

From: "Arlene Blum"

Sent: Thursday, April 26, 2012

Subject: Please consider the possible benefits and harm from an external candle flame requirement for flat screen TVs

Dear IEC Committee Secretary,

I am writing to ask you to give careful consideration to the mandatory candle flame ignition requirement in Clause 11 of IEC 62368-1 Ed 2.0 -108/479/CDV and Clause 21 of IEC 60065 Ed 8.0 -108/478A/CDV.

As you may know these proposed candle flame ignition clauses requires that a TV be able to withstand a 3 minute external candle flame.

Please pause for a moment and think about the need for such a requirement, especially given current TV flat panel display technology design and new candle industry safety standards. (There are six current ASTM candle safety standards and three CEN standards). Under what real life conditions could this type of ignition possibly happen? One would have to hold a candle under their flat-panel TV for 3 minutes. The only real life scenario in which this could occur is through deliberate ignition such as arson and **No** standard can protect televisions from deliberate ignition such as arson.

Do we really want to include a requirement that offers no fire safety benefit and instead poses the likelihood of untested and/or toxic chemicals being placed in our televisions? Does it make sense to include a requirement that could lead to the use of flame retardants in amounts of up to 20% by weight of the television? Doing so will not protect against arson, but will introduce into homes with TVs potentially toxic chemicals that easily leave the TV casing and become part of household dust and end up in our environment: sediment, soil, water and wildlife.

Chemicals used in the past and present to meet such candle standards have been associated with cancer, decreased fertility, endocrine disruption and thyroid problems, as well as lowered IQ and hyperactivity in children.

Not surprisingly, the external ignition requirement was initiated and is in large part supported by the flame retardant chemical industry that will benefit financially from implementation of this requirement.

Please take a moment to carefully think about the candle as an improbable ignition source for televisions and whether it is in the best interests of the public and the environment to include an external candle ignition requirement for a fire problem that does not exist; especially when doing so creates an environmental problem of disposing of the treated plastic safely and a public health problem regarding children's health. There is important information for your consideration in the "Case against Candle Resistant TVs" found [here](http://bit.ly/H8ADik). (Also available at: <http://bit.ly/H8ADik>)

Many thanks for your thoughtful consideration,

Judy Levin, MSW
Pollution Prevention Co-Director
Center for Environmental Health
(510) 655-3900 x316

Sharyle Patton
Director, Health and Environment Program Commonweal
POB 316 451 Mesa Road Bolinas, CA 94924
Main Office - (415) 868 0970 ext 310
Direct line - (415) 779 1010
fax - (415) 868 2230
www.commonweal.org

Arlene Blum PhD
Arlene@arleneblum.com
Visiting Scholar, Chemistry
University of California, Berkeley
Executive Director, Green Science Policy Institute
P. O., Box 5455, Berkeley, California, 94705
Telephone: 510 644-3164 Mobile: 510 919-6363
Web: www.greensciencepolicy.org, www.arleneblum.com