

BIFMA Sustainability Assessment Standard Stakeholder Meeting
Tuesday January 9 and Wednesday January 10, 2007
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.

Day One

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.

II. Previous Meeting Minutes/Approval

The stakeholders reviewed the draft meeting summary from December. Gabe Wing suggested the following changes be made to the December meeting summary.

B. ~~Water and Natural Resources~~ Materials

Jim Kozminski and Mark LaCroix updated the group. The Natural Resources work group has been focusing on a couple of credits- materials use efficiency and end of life issues. They made some progress and are ready to put it in front of the larger group for feedback. They are hoping to have a near final version for Jaclyn to have NSF staff “check for auditability” in January. They received some valuable input from Robert Hrube of SCS on wood that validated the draft language to date. They did question if VOC emissions was going to be addressed under the scope of the Human and Ecosystem health work group. Denise VanValkenburg replied that it is on their radar and that Matt Earnest is heading up the emissions issues. Mark LaCroix added that climate is a hot topic and questioned if the stakeholders felt this should have a larger role in the standard. Mark LaCroix agreed to take this aspect on for carbon neutral products.

C. ~~Materials~~ Energy

The task group reported that they discussed renewable energy standards to reference such as the Green-E standard or a new ASTM standard that will identify an environmental performance index score for use in facilities. Jaclyn Bowen stated that the Renewable Energy task group for Sustainable Carpet was also evaluating the usefulness of this new ASTM standard. The task group is looking to restructure the language to follow the ASTM standard

Motion: Fred Stevens moved to accept the meeting summary with suggested revision. Gabe Wing seconded.

Discussion: Larry Dykuis questioned the status of the discussion of company certification vs. product certification. According to the meeting summary, it was acknowledged but appears to be an unresolved issue.

Vote: All in favor.

Motion passed.

III. Review of Agenda and Meeting Goals and Schedule

Bill Stough stated that during the December meeting, stakeholders emphasized the importance of having more full group interaction. However, with some of the work groups still having tasks to complete, continuing to have individual breakout sessions was still needed. Bill Stough stated that the focus of this meeting should be to lock in any remaining questions relating to direction and philosophy. He encouraged work groups to resolve any remaining issues preventing them from establishing a definitive approach. It is coming time to pull together a draft final document that can be put through the ANSI process.

Anne Saliers questioned if the documentation necessary to demonstrate compliance for each credit should be defined. This language lets others know the magnitude of the work required to achieve that credit. Bill Stough encouraged task groups to work on this aspect if they had reached that point, however if additional work on credits still needed to be completed, that should be accomplished first.

Mark LaCroix asked to clarify the standard development process moving forward. He questioned if BIFMA would be circulating the document to their stakeholders first and then it would go through the ANSI process. Jaclyn Bowen confirmed that it would. Mark LaCroix next questioned if the changes that may come out of the ANSI process would be sent back to the stakeholders for review. Tom Reardon responded no. *Formally, there would not be another balloting process for the stakeholders through the BIFMA process. However, ANSI does require NSF to maintain an open process including having the document available for public comment. If BIFMA stakeholders had a concern with suggested changes once the document was going through the ANSI process, they could be addressed through the public comment forum.*

Bill Stough also stated that some time over the course of this meeting, the innovation group needed to get together. The innovation component needs to be addressed before a draft document can be considered complete.

The task group next discussed product vs. company certification. Bill Stough explained that the BIFMA board originally suggested this idea in that it may make sense to have company certification in addition to product certification. When reviewing the credits, many of them were company specific rather than product specific. Bill Stough asked that the work groups consider this, factor the ramifications into their approach, and make it part of the work group recommendation.

The stakeholders agreed that it would be easiest for them to review their credits and separate them as if they are more/less product vs. company specific. Mark LaCroix stated that company and product level certifications could be confusing to the end user. Additionally, does a corporate level certification provide any value in the market? Jane Wilson agreed and added that a company certification could create the perception that all products created by that company are sustainable. Mary Ellen Mika added that with product and company certification the re-certification cycles would likely be different and cause confusion.

Anne Saliers clarified that at the board meeting, board members were looking for some way to designate those companies that pass all the prerequisites that they are on the journey to sustainability from those who aren't even trying. Company level certification would identify those companies who are conforming to the basic levels of compliance.

Gabe Wing suggested that the work groups split up and figure out which of their credits are corporate or product. Then the stakeholders can reconvene and figure out where the groups ended up in terms of credits. Mary Ellen Mika also encouraged the work groups to consider whether the credits are essential or optional in a total point system. Perhaps some of the essential components can be transitioned into pre-requisites.

