NSF 426 Environmental Leadership Standard for Servers (ELSS) Joint Committee
Meeting Summary
July 22, 2014, 11 am – 1:00 pm eastern

This document is the property of NSF International (NSF), part of the NSF standards development process and is for NSF Committee purpose only. Unless given prior approval from NSF, it shall not be reproduced, circulated, or quoted, in whole or in part, outside of NSF.

Meeting Summary
Agenda & Antitrust Statement
Jessica Slomka, NSF Secretariat, welcomed participants, noting that the Joint Committee (JC) Chair, Matthew Realff, will be a few minutes late. Slomka took attendance and read the antitrust statement.

Slomka reviewed the meeting agenda. There were no proposed changes to the agenda.

Approval of May F2F Minutes
Slomka asked the JC if they had any comments on the meeting summary from May 20-21, 2014. The JC had no comments or revisions to the May meeting summary. The minutes were approved by affirmation.

Straw Ballot Comments
Jessica thanked the JC for balloting on the recent straw ballots. All 9 straw ballots have been approved, and have been incorporated into the updated 426 draft standard document now posted on the NSF Online Workspace.

Jessica explained that a couple JC members submitted comments on the ballots. The comments fell into three categories. Jessica explained the categories and how each is handled:

1) Editorial – When comments are editorial/grammatical improvements and do not modify the intent of the criterion, NSF will put them forward to JC for approval.

2) Topics/issues that have not been discussed by the TG or JC – If a topic or issue has not previously been discussed or addressed by TG or JC, NSF will ask the TG or JC to consider the item.

3) Topics/issues that have already been discussed and balloted - Issues that have been previously discussed by the JC and balloted, and where the comment does not introduce new information, the comment will be noted but no further action will be taken. The JC, through a motion, can choose to reopen a topic for discussion.

There were no questions on the handling of comments.

Jessica then showed the JC the 3 editorial comments and asked if there were any objections to including those edits in the next version of the draft standard. There were no objections to the 3 editorial changes; they were all approved.

Pamela Brody-Heine noted that the remainder of the comments fell into category 2 or 3, and will be handled as noted above. Slomka reminded the JC that the comments are posted on the NOW system, if anyone is interested in reviewing them.
Section 5 – Energy: Review TG Recommendations

Criterion 5.3.1
Brody-Heine presented the TG recommendation for criterion 5.3.1 on energy efficiency in the supply chain. The JC discussed the criterion and modified the text, including the following:

- The first sentence was modified to clarify the intent. Specifically, the criterion is not requiring that the product contain certain parts. Rather the criterion requires that at least one supplier of certain parts be certified by the SEP program.

- The question was raised about the adoption of the SEP program by industry. Holly Elwood referred to a presentation from a program official on this topic. The program is a little over 2 years old and is expanding. It’s getting additional support from the Obama administration. Several facilities are certified in US and certification is expanding to other countries.

- A JC member asked if SEP is equivalent to ISO 150001; and is it international recognized? Elwood noted that conformance with SEP requires certification to ISO 15001, and additional requirements. The DOE program requires goal setting and provides technical assistance. SEP is collaborating with other counties to work on internationalization of the SEP program. Walter Jager requested that the JC outline, where possible, technical performance requirements that can be implemented anywhere in the world, rather than referencing a program. Patty Dillon stated that similar programs with the same technical requirements can be adopted within the NSF continuous maintenance process.

  Motion: Elwood motioned to approve criterion 5.3.1 as modified to move to ballot.
  Seconded: Wayne Rifer
  Objections: None
  Abstentions: None
  Motion passed unanimously.

Section 6 – Substances of Concern: Review TG Recommendation

Deletion of criterion on non-mercury containing light sources
Brody-Heine presented the TG recommendation for deleting the criterion on non-mercury containing light sources. The TG had asked the researchers to explore the prevalence of mercury in servers, noting that the research deliverable is posted on the NSF workspace (see NSF 426 Research Task 3 - Presence of Mercury in Servers). The researchers concluded that “Based upon our understanding of current server design, a criterion specifying that products shall not contain lamps with intentionally added mercury is not likely to result in any changes in server design, or any environmental savings.”

The JC discussed the deletion of this criterion.

  Motion: Cate Berard made a motion to remove criterion 6.1.3.
  Second: Paul Parkinson
  Objections: None
  Abstentions: None
  Motion passed unanimously.

