

Minutes of EUP Lot 11 Pumps Meeting, Brussels – 25/10/07

A summary of each chapter was presented in turn, with discussion invited on the contents of each chapter. These minutes record these discussions rather than repeating the summaries – these summaries are included in the presentation also available on the www.ecomotors.com website.

Attendees

Brock, Justin - AEA
Bartoschek, Manfred – KSB AG
Bayerer, Reinhold - Infineon
Bidstrup, Niels - Grundfoss
Bo, Hu – China National Institute of Standardisation
Brunner, Conrad – SEEEM
Cory, William – Independent consultant
De Almeida, Anibal – UOC
Dodane, Robert – Salmson Pumps
Drachenberg, Tine -
Ennenbach, Frank – ABS Group
Falkner, Hugh – AEA
Grose-Sudhues, Martina
Kuhuhenu, Kai
Kusch, Friedrich - VDMA
Lebrun, Alexandre - Profluid
Murray, Robin – UK MTP
Nystrup, Helle - Grundfoss
Oberschmidt, Julia – Fraunhofer
Schmalfuss, Horst-Berg - Consultant
Schofield, Steve - BPMA
Siderius, Hans Paul – Senter Novem
Sigloch, Uwe – ebm-papst Mulfingen GmbH & Co.
Teepe, Markus – Wilo AG
Van Doorslaer, Guy - Europump
Yuejin, Zhao – China Standard Certification Centre

Chapter 1

It was noted that the pump study doesn't include motor – is it reasonable to consider design options for just the pump, (Hans- Paul Siderius, Senter Novem). It was explained that we had weighed up the pros and cons of all products, and while it would have been nice to have a common approach for all products, for example with fans, it was eventually decided to go with what was most appropriate for individual products. Advantages for concentrating on the pump alone include the point that it is what schemes in other countries are doing. Also, while fans use mainly tailor-made motors (which are not covered by the motor study), pumps use standards motors, which are already covered by the motor study.

Discussion on the Testing and verification section, with a commentary on the wider issues given by Hans-Paul. HF to verify later how manufacturers' measurement uncertainty is dealt with, as Europump (Markus Teepe) claimed that it is included in the 5% allowance, whereas the report states that zero tolerance is assumed.

Self declaration was regarded by all as being the most desirable option, with there being concern over the possible cost of mandatory third party verification.

Chapter 2

Comment that 11 years seems a very low figure for lifetime, (Conrad Brunner). It was explained that this was an arithmetic figure designed to ensure that the critical life \times sales pa = stock relationship held true – we have no accurate data on pump life. This had been discussed at length in earlier dialogue with the industry. There was a proposal to go up to 15 – 20 years. The impact of longer lifetime would be to reduce the rate at which improved stock would reduce energy consumption and to improve the attractiveness of more expensive lower energy designs. This point will be considered again in the LCC results.

Chapter 3

No comments

Summary of chapter 4

No comments

Summary of chapter 5

(Hans-Paul Siderius)– Commented on the suggestion that there are no significant design developments that can improve efficiency – rather a continuum of gradually increasing efficiencies. HF stated that this is indeed the case, with no absolute technology better than any other, which is in contrast to the case with circulators.

Hans Paul - Have the feeling that if you look at the pump (mechanical part) there is a gradual improvement but no big gains to make – hence for example a VSD can improve the product. So why study just the pump, when savings are outside this? HF agreed with the energy savings potential beyond the pump, but stated that this is outside the scope of project.

Chapter 6

Markus Teepe, Europump – not generally acceptable to generalise how to improve the efficiency of the pump. Responsibility of HOW you achieve the efficiency should remain with manufacturers. HF agreed with this point, and will amend the chapter to reflect this.

Chapter 7

Kai Kuhnheny - would favour the top runner approach. HF stated that the methodology allows setting limit values that can be used for the setting of a label for particularly good products.

Steve Schofield, (Europump) – What would happen in the situation where the EC have identified a criteria, however some member states have higher carbon policies? Will each member state have to go higher or will member states have to implement the policy as set by EC?

(EC) – Impact assessment will look at a wider range of issues that could include member state politics. The Consultation Forum will allow to discuss these matters.

Europump presented a detailed listing of their comments on the report, a copy of which was forwarded to HF for reference.

Conrad Brunner – pointed out that lots of savings from the wider system are missing. HF agreed that while out of scope, the wider perspective could be further emphasised in the report.

Conrad Brunner queried the assumed profile as it underplayed the savings from VSDs. HF stated that the study is not about flow profiles and the suitability for Variable Speed control, rather it is about finding a way to characterise average pump efficiency.

Hans Paul Siderius. Use of the term “system” is dangerous as Ecodesign does not know what system is. Questioned whether there was a way in which integrated units (eg motor and pump) could be characterised.

Antonio Zoccoli, (Caprari) - P77 – Reiterated that in practice there is little overlap between the duty served by the 4” and 6” sizes. Manfred Bartoschek largely supported this view.

Hugh Falkner AEAT 30 October 2007