Mark LaCroix reiterated that during the last meeting he expressed his concern that the standard doesn't address climate change enough. He encouraged the stakeholders to make this a larger role in the standard. John Shank stated that the Energy work group was addressing greenhouse gases and greenhouse gas reduction by putting in a point for greenhouse gas inventory and reduction. Mark LaCroix said that he could get Erin Meezan involved to perhaps propose a whole new section.

The work groups split up and reconvened after designating their points as company vs. product specific. The following table was used to tabulate the findings:

Point Breakdown			
	Company specific	Product specific	Total
Materials	3	21	24
Energy	6	14	20
Ecosystem	7	25	32
Social	8	0	8
Totals	24	60	84
Percent of points	29%	71%	100%

The stakeholders agreed that they were comfortable with the ratio of points.

The stakeholders broke into breakout groups for the remainder of the day.

Day 2

III. General Session

Bill Stough stated that the focus of the second day of the meeting was to discuss some of the issues that came up during the deliberations yesterday. The main point of discussion is the point system and if it is possible for an applicant to use the standard to get a product certified without having any credits that are product specific. As originally suggested, the point system is as follows:

Point System Breakdown¹	
Percent Achieved	Level
48	Silver
61	Gold
74	Platinum
¹ These percent levels are consistent with LEED CI	

Bill Stough stated that since only 24 of the credits were identified by the work groups as being company specific, the group didn't have to worry about an applicant using the standard to get product certified without having any product specific credits.

The stakeholders agreed to not incorporate a company-level certification.

Bill Stough stated that when considering the percent of points achieved for the various levels and the number of points actually available, below is the point distribution.

Point Distribution				
Category	Percent needed to achieve	Total points available	Math	Total points required
Silver	48	84	48/84	40
Gold	61	84	61/84	51
Platinum	74	84	74/84	62

Therefore, to demonstrate minimum compliance for Silver level, an applicant would potentially need to achieve the 24 corporate level points and 16 product specific points.

When this standard development process originally began, the following point distribution was suggested.

Point Breakdown	
Materials	30
Energy	20
Ecosystem	30
Social	15
Innovation	5

The resulting point distribution is as follows.

Point Distribution Current vs. Original						
	Current				Original	
	Company Specific	Product Specific	Total Points	Total percent	Total Points	Total percent
Materials	3	21	24	28%	30	30%
Energy	6	14	20	24%	20	20%
Ecosystem	7	25	32	38%	30	30%
Social	8	0	8	10%	15	15%
Innovation	?	?	?	-	5	5%
Totals	24	60	84	100%	100	100%

IV. Task Group Update

A. Energy

John Shank gave an update on the progress of the Energy task group. The two issues he wanted to discuss with the group were as follows:

- Energy/Renewable Resources- What about the title?
- ASTM standard on Renewable Energy

The work group decided to go with the title of Energy since it was all encompassing. Additionally they incorporated language to give a point for compliance to the ASTM standard on Renewable Energy. Jaclyn Bowen questioned the status of the ASTM standard because the last she heard, it was still being created. John Shank confirmed that it was still a work in progress. Jaclyn Bowen stated that while the timeline to completion for the ASTM standard is probably shorter than the timeline for the completion in this standard, perhaps the Energy task group should have alternative language just in case. With this standard being a living document, in the worst-case scenario, the language could be revised to incorporate reference to the ASTM standard upon its adoption.

B. Materials

Jim Kozminski and Mark LaCroix updated the group. The Materials work group has been focusing on a couple of credits and materials use efficiency and end of life issues. For the Materials Efficiency credit they were looking at awarding:

- 1 point- 80% material efficiency
- 2 points- 90% materials efficiency

The purpose of the material efficiency credit would be to reduce the quantity of raw materials used in the manufacture and delivery of products and services in order to minimize the ecological and economic footprint. Documentation for the credit would include demonstrating that waste mass calculations include materials sent to recycling unless full economic value recovery can be demonstrated. Jaclyn Bowen questioned the use of the term “full economic value” as the concept of value is a matter of perception. Mark LaCroix clarified that while value is a matter of perception, the purpose of the credit is to avoid waste in all forms in the first place.

The stakeholders suggested incorporating examples and definitions where applicable.

The Materials group next discussed recycled content.

The stakeholders agreed that as currently written, the Second Level Recycled Content Achievement might be too difficult. If a credit is too difficult, no one will strive to attain it. They suggested revising the credit to state the following:

- Option 1: change to 40%
- Option 2: change to 50%

The Materials group next discussed End-of-Life Management.

