Welcome & Agenda
Jessica Slomka, NSF Secretariat, took attendance and read the antitrust statement.

There were 17 voting JC members in attendance. The meeting attendance record is located at the end of this document.

Matthew Realff welcomed JC members and reviewed the agenda. The goal of this call is to review criteria/text from Task Groups (TG) 8, 12, 9-1 and 4-4 and next steps for weighting and scoring.

Agenda
- Roll Call / Anti-Trust / Review Agenda / Approve Dec. 16th Meeting Summary
- Section 8 - Product Packaging
  o JC direction/approval of recycled fiber content criteria (continuation of discussion from 12/16)
    ▪ Review options for JC consideration (see p. 7-9 of "Section 8 Packaging JC Action Items from 12-9-14 call.docx")
    ▪ 8.1.3 Total Recycled Fiber Content in Packaging
    ▪ 8.2.1 Higher Total Recycled Fiber and Post Consumer Content
  o 8.3.1 Optimization of Packaging System to Reduce Packaging Volume
- Section 12 - Responsible End-of-Service/End-of-Life Management
  o 12.1.3 Trans Boundary Movement (note: EPA withdrew request to add text to footnote)
  o 12.2.2 Recyclability Achievement (modification)
  o 12.2.3 Take-Back of De-Installed Equipment
- Section 9 - Design for 3R
  o 9.4.1 Consultation for Recyclability Rate Calculation - last bullet revision
- Section 4 (global revision)
  o Structure of "Not applicable" statements - TG recommends putting "if" clause at the beginning of sentence.
    For example, revise ""Not Applicable" may be declared if the product is not a one or two socket system." To "If the product is not a one or two socket system "Not Applicable" may be declared."
- Weighting and Scoring
  o Remaining TG recommendations on optional points (placeholders for JC consideration)
  o Outstanding criteria
  o Upcoming survey for weighting and scoring
- Wrap Up and Action Items
  o Process to address comments from December straw ballot
JC Straw Ballot of Today’s Motions

- Adjourn

Approval of 12/16 Meeting Summary

Motion: Realff asked for a motion to approve the 12/16 meeting summary.
  a. Motion: Wayne Rifer
  b. Second: Ann Jackson
  c. Consensus: All in favor – no objections; meeting summary notes approved

Outcome of December Straw Ballot

Slomka thanked the JC for their participation in the straw ballot. All 13 motions passed.

- 6 motions passed unanimously (includes motions with abstentions)
- 7 motions had 1 or 2 negative votes
- 7 JC members submitted comments; these comments will be reviewed by NSF and a determination will be made as to whether the comment is editorial or technical. NSF will handle editorial comments. Depending on the technical comments, a response may be recommended to the JC for approval, the JC may be asked to further discuss the issue, or the issue may be referred to a Task Group.

The JC did not have any questions or comments.

Joint Committee Membership Participation Review

Realff announced that NSF has performed a membership participation review, and will be making adjustments to the committee. Realff stated that any observers interested in moving to a voting member status can email Jessica Slomka (jslomka@nsf.org), with their request. In addition, if any JC members and observers have suggestions for new members, please send those to Jessica Slomka (jslomka@nsf.org).

Section 8 – Product Packaging

Patty Dillon, TG 8 Chair, summarized the status of Section 8. Three criteria recommendations from TG 8 were discussed by the JC on the 12/9/14 and 12/16/14 calls. The JC requested additional time to review background information and options for recycled fiber content criteria (8.1.3 and 8.2.1), and additional clarifications were requested for 8.3.1, Optimization of Packaging System to Reduce Packaging Volume.

- Recycled fiber content criteria (continuation of discussion from 12/16)
  On the 9/16 call additional background information requested by the JC was reviewed, including definitions and the percent recycled content composition in different geographic regions. Dillon referred the JC to the background document and 9/16 meeting summary. Dillon reviewed options for JC consideration on p. 7-9 of the background document ("Section 8 Packaging JC Action Items from 12-9-14 call.docx"), noting that there was a motion to approve a total recycled fiber criterion only with no PCR differentiation. This was withdrawn following a request for additional time to review the options. Dillon also noted that language was inserted (red text) to address the JC request to provide an exemption for alternative sources of fiber based material such as mushroom packaging. The JC had discussed and LCA-based approach on the 9/16 call; since the 9/16 call the JC
members who requested the exemption agreed to the alternative text proposed in the draft criterion 8.1.3.

