

BIFMA Sustainability Assessment Standard Stakeholder Meeting
Wednesday October 25 and Thursday October 26, 2006
Draft Meeting Summary

This document is part of the NSF International standard development process. This document is subject to change and may be a draft and/or non-final version. Committee members may reproduce, quote from, and/or circulate this document to persons or entities outside of their organization after first providing NSF International with written notice of to whom and for what purpose this document is to be shared.

Please go to <http://BIFMA.org/public/SusFurnStd.html> for BIFMA Sustainability Assessment Standard documentation.

I. Welcome/Introductions/Anti-trust Statement

Bill Stough called the meeting to order and welcomed the group. Jaclyn Bowen read the anti-trust statement. The group went around the room giving self-introductions.

He thanked Paul Chalmer for allowing NSF and BIFMA to use his facilities.

II. Review of Agenda and Meeting Goals and Schedule

Bill Stough reviewed the agenda and asked if there were any motions to make changes, there were no motions.

Bill Stough stated that in between each of the face-to-face monthly meetings, BIFMA attempts to get the chairs/co-chairs together to discuss the agenda via conference call. The recommendation at the last chair's conference call was to spend more time together as a full stakeholder group and not break up into individual work groups. This way, all stakeholders can comment on each of the separate areas.

When reviewing the draft document, please keep the following in mind:

- Identifying overlap between the Work Groups
- What is the required documentation to demonstrate compliance?
- Does the standard help differentiate Environmentally Preferable furniture?
- How can we help incentivize SBEs participation?
- Does the standard contain Measurable Performance Criteria?
- How can we demonstrate Continuous Improvement?
- How can we capture Innovation?

Bill Stough stated that there is no formal face-to-face meeting scheduled for November. The face-to-face meeting is scheduled for December 5th and December 6th at the NSF International headquarters in Ann Arbor, Michigan. The exact agenda is still being determined as there may be a need for 2 full day meetings since the stakeholder group will not have met for two months.

Anne Saliers added that when reviewing the draft document, stakeholders should also keep in mind what type of approved documentation is necessary and what is the scope of the work that is on each company to provide proof.

Tom Reardon stated that during the last face-to-face meeting, he had mentioned that the BIFMA board had some reservation about the multi-tiered approach. Tom is preparing a position paper to share with the board the pros and cons of a multi-tiered standard. This way, he is hoping to capture their concerns in writing, so this group could respond back. He will keep the stakeholders posted on the progress.

III. Previous Meeting Minutes/Approval

Bill Stough reviewed the September 2006 meeting summary and questioned if any corrections/changes needed to be made.

Denise Van Valkenburg stated that on the last line on the first page, July should be August.

Motion: Lou Newett motioned to accept the September 2006 meeting summary. Fred Stevens seconded.

Discussion: None.

Vote: All in favor.

Motion passed. September Meeting Summary is accepted.

IV. Update on NIST Workshop on "Innovation and Competitiveness: A Strategic Approach to Emerging Chemical Issues"

Jane Wilson gave an overview of the NIST workshop on "Innovation and Competitiveness: A Strategic Approach to Emerging Chemical Issues.

This workshop was held on Tuesday September 26 and Wednesday September 27, 2006 at the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) in Gaithersburg, Maryland. This workshop was held to address the increasing pressure on U.S. manufacturers from emerging chemical controls and regulations from such countries as China and the European Union. Global manufacturers are under increasing pressure from chemical-related regulations and standards. The suite of issues stemming from regulatory actions in various markets, as well as global reporting and management efforts, has serious cost and market implications both for manufacturers of chemicals and for chemicals users and are potential barriers to innovation. As examples, chemicals and chemical products contribute 16% of the value of material inputs in the automotive sector, 33% of the value of material inputs used to make semiconductors, and 30% of the value of medical supplies. The workshop provided a forum to gather industry views on these issues and to develop an early consensus on how the business, scientific and technical communities can better address and prepare for new chemical-related rules and regulations worldwide that affect U.S. manufacturing. Breakout sessions explored the use of voluntary standards by government and industry; methods for early identification of issues; and mechanisms for broader stakeholder collaboration. Outcomes are expected to include recommendations for coordinated actions, strategies, and plans for implementation.

The stakeholders asked that BIFMA post the executive summary and overview slides and publications on the BIFMA website.

Laura Rauwerda thanked Jane Wilson for the update and agreed that the work groups have been struggling with injecting science into policy. Deborah Dunning questioned if there were any additional inputs from the breakout voluntary standards by government and industry meeting as to the use of standards. Jane Wilson responded that the primary thought was that when the regulations come out, they are not prescriptive. Standards can be used to clarify the methodology and intent.

