

18th December 2023

- > **Question 1.** We are proposing to expand the range of EMC standards that may be used by suppliers to demonstrate compliance. This is anticipated to reduce barriers to trade, compliance costs and time to market. Do you have any comments on the proposal to reference all the EMC harmonised standards for emission under Directive 2014/30/EU in the ACMA's EMC regulatory arrangements?

We highly recommend that the current list of EMC Standards maintained by ACMA shall continue. Standards be added per need basis instead of opening up a large list of EU standards. The relevance may be lost and may give rise to incorrect or inappropriate standards referred to declare compliance. By this we do not see the need to refer another jurisdiction's set of standards.

Australian standards must be given prominence while the EU standards may be chosen only where there are no available ANZ standards. The EMC test reports being used for Level 2 & 3 compliance must also list the AS/NZS standard in addition to the EN standards.

This is not barrier to trade.

European legislation is different to Australian. Under the EU legislation there are multiple ways for a manufacturer to self-declare product compliance. EU regulation is based on Industry standards whereas in Australia one has to declare compliance against ACMA Technical standards. In EU, one may choose not to test the product and still declare compliance.

EU's CE compliance is based on "Presumption of Conformity" and backed up by Risk Assessments by the manufacturers. There are no such strong means of ensuring compliance in Australia.

When the AS standard is not listed in an EMC report, there must be an assessment against AS standard and based on which the responsible party should complete the SDoC.

Reason: If ACMA refers the EU OJ listed standards, why does Standards Australia need to prepare and publish AS/NZS standards? **The AS/NZS standards will lose complete significance of its existence.**

EU OJ listed standards are not always a direct adoption of the IEC CISPR standard, CENELEC has a process to review and adopt the IEC CISPR standards and publish their own EN standard.

These standards are not subjected to Australian input (at IEC/ISO/CENELEC level or TE-003 directly).

EN 301 489 series are EMC standards for Radio equipment like WiFi, Bluetooth, LTE, etc. Many manufacturers are using this report to claim Australian Compliance under CISPR 32, CISPR 14, CISPR 15.

In Australia there is no EMC requirement for Radios. This is unique in Australia.

If referencing EU standards directly, then why not immunity requirements ?

For CISPR11-based standards, we need to maintain the current remark on the ACMA website, which is: "The 900 ISM band for Australia is 915–928 MHz, not 902–928 MHz as shown in the standard. 900 MHz ISM devices operating outside 915–928 MHz cannot be used in Australia."

This remark would need to also be included with other standards that reference CISPR11, such as the EN55011, EN50121 series and EN61326 series, just to name a few.

- > **Question 2.** Modern vehicles are increasingly embedded with and reliant on advanced electronic and safety systems. Do you have any comments on whether the current EMC regulatory arrangements for managing EMC risks for vehicles, including electric vehicles, are effective?

No. The risks are huge for such vehicles especially without immunity tests requirements. While ACMA exempts any requirements for vehicles handled by the FCAI, TIC, CMEIG & TMA members, there are many electric vehicle accessories with varying features, chargers, non-road vehicles like e-scooters, etc are already in the market without adequate EMC assessment. CISPR 12, CISPR 25, CISPR 36, UN ECE Reg 10 like standards needs more considerations to address such vehicles and its accessories. There are big variations in the type of charging stations and similar systems used in cumulative configurations already in the Australian market

All countries who have adopted the E-mark UN regulations require both emissions and immunity /transients except in Australia. So, there is a high risk of low-quality products dumping and compromising safety of passengers.

- > **Question 3.** Do you have any comments on the options to exclude specified low-powered inductive power transfer devices such as wireless chargers for phones, electronic wearables and electric toothbrushes from the definition of a high-risk device?

While some products can be classified as medium-risk (not Low-risk), there are products with varying or high power levels like cordless kettles, The number of WPT devices has increased multi-fold in households. It is better to leave them as Level 3 until there is sufficient knowledge of their EMC performance. The types and categories and their varieties are quite large and hence difficult to put them all into a single medium or low risk category.

- > **Question 4.** Do you have any comments on our proposal to lower the compliance level of certain household devices? Are there any other devices that we have not identified, where we should consider lowering the compliance level due to their low risk of causing interference? If so, please specify the types of devices and why their compliance level should be changed, including any common characteristics that cause these devices to pose a low risk of interference.

RCM approval especially ACMA RCM is taken as the most easiest of the approvals in the world. Many claim that there is nothing to be done other than just completing the SDoC document.

It is surprising many a times that many importers don't even know that an RCM process exists. They think it has a CE mark so nothing more required. On top of such leniency, there is no Surveillance process or audit of products on the shelf or manufacturer/importers compliance folders.

How does ACMA know or determine that the products coming into Australia are compliant and safe ?

Suggest ACMA conduct RCM awareness programs, surveillance / audits, and strongly suggest to have a committee setup (like previous TWG) and have a yearly/half-yearly meeting to discuss various inputs from stakeholders involved in Product compliance.

The proliferation of electronic products/gadgets in any household have doubled or tripled (rather exploded in numbers). CISPR is seriously discussing this topic in conjunction with changing the EMC limits due to its cumulative effects.

We do not support the proposal of lowering the compliance level for certain household devices from medium-risk to low-risk, mainly because for low-risk devices a supplier does not need to obtain a test report which basically means no need to be tested).

Within CISPR there are on-going discussions about protection distances and whether the current limits are still adequate. The current limits are based on a 10m protection distance, however with the increase in higher density housing (ie, lots of apartment buildings) and an increase in the number of devices, the protection distance is likely to be less than 10m and thus limits may need to be tightened accordingly. While that discussion is on-going and unlikely to be resolved in the short-term,

Answering this question, NO until a surveillance program is strong lowering the compliance requirements makes no sense.

- > **Question 5.** Do you have any comments on the categorisation of battery-powered devices as low-risk devices?

Current definition of battery-powered device means a device that is not capable of being connected, directly or indirectly, to an external power supply.

The original intention of classifying battery powered devices as Low-risk was for simple toys, devices that do not have a microprocessor, etc.

But now high-tech microprocessor-based battery powered devices are available and cannot be categorised as low-risk devices.

Additional Comments:

There are many safety standards which include EMC requirements for a reason. Malfunctions of some critical applications of products due to interference. ACMA needs to reconsider this to introduce Immunity requirements for safety critical products. Eg. Treadmills, automatic and semi-automatic power tools, etc.

Thanks,



Praveen Rao

CEO, Technical Director, C-PRAV Group
C-PRAV Labs and Certifications



P: +61 3 9087 9383 | **M:** +61 412 258 952



praveen@c-prav.com



Unit A9, Hallmarc Business Park, 2A, Westall Road, Springvale, Victoria 3171, Australia



www.C-PRAV.com

C-PRAV Australia, New Zealand, India, Canada