**Options considered:**
- #1 Required Total Recycled + Optional PCR (as proposed by TG)
  - 8.1.3 Total Recycled Fiber Content in Packaging
  - 8.2.1 Higher Total Recycled Fiber and Post Consumer Content
- #2 Required Total Recycled only
- #3 Required Total Recycled only with higher thresholds
- #4 No recycled fiber criteria

**Discussion:** Realff asked for discussion. Wayne Rifer asked if there was a TG preference for one of the options presented. Dillon indicated that the TG recommended option 1, however, option 1 was discussed on previous JC teleconference. The JC had requested additional information and discussed alternative options. Dmitriy Nikolayev noted that Holly Elwood’s concerns have led to this discussion. Elwood is fine with the option 1 exemption language on alternative fibers, and addresses EPA’s concerns. EPA prefers option 2 because it is more aggressive than 1680.2/1680.3 and 1680.1. The optional criterion (8.2.1) included in option 1 gets into postconsumer content (PCR). While EPA would like to see PCR tracked and measured, internationally that is not the case, so for this reason we don’t support the PCR requirement. Nikolayev suggested another option (option 5) to include the required criteria from option 1 and the optional 8.2.1 with higher recycled fiber content but minus the PCR requirement. Elwood suggested voting on 8.1.3 first.

**Motion:** Realff asked for a motion to approve 8.1.3 as written. *Note: Elwood withdrew original motion after discussion and moved to adopt the revised language.*

a. Motion: Holly Elwood (also motioned for revisions)
b. Second: Fareed Ferhut (also seconded for revisions)
c. Discussion: Jonathan Wood asked if we should define alternative sources, and if the list of alternative sources was exhaustive. Dillon confirmed the list is not exhaustive since it says “such as”. Brian Martin urged the group not to limit alternatives to a small number of choices as companies are trying to explore alternatives. Elwood likes sentence as written as it addresses two materials we’d like to encourage, while leaving door open for new fiber sources. Wood said he’d be concerned about biobased fibers that could be used for food or food crops. Rifer favored leaving alternatives undefined and see what happens; the language can always be modified through the continuous maintenance process. Realff asked Brian Martin if his organization would be willing to share fiber sourcing information. Martin confirmed they would reveal the material type but not the source. The group agreed this was acceptable, and added a sentence to the criterion.

d. Consensus: All in favor – no objections; motion approved

**Motion:** Realff asked for a motion to adopt optional 8.2.1 revised to remove PCR column.

a. Motion: Dmitriy Nikolayev
b. Second: Wayne Rifer
c. No discussion
d. Consensus: All in favor – no objections; motion approved

- **8.3.1 Optimization of Packaging System to Reduce Packaging Volume**
  Dillon presented modifications to the criterion to address the JC action item from the 9/16 call.
**Discussion:** A few JC members questioned whether the points for this criterion were two high relative to other criteria in the standard. Hoffman noted how UL 110 allocated points. Dillon pointed out that Section 8 on packaging only has 2 optional criteria, including the recycled fiber just approved. Criterion 8.3.1 covers several concepts, including packaging evaluation and reduction through reuse and reduction in mass. Early on the TG had recommended several separate criteria, and the JC asked that the criteria be combined. The JC agreed to revisit later, when considering the distribution of points across all sections.

**Motion:** Realff asked for a motion to approve criterion 8.3.1 as modified.
   a. Motion: Wayne Rifer
   b. Second: Cate Berard
   c. No discussion
   d. Consensus: All in favor – no objections; motion approved

**Section 12 – Responsible End-of-Service/End-of-Life Management**

Julie-Ann Adams, TG 12 Chair, was not able to attend the call, so Patty Dillon led the discussion on the three outstanding criteria.