V. Full Stakeholder Element Discussions

Prior to examining the work group language, the stakeholders reviewed the general sections in the beginning of the document.

Under section 3.0, Scope, stakeholders requested that Bill Stough add a preamble discussing the strategic nature of defining the scope of conformance to the standard.

Under section 5.0, Definitions, definitions that were added and or modified include:

- Air pollution
- Air pollutant
- Design for the Environment
- Green Chemistry
- Green Engineering
- Life Cycle Assessment
- Life Cycle Thinking
- Stakeholders
- Sustainable Development

Two definitions were proposed for Design for the Environment. The definitions read:

Design for the Environment (DfE): *Is the systematic integration of environmental considerations into product and process design. (The National Research Council of Canada, http://dfe-sce.nrc-cnrc.gc.ca/home_e.html)*

Design for the Environment (DfE): *Option 2. Is a systematic way of incorporating environmental attributes into the design of a product. There are three unique characteristics of DfE:*

1. *The entire life-cycle of a product is considered*
2. *Point of application is clearly in the product realization*
3. *Decisions are made using a set of values consistent with industrial ecology, integrative systems thinking or another framework*

(State of Minnesota DfE <http://www.moea.state.mn.us/p2/dfetoolkit.cfm>).

Tom Reardon suggested morphing the two proposals. Toni Stein agreed. Work Group 3 agreed to take a shot at merging the two definitions.

Clinton Boyd stated that ASTM has a good definition for compost and biodegradable that he would circulate to Jaclyn Bowen.

Deborah Dunning suggested that the Life Cycle Assessment definition make reference to the 14040 series.

Stakeholders asked Bill Stough to provide a definition of “hazardous substance.”

The task group next discussed Section 6.0, Elements, Prerequisites and Credits

In section 6.1, the names of the four elements need to be changed and repositioned.

A. Social Responsibility

Bill Foley gave an update on the language that was developed by the Social Responsibility work group. He stated that the work group was not looking to wordsmith the proposed language unless there is an incredible blunder. He stated that he would just give a broad overview of the intent and go through the credits in general.

He stated that the definition listed is the original definition that has held up since this work group began working on the document. The definition reads:

Social Responsibility - Involves the identification of issues, the development of standards and the implementation of programs that address corporate responsibility for the ethical treatment of employees, communities and other stakeholders.

The first pre-requisite is a health and safety management program. Bill Foley stated that since the intent of this section is to develop and implement an employee health and safety management process that will establish systems to detect, avoid or respond to potential threats to the health and safety of all personnel, he questioned if this area should stay in Social Responsibility or be moved to the section on Human and Ecosystem Health. The stakeholders agreed to leave it in Work Group 4.

Bill Foley next reviewed Prerequisite 2: Labor and Human Rights Management Processes.

The stakeholders discussed if all of a manufacturer’s facilities needed to fulfill these requirements or just the final place of assembly. The stakeholders agreed that it might be necessary to define corporate and facility. Mark LaCroix suggested, for the time being, to go with the final place of assembly and any facility that contributes substantially to the final product (i.e in the case of a large vertical assembly,) or as the applicant has defined in the scope. A member of the stakeholder group posed the question that if a manufacturer is receiving components from a supplier, is the recipient of the components responsible for the social practices of the supplier. The stakeholders agreed that a definition of the supply chain is necessary.

The stakeholders suggested possibly changing the language to as applicable to the product rather than as applicable to the facility. Toni Stein questioned if prison work

would be included or excluded. The stakeholders agree that prison work would be excluded. She suggested that the standard provide more clarity on how an applicant would document compliance with this pre-requisite. The stakeholders agreed that it is a reasonable prerequisite.

Bill Foley next reviewed 10.5 Credit 2: Comply with external Health and Safety Management Standard.

Toni Stein questioned how to handle the issue of non-OECD countries where there are no local regulations/oversight etc. OECD is the Organization for Economic and cooperative development. The stakeholders agreed that it might be necessary to put some information up front to define the scope of the section.

Bill Foley next reviewed the credits:

- Credit 1: Policy on Social Responsibility
- Credit 2: Comply with external Health and Safety Management Standard
- Credit 3: Social Responsibility Reporting
- Credit 4: Diversity
- Credit 5: Engage in community outreach and involvement
- Credit 6: Extend Social Responsibility Expectations into Supply Chain

The stakeholders stated that for Credit 4, it might be difficult to ensure diversity in a developing country where the population was less diverse than it in the states.

