collected since August 2015
Documentation Reviewed

• Test reports
  – LM-79, supporting IES file(s)
  – ISTMT
  – LM-80, supporting TM-21 calculator

• Supporting documentation
  – Product spec sheet
  – Driver spec sheet
  – LED spec sheet
  – Warranty
  – Installation instructions
  – Safety certification
What We See
Issues Encountered

• Misalignment between model in application and model reported in testing
• Mismatch between testing description and image of product tested
• Missing documentation in test reports
• Inconsistent performance values based on model tested
• Conflicting information between testing procedures and appropriate standards
• Misalignment between supporting documentation provided and publically available information
• Data entry errors within test reports and supporting documentation
• Failing data in test report
Explanations Given

• Typo in report or application, attached wrong image, copy/pasted wrong data
• Submitted report wasn’t final
• Testing was conducted incorrectly
• Testing was conducted on improper test equipment
Current DLC Policy

• If issue affects performance (e.g., typo in measured value), DLC will not accept revised test report.
  – See FAQ “I believe that the test report I submitted with my application does not represent my product's performance. Will DLC accept a new report with different performance on the same product design?”
  – Short answer: No, unless a design change has been made to the product.

• If issue does not affect performance (e.g., incorrect image, missing reference housing), DLC will request revised report.
  – Revised report must follow applicable accreditation rules regarding report revisions
Kickoff Webinar Feedback
Kickoff Discussion

- Webinar held 6/20 @ 1pm
- 21 attendees from 9 labs
- Initial feedback from participants
  - DLC should track and monitor lab issues
  - Pull labs with consistent mistakes
  - Leverage accreditation bodies where applicable
Discussion