Clare Lindsay was heading up this section. The stakeholders had a lengthy discussion about Clare Lindsay’s proposed requirement for the Buy-back/Lease Back component. As currently written, Clare Lindsay is proposing that fulfilling this requirement is essential for platinum level compliance. The stakeholders discussed the concept of incorporating this approach into other sections. Some task group members felt that this was an important component since it brings this standard full circle. Toni Stein suggested changing the name of the section to Extended Producer Responsibility.

The Materials group next discussed Bio-based Materials. The stakeholders questioned how process aids would be treated. It was suggested to possibly include these as an innovation credit. The stakeholders discussed the documentation necessary to demonstrate compliance.

C. Human and Ecosystem Health

Denise Van Valkenburg walked the stakeholders through the Air Emissions credit. Randy Carter gave a PowerPoint presentation highlighting some of the important issues. Essentially, the draft language is proposing that since so many manufacturers have demonstrated compliance to the GreenGuard method, a provision would be made so that the manufacturers can also be considered compliant to this standard for 1 year. After that, they would need to comply with the requirements of BIFMA M7.

Jensen Zhang stated that the proposed 72 hour and 96 hour data points are too short for extrapolation; he suggested 72 and 168 hour as an alternative. He clarified that points before 72 hours should not be selected because the emissions have not yet peaked. The purpose of this test is to measure the decay over time.

The sub task group on Air Emissions agreed that they still had some work to do.

Denise Van Valkenburg next reviewed the credit, 9.6.1 Assessing Greenhouse Gases. This credit gives out credit for the amount of embodied energy relating to actual products. The Energy task group clarified that they too had a credit for greenhouse gases but it addressed those released from a building.

The Energy work group confirmed that they are also handling transportation.

Mark LaCroix suggested having Greenhouse Gas emissions be more prominent in the standard. Credits can be created for manufacturers who have a plan for reducing all emissions and for companies that publicly and actively report on it.

The task group next discussed the credit on phasing out chemicals of concern. This includes chemicals such as PBTs, vPvBs, carcinogens, mutagens, reproductive toxicants, and endocrine disruptors. Jaelyn Bowen stated that the Sustainable Textiles task group on Safety of Materials is addressing this same issue. She stated that the Safety of Materials group had encountered some difficulty in assigning how various chemicals should be classified. While the Safety of Materials group is referencing reputable lists, the lists are different. If a chemical shows up on one list and not another, should it still be included? She agreed to send Gabe Wing and Denise Van Valkenburg the list the Sustainable Textiles Safety of Materials group was working from.

D. Social Responsibility

Larry Dykuis gave an update on the progress of the Social Responsibility group. He stated that Jaelyn Bowen was able to provide him with comments from the NSF auditor on the Social Responsibility section's auditability.

The task group made substantive changes on the use of the term EOE (Equal Opportunity Employer) since it is strictly a US term.

V. Open items

The stakeholders discussed the timeline moving forward.

February 8, 2007- Follow-up BIFMA Board meeting

March 15, 2007- Sustainable Textiles tentatively has a face-to-face meeting scheduled in Ann Arbor.

Tom Reardon stated that he hoped this group could reconvene 6 weeks after this draft is released. The stakeholders felt that they could have the draft complete and ready to circulate to the stakeholders by January 31, 2007

A chair's meeting is scheduled for Friday January 19, 2007 from 8:30am-10am (ET) to discuss steps moving forward.

Attendees:

Via Conference Call:

Chalmer, Paul- *National Center for Manufacturing Sciences*
Fraser, Mary- *BASF Corporation*
Hansen, Jean- *Chong Partners Architecture*
Hietkamp, Doug- *Teknion*
Lindsay, Clare- *USEPA*
Manzo, Catherine *on behalf of Kathleen Vokes- USEPA*
Margosian, Rich- *SCS*
Miller, Scott- *Knauf*
Ritchie, Kirsten- *Gensler*
Steady, Scott- *AQS*
Stein, Toni- *California DHS*
Taube, Ben- *GreenGuard*
Wilson, Jane- *NSF International*
Worthy, Karen- *Global Contract Inc.*
Zhang, Jianshun- *Syracuse University*

In Person:

Bowen, Jaclyn- *NSF International*
Carter, Randy- *Steelcase Inc.*
DeVault, Kathy Jo- *Knoll Inc.*
Dykhuis, Larry- *Herman Miller Inc.*
Dykstra, Tom- *Haworth*
Kozminski, Jim- *Haworth*
LaCroix, Mark- *Interface*
Mika, Mary Ellen- *Steelcase*
Miller, Brad- *BIFMA International*
Rabiah, Janan- *ACT*
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.*
Wing, Gabe- *Herman Miller Inc.*
Worthy, Karen- *Global Contract Inc.*
Zimmerman, Michael- *Sauder Woodworking*