- **12.1.3 Trans Boundary Movement**
  Dillon provided the status of this criterion. The criterion was discussed at the May face-to-face meeting. Holly Elwood, on behalf of EPA, requested a modification to the footnote. Elwood and Sarah Westervelt were tasked by the JC to come back with a modification that addresses stakeholder concerns. Elwood and Westervelt worked off-line, and ultimately, Elwood withdrew the request for a modification.

  **Discussion:** Holly explained that the text was getting too complicated, and the initial footnote was sufficient.

  **Motion:** Realff asked for a motion to approve criterion 12.1.3
   a. Motion: Holly Elwood
   b. Second: Wayne Rifer
   c. Consensus: All in favor – no objections; motion approved

- **12.2.2 Recyclability Achievement (modification)**
  Dillon explained that this criterion was approved by the JC at the May face-to-face meeting. The JC had requested that one bullet be clarified, specifically the term “end of waste status”. When reviewing the bullet, the Task Group decided that the criterion included a redundant set of bullets. The modified criterion clarifies the JC request, and also simplifies the criterion. Dillon noted that the gray text has now been approved by the straw ballot that closed yesterday. The modifications to the approved criterion are in track changes.

  **Discussion:** Bill Hoffman thought the grammar in the bullets was difficult to understand, and requested that “mass of” be used instead of “output fractions”. The JC revised the bullets as suggested, and requested parallel changes in the diagram.
Motion: Realff asked for a motion to approve criterion 12.2.1
   a. Motion: Rifer
   b. Second: Cate Berard
   c. Consensus: All in favor – no objections; motion approved

Action Item:
   o Revise the table to parallel the bullet revisions. (Note: Realff confirmed that these changes do not need to come back to the JC before straw balloting.)

• 12.2.3 Take-Back of De-Installed Equipment

Dillon presented this new optional criterion to the JC, and explained that the take back of de-installed equipment was originally in the required criterion 12.1.1. At the May face-to-face meeting the JC asked that the take back of de-installed equipment be removed from the required criterion and a separate optional criterion be created. The rationale from the JC was that these two take back requirements apply at different points in time, to products currently in the market and not products that conform to the standard, and to other manufacturer’s brands. Dillon explained that the text parallels required 12.1.1, then references the other required criteria for use of certified recycler, etc.

Motion: Realff asked for a motion to approve criterion 12.2.3.
   a. Motion: Lynn Rubinstein
   b. Second: Dmitriy Nikolayev
   c. Consensus: All in favor – no objections; motion approved

Section 9 – Design for 3R

• 9.4.1 Consultation for Recyclability Rate Calculation – last bullet revision

Brody-Heine noted that 9.4.1 was approved in the last straw ballot in December, however, there is some additional proposed revisions to the approved language under the optional points, bullet 2 to address an action items requested by the JC during the 12/16 meeting:

   ▪ Need to revise the last bullet in 9.4.1 Consultation for Recyclability Rate Calculation to have the report document specific design changes that will improve recyclability of future products; incorporate lessons learned (more than information and concepts).

Wayne Rifer, TG Chair, noted that the proposed revision adds clarity to the last bullet:

   • The report shall document potential improvements in product design and materials applicable to the product and next generation products that could increase their recyclability and potential for reuse. The report shall include information and concepts developed during the consultation that will influence the future design choices of similar and/or the next generation of the product. (1 point)

Motion: Realff asked for a motion to approve 9.4.1 revisions.
   a. Motion: Wayne Rifer
   b. Second: Cate Berard
c. No discussion  
d. Consensus: All in favor – no objection; motion approved  

Section 4 (Global Revision)  
Pamela Brody-Heine, TG 1-4 Chair, presented the TG’s recommendation Structure of “Not applicable” statements. The TG recommends reorganizing NA statements to put “if” clause at the beginning of sentence. For example, revise “*Not Applicable* may be declared if the product is not a one or two socket system.” To “If the product is not a one or two socket system *Not Applicable* may be declared.”  