The stakeholders discussed Credit 5 and stated that this may be viewed at corporate responsibility. Jaclyn Bowen questioned if a quantitative percent was necessary. Bill Foley stated that the task group deliberating meant to not include that and to leave the community outreach extent up to the corporation.

B. Materials

Mark LaCroix stated that recent discussion in the Water and Natural Resources work group has been devoted to wood. The American Forest and Paper Association (AF&PA) developed the Sustainable Forestry Initiative (SFI) program to document the commitment of member companies in the United States to sustainable forestry. The SFI wood procurement system certification requires participant companies to have an auditable system in place to characterize the forest practices on the lands where they procure raw material. FSC Certified wood is wood that has been harvested from forests deemed to be practicing environmentally and economically sustainable forestry. The Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) is an international organization that certifies forestry practices all over the world; as a result, a wide variety of species are available as FSC Certified from common domestic species to exotic species. The task group discussed SFI vs. FSC certified wood.

The stakeholders discussed allowing credits if a percentage of wood came from FSC Certified wood and another percentage came from other recognized wood certification

plans such as SFI or the Canadian standard. This was seen as an innovative approach by most of the stakeholders and the Work Group was encouraged to continue along this line of reasoning.

With regard to the certified wood, Randy Carter questioned how that would be perceived with the motion accepted in a previous meeting stating that:

The BIFMA SAS, as with all ANSI/BIFMA standards, shall neither encourage nor discourage the use of third-party certification for conformity assessment. The BIFMA SAS shall be written to accommodate first party (manufacturer or supplier), second party (purchaser), and third party (independent of first and second party) claims of compliance. Third-party certification shall be accommodated but not required for any credit within the BIFMA SAS.

The task group discussed the feasibility of this motion when applied to certified wood because it is so engrained in the industry. Jaclyn Bowen stated that language in the standard could state that the wood in question is certified to standard xx or compliant to the requirements of standard xxx. This way, requiring certification isn't necessary, the manufacturer would just need to demonstrate compliance. A voice vote was called to determine if the approach recommended by the Work Group was in conflict with the certification motion. The consensus was that the proposed approach to the use of wood certification programs was not in conflict with the motion.

Mary Fraser walked the group through section 7.3, Increase Materials Use Efficiency. The focus of this section is to optimize the volume and weight of materials used in the manufacture and delivery of products and services. This strategy can improve the productivity of material resources and save on raw material consumption and transportation costs as well as reduce the environmental impacts of resource consumption.

It was suggested that efficiency, durability, longevity, and upgradability also be included as a component possibly in another section. Mary Fraser is to work with Clare Lindsay on material intensity. It was also suggested that Transportation be removed from this section as it is already adequately covered in the energy work group.

C. NCMS Assessment Tool Discussion

Paul Chalmer stated that he has been attempting a few different approaches to the NCMS Assessment Tool for BIFMA. Life cycle approach is looking at what happens when raw materials come into a facility. He showed the materials selection guide that would require data from the supply chain. He questioned if the stakeholders found this useful.

He stated that the focus of this tool was to help the industry figure out what kind of materials and chemicals of concern come between a manufacturer meeting the requirements of the standard. This approach was extended to include more life cycle assessment components. He questioned if the stakeholders were in need of a materials-based or life cycle assessment tool. The Energy work group responded that they were looking to identify embodied energy and how much energy is used during production.

Scott Lesnet stated that he would be in touch with Paul Chalmer to provide him with new information on numbers for File cabinets.

D. Schedule

Bill Stough stated that there would be no face-to-face meeting in November. The work groups are still encouraged to hold conference calls and meetings seeing as it is getting close to deadline and there is still work to do.

The stakeholders discussed creating guidelines and certification policies. Jaclyn Bowen stated that the guidelines and policies are not part of the consensus process and could be created after the standard. Most of the components of the guideline could be incorporated into an informational annex in the back of the standard.

Tom Reardon stated that the next BIFMA board meeting is January 24, 2006.

The stakeholders discussed the document and if it was nearing completion. Jaclyn Bowen stated that the stakeholder group could issue a straw ballot among themselves to see what aspects of the standard still needed to be developed.

Continuation of Work Group 7.0 Materials

Jim Kozminski and Mike Zimmerman led the group through the changes in section 7.1 on DfE. Stakeholders recommended that the issue areas listed under Documentation be moved up into the requirement section to help better define the meaning of the minimum requirements of a DfE program.

