Welcome & Agenda
Jessica Slomka, NSF Secretariat, took attendance and read the antitrust statement. Matthew Realff reviewed the agenda. The goal of this call is to finishing reviewing criteria that the JC did not complete at the face-to-face meeting last week.

Slomka noted that there were 13 voting JC members in attendance. Since quorum is 20, absentee ballots will be sent to all JC voting members not in attendance to reach quorum on any motions made during the meeting. [Meeting postscript: quorum was reached following the meeting and all motions passed.]

- Roll Call / Anti-Trust / Review Agenda
- Section 12 - EOL Management
  - 12.2.2 Publically available record of the reusability/recyclability achievement
- Section 9 – Design for Repair, Reuse, and Recycling & Section 10 – Product Longevity
  - 9.1.4 Information and Reporting in Preparation for Re-use and Recycling
  - 9.1.6 Informing Reuse Operators and Treatment Operators of Information Available for their Assistance (Corporate)
  - 9.2.1 Reduction of Materials Incompatible with Recycling
  - 10.1.2 Product User and Reuse Operator Access to Enabling Code (tentative)
- Section 8 - Packaging
  - 8.1.2 Recyclable packaging materials
  - 8.1.3 Total recycled fiber content in packaging
  - 8.2.1 Higher Total Recycled Fiber and Post Consumer Content
  - 8.1.4 Elimination of individual packaging for hardware and components (modifications)
  - 8.1.5 Elimination of chlorine in packaging materials
  - (Deletion) 8.2.1 Compostable, Recyclable, and/or Reusable Packaging
  - 8.3.1 Optimization of packaging system to reduce packaging volume
- Wrap up and Action Items
- JC Straw Ballot of Today’s Motions
- Adjourn

Sections 12 – 12.2.2
Julie-Ann Adams, TG 12 Chair, presented the proposed criterion:
- 12.2.2 Publically available record of the reusability/recyclability achievement
Below is a summary of the TG 12 submittal on recyclability calculations with the outcome of the JC November 13 call in the right-hand column. See “Section 12 End of Life Management – JC Nov F2F and 11/13 2014 Meetings FINAL.docx” for the complete TG submittals and edits made by the JC during the November 5-6 meeting and November 13 call.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion Number and Title</th>
<th>Optional Points</th>
<th>Status and Reference Documents</th>
<th>Status after Meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.2.2 Publically available record of the reusability/recyclability achievement</td>
<td>TG Recommendation</td>
<td>JC approved to go to Straw Ballot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion Criterion 12.2.2:** Adams presented this criterion language. The criterion requires the manufacturer to work with the operators they have contracts with such that the recyclers annually report how much of the server product was received and the percentage that was recycled, reused, and recovered. The committee revised the language for clarity.

Holly Elwood noted EPA is generally in support of this approach but recommended adding definitions; for example, different countries could interpret “end of waste status” differently for each component of the server (e.g. the circuit board). The JC discussed moving the flowcharts to an annex in the final cleanup of the document. Slomka indicated that some NSF standards keep flowcharts and calculations in the body of the standard, while others include as an annex. Depending on what the JC decides, this could be done during the editorial cleanup.

Westervelt suggested adding disposal to the first sentence for consistency with the bulleted list of percentages to report. Adams said it could be included, however, the calculations include other options. In addition, recycling, reuse, and recovery are achievements, however, land filling it not an achievement. Disposal was not added.

**Action Items:**
- Define end of waste status – possibly as a note to this criterion
- Consider moving the flowchart to an annex (editorial)

**Motion:** Realff asked for a motion to move 12.2.2, as revised, to straw ballot to go into the draft standard?
  a. Motion: Wayne Rifer
  b. Second: Sarah Westervelt
  c. Consensus: All in favor – no objections; will move forward for straw balloting