Discussion: Berard asked if there were several sections with “not applicable”. Realff indicated that this is an item that does come up at times  

Motion: Realff asked for a motion to approve these revisions.  
  a. Motion: Dmitriy Nikolayev  
  b. Second: Holly Elwood  
  c. No discussion  
  d. Consensus: All in favor – no objection; motion approved  

Weighting and Scoring  
Brody-Heine explained that during the November face to face meeting the JC decided to assign optional points with the following steps:  
1. Each TG to assign points to optional criteria as a relative weighting within that section  
2. NSF to create a survey such that each JC member can submit their preferred weighting for environmental categories; results will be averaged and adjusted to be a set number of points  
3. Depending on the changes, either the JC will take on reassigning points or go back to TG will to review their criteria and assign points based on assigned weighting, if needed  

Brody-Heine explained that there are several remaining TG recommendations on optional points to completed step #1. These are placeholders for JC consideration. Brody-Heine reviewed the “Remaining TG Recommendations on Optional Points.docx” document. Barbara Kyle indicated these are difficult to evaluate without the context, and just wanted to clarify that this is just a motion for a placeholder. Realff and Brody-Heine confirmed it is a placeholder so we can then review points allocation and relative importance overall.  

Motion: Realff asked for a motion to approve these optional point recommendations.  
  a. Motion: Wayne Rifer  
  b. Second: Holly Elwood  
  c. No discussion  
  d. Consensus: All in favor – no objections; motion approved  

For step #2, NSF will send out a survey for weighting such that each JC member can submit their preferred weighting for environmental categories; results will be averaged and adjusted to be a set number of points. Brody-Heine shared a slide on the current distribution of required and optional points. She noted that all criteria under consideration were approved as of today’s call with one exception. TG 13 is still working on a social responsibility criterion.
The survey will be sent out later this week, and will be open for about two weeks. Elwood recommended a revision to change the point allocations (7.2.2 revise from 1 to 2 points and 9.5.1 revise from 2 to 1 points). Elwood asked if Martin agreed with this approach. Martin indicated that 9.5.1 is difficult to achieve and suggested revising 9.5.1 to 1 point but keeping 7.2.2 at 2 points.

**Motion:** Brian Martin motioned to change 9.5.1 from 2 to 1 point.
- a. Motion: Brian Martin
- b. Second: Holly Elwood
- c. No discussion
- d. Consensus: All in favor – no objections, motion approved

**Meeting Wrap Up & Next Steps**

**Next Meetings & Steps**

**Feb. 5th Meeting**
- o TG 13 social responsibility criterion
- o Definitions
- o Weighting & scoring

**Feb. 12th Meeting**
- o Outstanding items

**Motion to adjourn meeting**
Motion: Elwood
Second: Berard

**Attendance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Interest Category</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US Department of Energy</td>
<td>Cate Berard</td>
<td>Public Health / Regulatory</td>
<td>Vice chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUV Rheinland of North America</td>
<td>Geoffrey Bock</td>
<td>User</td>
<td>Member</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>Green Blue Institute (GreenBlue)</td>
<td>James Ewell</td>
<td>Public Health / Regulatory</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California EPA - Department of</td>
<td>Fareed Ferhut</td>
<td>Public Health / Regulatory</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</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>ECD Technology Ltd.</td>
<td>Walter Jager</td>
<td>General Interest</td>
<td>Observer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronics TakeBack Coalition</td>
<td>Barbara Kyle</td>
<td>Public Health /</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Regulatory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyrcle Consulting/UN University</td>
<td>Federico Magalini</td>
<td>Public Health /</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Regulatory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seagate Technology</td>
<td>Brian Martin</td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth of MA</td>
<td>Dmitriy Nikolayev</td>
<td>User</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Institute of Technology</td>
<td>Matthew Realff</td>
<td>Public Health /</td>
<td>Joint Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Regulatory</td>
<td>Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Electronics Council</td>
<td>Wayne Rifer</td>
<td>User</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast Recycling Council, Inc. (NERC)</td>
<td>Lynn Rubinstein</td>
<td>Public Health /</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Regulatory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSF International</td>
<td>Jessica Slomka</td>
<td>General Interest</td>
<td>Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green House Data - Data Center Operations</td>
<td>Cortney Thompson</td>
<td>User</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of the Environment Food and Rur...</td>
<td>Jonathan Wood</td>
<td>Public Health /</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Regulatory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>