The issue was raised about how to define baseline so that companies that have already instituted DfE or any other aspects of the standard not be penalized for doing past good work when they apply for conformance to the standard. After discussion a consensus developed that applicants would be given flexibility in identifying the baseline year. It suggested that applicants be allowed to go back up to seven years to establish the baseline, the rationale being that seven years is the amount of time the Internal Revenue Service requires documents to be retained. It was also suggested that Jim Kozminski wordsmith the language contained in section 7.1 to clarify that it is the product undergoing the certification. It was also suggested to define LCA summary.

Randy Carter again brought up the question if the reference to ISO 14040 violates the motion to not utilize third party certification. Jim Kozminski agreed to look at ISO 14040 and check on the requirements.

Denise Van Valkenburg suggested removing the reference to 5 Winds or to add other consulting firms.

The stakeholders discussed the need for BIFMA to hold an LCA workshop. The stakeholders suggested possibly holding it in the Detroit, Grand Rapids, or Chicago areas. Mary Fraser stated that BASF could potentially support that effort and offered the group to utilize BASF meeting space.

The stakeholder next discussed recyclability. In order for recycling to be economically valuable, a product must be able to be taken apart quickly and in an economically viable way. The stakeholders agreed that marking the products for recycling purposes was an integral component of a product's recycling success. It was also suggested that a definition be included or a requirement be added that these potentially recycled products need to be capable of being disassembled with simple tools.

There was a question about which work group should take the lead on solid waste generation, since it was not explicitly identified in the Materials section under the DfE approach. The Materials Work Group agreed to address material destined for disposal as part of their work.

Clare Lindsay walked the group through her segment on recycled materials and optimizing end of life management.

Mark LaCroix walked the group through Karen Worthy's work on water inventory.

It was pointed out that POGW is incorrect and should be replaced with POTW just above 7.10. It was stated that 20-30% less water may be too high for new companies and the standard should perhaps start with 15%. The stakeholders agreed to revisit this issue if needed.

F. Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy

John Shank gave an overview of the Energy Efficiency & Renewable Energy section. It focuses on energy conservation from building operations, product design, manufacturing processes and energy consumption of a product during its use. In addition, there are incentives to produce energy on-site and to purchase renewable energy.

John Shank stated that the work group still needed to update the credit about green house gases and organize the innovation credits. During the last face-to-face, the stakeholders discussed the term green energy vs. renewable energy.

Larry Dykuis stated that he had one overall comment. So far, no one has looked at all the sections put together yet. We have some prerequisites that can be created but are policy. A manufacturer shouldn't be able to get certified if they are only implementing policies rather than making the changes in their inventory.

G. Adjourn

Laura Rauwerda stated that the DEQ is partnering with series of manufacturers on November 1, 2006 at the Eagle Eye Golf Club to focus on the sustainable reporting initiative. If you are interested in attending, please see Laura Rauwerda.

Tom Reardon presented Paul Chalmer with a gift on behalf of BIFMA and NSF for hosting this meeting.

Attendees:

In Person:

Bowen, Jaclyn- *NSF International*
Carter, Randy- *Steelcase Inc.*
Chalmer, Paul- *National Center for Manufacturing Sciences*
Dykhuis, Larry- *Herman Miller Inc.*
Earnest, Matt- *Interface Fabrics*
Foley, Bill- *Interface Fabrics*
Fraser, Mary- *BASF Corporation*
Kozminski, Jim- *Haworth*
LaCroix, Mark- *Interface*
Miller, Brad- *BIFMA International*
Musculus, Jeff- *Steelcase Inc.*
Newett, Lou- *Knoll Inc.*
Rauwerda, Laura- *State of Michigan DEQ*
Reardon, Tom- *BIFMA International*
Saliers, Anne- *izzydesign*
Shank, John- *Kimball International*
Stevens, Fred- *Group Dekko*
Stough, Bill- *Sustainable Research Group*
Van Valkenburg, Denise- *Steelcase Inc.*
Wilson, Jane- *NSF International*
Wing, Gabe- *Herman Miller Inc.*
Zimmerman, Michael- *Sauder Woodworking*

Via Conference Call:

Boyd, Clinton- *Sustainable Research Group*
Brenner, Diana- *Brenner Design (AIA Rep)*
Choo, Charles- *Teknion Furniture Systems Ltd.*
Dunning, Deborah- *IDCE*
Jenkins, Peggy- *CA Air Resources Board*
Lesnet, Scott- *HNI Corporation*
Lindsay, Clare- *US EPA- Office of Solid Waste*
Manzo, Catherine on behalf of Kathleen Vokes- *USEPA*
Stein, Toni- *California DHS*
Steady, Scott- *AQS*
Taube, Ben- *GreenGuard*
Worthy, Karen- *Global Contract Inc.*