**Section 9 & 10 – Design for Repair, Reuse and Recycling & Product Longevity**
Wayne Rifer, TG 9/10 Chair, presented recommendations of the 3 remaining criteria in Section 9 developed by Task Group 9 & 10. Below is a summary of the TG 9/10 submittal with the outcome of the JC November 13 call in the right-hand column. See “Section 9 10 Design for 3R Longevity – JC Nov F2F and 11/13 2014 Meetings FINAL.docx” for the complete TG submittal and edits made by the JC during the November 5-6 meeting and November 13 call.
**TG 9 & 10 status summary:** The TG has completed a recommended draft set of criteria with 2 prerequisites and 1 optional criterion for Section 9, 1 prerequisite for Section 10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion Number and Title</th>
<th>Optional Points</th>
<th>Status Pre-Meeting</th>
<th>Status after Meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 9 - Design for Repair, Reuse and Recycling</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prerequisite Criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.1.4 Information and Reporting in Preparation for Re-use and Recycling</td>
<td></td>
<td>TG Recommendation</td>
<td>Motioned to Straw Ballot as a prerequisite for silver and gold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.1.6 Informing Reuse Operators and Treatment Operators of Information Available for their Assistance (Corporate)</td>
<td></td>
<td>TG Recommendation</td>
<td>Motioned to Straw Ballot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optional Criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.2.1 Reduction of Materials Incompatible with Recycling</td>
<td></td>
<td>TG Recommendation</td>
<td>Motioned to Straw Ballot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 10 – Product Longevity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prerequisite Criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1.2 Product User and Reuse Operator Access to Enabling Code</td>
<td></td>
<td>TG Recommendation</td>
<td>Not Ready to be Discussed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion of Criterion 9.1.4:** Rifer presented this criterion language. The JC discussed the viability and value of the criterion. Adams noted that this criterion would be valuable based on her outreach to operators. Rifer clarified that this criterion does go beyond current laws, therefore providing value for reuse and recycling.

Elwood noted the EPA was concerned with timing of report preparation in relation to product registration. The group discussed and decided to remove the timing language. Elwood suggested adding “without restriction” to the uniform URL language (that was approved by the JC at the November 5-6 meeting) throughout the standard. The group agreed that any changes to the URL language will need to be balloted separately if the committee wants to add it throughout the standard.

In an effort to not disadvantage small manufacturers, the group decided to make the criterion required for silver and gold levels (but not bronze).

**Action Items:**
- Make language about “prerequisite for silver and gold” consistent with section 5

**Motion:** Realff asked for a motion to approved 9.1.4 to go to straw ballot as a required criterion for silver and gold certification.
  a. Motion: Bill Baxter
  b. Second: Holly Elwood
  c. Consensus: All in favor – no objections; will move forward for straw balloting

**Discussion of Criterion 9.1.6:** Rifer presented this criterion language. The group revised the language to removed redundancy.
Motion: Realff asked for a motion to move 9.1.6 (as revised) to straw ballot to go into the draft standard?
   a. Motion: Holly Elwood
   b. Second: Cate Berard
   c. Consensus: All in favor – no objections; will move forward for straw balloting

Discussion of Criterion 9.2.1: Rifer presented this criterion language. Berard noted that the last time the JC reviewed this, there was concern about the testing methodology, which has been revised.

Several JC members expressed concern about the word “additives” – all plastics are made with additives – and the inclusion of pigments. The group discussed possible revisions to address these concerns. The group revised the language to remove reference to pigments and additives, and only include a specific list of restricted additives.

Motion: Realff asked for a motion to move 9.2.1 (as revised) to straw ballot to go into the draft standard?
   a. Motion: Holly Elwood
   b. Second: Cate Berard
   c. Discussion on pigments
   d. Amended motions to include additional revisions
   e. Motion: Cate Berard
   f. Second: Holly Elwood
   g. Consensus: All in favor – no objections; will move forward for straw balloting

Section 8 – Product Packaging
Patty Dillon, TG 8 Chair, presented the status and recommendations of Task Group 8. Below is a summary of the TG 8 submittal with the outcome of the JC November 13 meeting in the right-hand column. See “Section 8 Product Packaging – JC 11/13 2014 Meeting FINAL.docx” for the complete TG submittal and edits made by the JC during the meeting. Note that the JC skipped several criteria due to time constraints, and will discuss on next call.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion Number and Title</th>
<th>Optional Points</th>
<th>Status Pre-Meeting</th>
<th>Status after Meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prerequisite Criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1.2 Enhancing recyclability of packaging materials</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>TG Recommendation</td>
<td>Motioned to Straw Ballot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1.3 Total recycled fiber content in packaging</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>TG Recommendation</td>
<td>Not discussed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1.4 Elimination of individual packaging for hardware and components</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>JC approved (June straw ballot)-TG recommendation for modification to address JC straw poll comment</td>
<td>Motioned to Straw Ballot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1.5 Elimination of chlorine in packaging materials</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>TG recommendation</td>
<td>Motioned to Straw Ballot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optional Criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2.1 Higher Total Recycled Fiber</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>TG Recommendation</td>
<td>Motioned to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and Post Consumer Content | Delete
---|---
8.2.1 Higher Total Recycled Fiber and Post Consumer Content | 1 | TG Recommendation | Not discussed
8.3.1 Optimization of packaging system to reduce packaging volume | up to 5 points | TG Recommendation | Not discussed

Discussion of Criterion 8.1.2: Dillon presented this criterion language. She noted that this criterion was presented to the JC at the May meeting, and there was concern about defining “recyclable” packaging. As a result, the TG is recommending technical requirements to facilitate recycling, and not define recyclable. The group discussed the greater than 25 g requirement, and revised it to greater than or equal to.

