Secretariat took attendance and read the antitrust statement. The outreach for the Joint Committee on Carpet for industry and user was also provided.

Agenda:
1. Clearly define the issues
2. Modify/clarify the issues through discussion if necessary
3. Discuss the pros and cons of incorporating the issues into the standard
4. Determine how the standard might be changed to resolve the issues
5. Develop and send a consensus recommendations report to the full Joint Committee

Fareed presented the background and the recommendation on this topic. The standard should credit manufacturers for reducing energy consumption relative to update carpet industry baseline for reporting their GHG emissions and for reducing their GHG emissions. AND second was incentivize use of onsite renewable energy generation over the purchase of renewable energy credits.

Troy Virgo provided a few comments on the issue paper recommendation. The first point was to an industry baseline where there is none that exists. So even though there is reference in the standard, there is not one place where industry is sharing data to create one industry baseline. This causes issues with certification to achieve these credits and show data from older products or reference to a similar product wherever possible. Energy is compared against themselves for reduction over time (3 years prior) to achieve these credits in 140.

Fareed explained the reason behind the issue paper was not status quo. The point was made about how relevant this standard was to the industry. His comment was what can be done to gather data on what is being done now and how can it be improved.

At some point companies will be at their maximum reduction of energy so the only way to achieve the current credit would be the purchase of energy credits. Troy felt that the current energy credits were for the most part not in need of upgrade; however there could be more recognition of GHG emissions.

Section 7 addresses renewable energy and there are sliding scales of how much; but there is only 1 point on GHG emissions. Perhaps there should be more focus on GHG reductions on a scale of more than any percentage every three years.

The goal of the report from California was to promote continuous improvement in the industry. Fareed was hearing from the industry they were not typically wanting to change. Troy disagreed that there was room for improvement within the standard.

Perhaps there could be a minimum level of performance in regard to energy related to the method of manufacture of carpet. How this would be developed was not addressed. To make the comparison of energy use per product would need to be equal. The point was to reward companies based on a fair minimum level of performance for energy use. Carpet tile versus broadloom as well as processing methods all create variable energy levels to set a baseline.
This discussion on how the baselines are calculated will need more input from a broader group. If the baseline is created and all companies can achieve the baseline for energy use for their carpet and process - then there is no method for raising the bar for the standard.

There was concern with rewarding points for simply doing an LCA without requiring reduction of high impacts.

How is the environmental impact reduced? Through energy use alone? Or the type of energy being used? It is the type and emissions associated with manufacture of the product, in Fareed's opinion. Keith commented that the LCA task group was covering this topic around impact reduction. His suggestion was to merge the two groups to address the type of energy, emissions and amount of total energy consumed.

The life cycle approach is a product based view whereas the energy and emissions was a facility approach. The LCA was thought to be a tool to show where product reductions should occur related to environmental impacts. It is consistent among many carpet products that the majority of impact is from raw materials. This is challenging as manufacturers have little control of raw materials impacts to the overall product LCA. Energy reduction should be equally weighted to GHG emission reduction was one proposal to consider as part of this pathway for awarding companies.

The task group members were asked to provide input on these two ideas and a path forward. There were two approaches presented:

- LCA using that data to determine hot spots for energy use to focus on reduction
- Utilize energy data from the various carpet products and methodologies to determine baselines (CRI, or other various industry providing data)

And some questions posed:

- Should the JC be solicited for input on these two ideas?
- What should the JC be asked for regarding input on this issue?
- Is there another approach to address energy reduction?
- How should renewable energy be addressed?

The task group will regroup to discuss feedback.
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