Criterion 6.2.1
Pamela Brody-Heine presented the TG recommendation for criterion 6.2.1 for lead. Walter Jager reviewed the referenced exemptions. The JC discussed the exemptions and lead elimination, and modified the criterion. Topics discussed included:
• Whether this leadership standard should require elimination of the use of lead, rather than elimination of exemptions. Jager stated that the TG didn’t do a thorough review of the feasibility of each exemption, and not sure if it’s feasible to remove all exemptions over next 5 years. Westervelt also asked the group to consider not referencing other nation’s laws but to get at the route of the issue. Brody-Heine suggested possibly a tiered criterion: eliminate certain exemptions; and eliminate lead. Jager added that the referenced exemptions are the applications that use greater amounts of lead (e.g., grams of lead, not micrograms.). Berard added that this list was derived from exemptions that some manufacturers were already eliminating.

• Is “utilize” the correct verb? Jager explained that some manufactures “claim” the exemption, but others do not. Prefer not to use “claim” because a manufacturer might not “claim” the exemption, but the product might still contain lead in the application. Parkinson voiced that “utilize” was a better term.

• Should exemption “7b” should be its own exemption as it may be harder to eliminate lead from solder. Jager noted that this exemption is likely to go away soon, and some manufacturers are no longer claiming. Jager also noted that other exemptions cover lead in solder but they are specific (e.g., high melt, use in capacitors).

• Should verification requirements be added? Jager noted that going the route of 1680.1 would just increase testing cost. Verification should require conformity assessment program.

The JC agreed to add a table to the criterion, reflecting a tier in exemptions, and modify the title. The JC also agreed to ask the TG to consider verification requirements in parallel and consistent with verification of other criteria in Section 7.

Action Items:
  - TG to add verification language for review on next JC call.

Motion: Barbara Kyle made motion to approve the 6.2.1 criterion text as modified on the call through the end of table 6.X with the TG to consider adding verification language.
Second: Holly Elwood
Objections: None
Abstentions: None
Motion passed unanimously.

Section 7 – Preferable Materials Use: Review TG Recommendation

Criterion 7.3.1
Patty Dillon presented the TG recommendation for criterion 7.3.1. This criterion was discussed at the May JC meeting. The JC supported the concept, and asked the TG to work with NSF to address potential commercial terms in the May draft. The revision language was proposed by NSF to address commercial terms. The JC discussed and modified the criterion as follows:

• For clarity and consistency, the reference to points was moved to the end of the criterion and the numbered list was changed to a bulleted list. Dillon clarified that it is the intent of the criterion to require the customization to cover all listed options.

• Bullet for memory and drives was struck as this might void a warranty & might not be consistent with the definition of “product” in the standard.

• Bullet for cosmetic/blank dummies was changed to read “un-required parts” since some cosmetic pieces might have a function.
Motion: Paul Parkinson motioned to approve the language in 7.3.1 as modified and displayed on the screen.
Second: Bill Baxter
Negative: None
Abstentions: None
Motion passed unanimously.

Section 9/10 – Design for Repair, Re-use and Recycling & Product Longevity

Criterion 9.1.2
Wayne Rifer presented the TG recommendation for criterion 9.1.2. The JC discussed and modified the criterion, including:

- Why was 100 g chosen? Wayne noted that 100 g was appropriate for markings, since 25 g would be quite a small part. Cate noted that section 9/10 consistently uses 100 g.
- Do we want to define plastic part as part of an assembly or not; e.g., a fan? The text was modified to include a note stating that for components, the requirement applied only to the plastic part. “Parts” and “components/assemblies” also will be included in the overall definitions.

Action Items:
- Include part, component and assembly in definitions.

Motion: Cate Berard made a motion to move the criterion to ballot as modified.
Second: Wayne Rifer
Objections: None
Abstentions: None
Motion passed unanimously.

Criterion 9.1.3
Wayne Rifer presented the TG recommendation for criterion 9.1.2. The JC discussed the criterion and agreed to several modifications, including:

- Calculations should be m₂/m₁.
- Clarify that printed circuit boards considered “recyclable for the purpose of the calculation”
- For clarity, “fraction” was changed to “parts, components and assemblies”
- Recovery should be clarified as “energy recovery”

Jager asked Rifer if any part of the requirement conflicted with IEC 62635 on recyclability calculation; e.g., the IEC says circuit boards are “partially recyclable” and “partially recovered”? Rifer stated that he believed it was consistent with the exception of the explicit statement about circuit boards.

The JC requested additional time to consider the criterion text. The criterion will be taken up on the next JC call on September 16.

The JC did not have time to discuss the remainder of the TG 9/10 recommendations.

Next Steps The items not covered today will be considered on the next JC call on September 16.

JC Straw Ballot of today’s motions will be bundled with motions from the next JC meeting on 9/16 and then will be balloted.
Realff thanked participants for attending the JC meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 1:00 pm.
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