**Motion:** Realff asked for a motion to move 8.1.2 (as revised) to straw ballot to go into the draft standard?
- a. Motion: Holly Elwood
- b. Second: Julie-Ann Adams
- c. Consensus: All in favor – no objections; will move forward for straw balloting

**Motion:** Revise all numerical values with a greater than sign, currently existing in the standard, to greater than or equal to.
- a. Motion: Cate Berard
- b. Second: Holly
- c. Consensus: All in favor – no objections; will move forward for straw balloting

Realff noted that all references to “less than” will remain as is.

Discussion of Criterion 8.1.4: Dillon presented this criterion language. She noted that the proposed revision is in response to a June straw ballot comment.

**Motion:** Realff asked for a motion to move 8.1.4 to straw ballot to go into the draft standard.
- a. Motion: Holly Elwood
- b. Second: Cate Berard
- c. Consensus: All in favor – no objections; will move forward for straw balloting

Discussion of Criterion 8.1.5: Dillon presented this criterion language. Realff noted that as written this criterion would prohibit salt in the processing water. The group revised the language to specifically address bleaching instead of “processing”.

**Motion:** Realff asked for a motion to move 8.1.5 (as revised) to straw ballot to go into the draft standard.
- a. Motion: Holly Elwood
- b. Second: Julie-Ann Adams
- c. Consensus: All in favor – no objections; will move forward for straw balloting

Discussion of former Criterion 8.2.1 (Compostable, Recyclable and/or Reusable Packaging): Dillon presented this criterion language. The TG is suggesting that 8.2.1 be deleted from the standard The TG is proposing that compostable and recyclable not be covered in the standard. Compostable is dependent
on the availability of regional composting facilities, and recyclable is difficult to define. Reusable packaging is covered in another optional criterion.

**Motion:** Realff asked for a motion to delete former 8.2.1 - Compostable, Recyclable and/or Reusable Packaging.

a. Motion: Cate Berard
b. Second: Holly Elwood
c. Consensus: All in favor – no objections; will move forward for straw balloting

**Next Meeting:** December 9th, 2014

**Next Steps:**
The motions to straw ballot will be emailed to the remaining JC voting members that were not in attendance at this meeting. Once quorum is reached through email, the motions will be electronically straw balloted on the NSF Online Workspace.

**Motion to adjourn meeting**
Motion: Julie-Ann
Second: Cate Berard

**Attendance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization/Suborganization</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Really Green Credentials Ltd</td>
<td>Julie-Ann Adams</td>
<td>User</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant - User</td>
<td>William Baxter</td>
<td>User</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Department of Energy</td>
<td>Cate Berard</td>
<td>Public Health / Regulatory</td>
<td>Vice chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Electronics Council</td>
<td>Pamela Brody-Heine</td>
<td>General Interest</td>
<td>Observer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SABIC</td>
<td>Ralph Buoniconti</td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US DOE Sustainable Acquisition Program</td>
<td>Sandra Cannon</td>
<td>General Interest</td>
<td>Observer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRDC</td>
<td>Pierre Delforge</td>
<td>Public Health / Regulatory</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dillon Environmental Associates</td>
<td>Patty Dillon</td>
<td>General Interest</td>
<td>Observer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Environmental Protection Agency</td>
<td>Holly Elwood</td>
<td>Public Health / Regulatory</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California EPA - Department of Resources R...</td>
<td>Fareed Ferhut</td>
<td>Public Health / Regulatory</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underwriters Laboratories, Inc.</td>
<td>William Hoffman</td>
<td>User</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Maryland</td>
<td>Anne Jackson</td>
<td>User</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronics TakeBack Coalition</td>
<td>Barbara Kyle</td>
<td>Public Health / Regulatory</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US General Services Administration</td>
<td>Michael Morimoto</td>
<td>Public Health / Regulatory</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AT&T

Swathy Ramaswamy
General Interest Observer

Georgia Institute of Technology

Matthew Realff
Public Health / Regulatory Joint Committee Chair

Green Electronics Council

Wayne Rifer
User Member

NSF International

Jessica Slomka
General Interest Secretariat

Basel Action Network

Sarah Westervelt
Public Health / Regulatory Member