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

There were 14 voting JC members (excluding Cate Berard) in attendance. The meeting attendance record is located at the end of this document.

Cate Berard, Vice Chair, welcomed JC members and reviewed the agenda. The goal of this call is to review criteria/text from Task Group 13, review and approve responses to comments from the December straw ballot, review definitions and discuss the weighting and scoring survey results and next steps.

Agenda
- Roll Call / Anti-Trust / Review Agenda / Approve Feb. 5th Meeting Summary
- Update on IEEE/NSF Mediation
- Section 13 - Corporate Responsibility
  - 13.5.3 Certification to Social Responsibility Performance Standards - Discuss and approve TG recommendation
  - 13.4.1 Conflict Minerals Sourced Only from Validated Conflict Free Smelters - Proposal from Brian Martin, if available
- Responses to Comments from December Straw Ballot
  - Report back from Ralph Buoniconti and Brian Martin regarding consideration of LCA criterion "Demonstrated Reduction in Product Environmental Impacts"
  - Review and approve responses to comment
- Definitions - Review & approve
- Weighting and Scoring
  - Summary of survey results for weighting and scoring
  - Discuss & approve
- Wrap Up and Action Items
  - Outstanding Items
  - JC review of draft standard
  - Scheduling of meetings
  - March calls
  - Possible face to face meeting - June 25th - 26th
- Adjourn

Approval of 2/5 Meeting Summary
Motion: Berard asked for a motion to approve the 2/5 meeting summary.
  a. Motion: Fareed Ferhut
  b. Second: Ralph Buoniconti
c. Consensus: All in favor – no objections; meeting summary notes approved

**Update on IEEE/NSF Mediation**
Jessica Evans gave an update on the IEEE/NSF mediation. Currently IEEE is in the process of reviewing the comments submitted by the NSF leadership team. IEEE is expected to respond to comments this week. Once the final edits are completed, the documentation will be shared with both the IEEE and NSF stakeholders for review and open for comment. When consensus is reached by all parties including members of the NSF and IEEE consensus bodies, a face-to-face meeting (with all stakeholders) will be scheduled in Washington, DC to launch this joint initiative. Dates will be determined once consensus is reached.

**Discussion:** Holly Elwood suggested creating a timeline distribute to all stakeholders when a final agreement is reached. Wayne Rifer asked about the purpose of the Washington, DC meeting. Evans confirmed that this meeting will be to launch the new joint effort. Questions were asked about the composition of the new committee, and whether balance was evaluated. Evans explained that these details are laid out in the draft joint process document, and it currently says that participants from both NSF and IEEE will be joined to form the new committee. An evaluation of the composition of this joint group was examined about 6 months ago, and is likely no longer relevant. Barbara Kyle noted that the NSF ELSS standard is almost completed, and she’d want assurances that it’s not going to be an additional 2-3 year process. She noted that IEEE doesn’t provide staffing and support to keep the process moving along. Kyle suggested incorporating language in the agreement that IEEE would commit to a timeline and resources to make it happen. Evans confirmed that IEEE has committed to providing additional resources. Elwood noted that extra efforts should be made to make sure we confirm which policies and procedures will be used moving forward, and work out the details of operating procedures prior to launching the joint process.

**Feel free to email Jessica Evans directly if you have questions (jevans@nsf.org)**

**Section 13 - Corporate Responsibility**

**13.5.3 Certification to Social Responsibility Performance Standards** - Barbara Kyle, TG Chair, presented revisions to criterion 13.5.3 for JC review. Following the February 5th JC call, TG 13 met with EICC to discuss and modify the draft language to make audit process equivalent to SA8000 and ensure consistency with EICC. The TG also added a timeframe to both the SA8000 and EICC requirements to ensure that audit reports or certifications are current. Patty Dillon reported on action items from the 2/5 call, which were reflected in the modified language. Changes include the requirement for a certificate for both the VAP audit and closure audit. EICC currently does not issue a certificate, but they are willing to provide this. In addition, the second bullet -- closure audit -- includes remedying both major and priority non-conformances, which is above what EICC currently does. Finally, SA8000 confirmed their terminology for non-conformances: critical, major, and minor. These parallel EICC. SA8000 allows minor non-conformances when issuing certifications.

**Discussion:** No discussion.

**Motion:** Berard asked for a motion to approve criterion 13.5.3.
   a. Motion: Holly Elwood
   b. Second: Dmitriy Nikolayev
   c. Consensus: All in favor – no objections; motion approved
13.4.1 Conflict Minerals Sourced Only from Validated Conflict Free Smelters – Barbara Kyle, TG Chair, explained that during the Feb. 5th call this criterion was discussed and there was an action item for Brian Martin to review criterion with in-house expert, and propose modification to criterion, if needed.

Martin reviewed his proposed addition to 13.4.1; the goal is to level the playing field to avoid unvalidated claims.

Independent private sector audit is required to verify manufacturer’s control systems and justification for determination.

Martin also suggested that the criterion could include a requirement to make the audits public, which wouldn’t be a burden for companies given SEC filings.

Discussion: Barbara Kyle asked for feedback on the proposed changes, and whether audit reports should be made public. Elwood asked if there was a third party certification for conflict free. Martin confirmed that SEC has a guidance for these audits. Bill Hoffman asked about companies that are not required to have the audit. Martin indicated it’s hard to audit either way, however, most companies will have to subject themselves to the audit because of regulation or because their customers request it. Sarah Westervelt asked if SEC spells out the audit requirements. Federico Magalini asked if the auditors had to be accredited. Martin believes that the SEC guidance does include this information but he’s not sure. Hoffman is not familiar with any auditor accreditation process. Martin will contact his staff expert, and ask him to suggest language for audits. Wayne Rifer asked how China was handling this – no one was sure. EU rules are still under development. Nikolayev suggested adding a point for public disclosure. Kyle and Elwood indicated that this section already has too many points. Brody-Heine suggested that any further changes to this criterion could be proposed during balloting. Martin closed the discussion by adding that a credible claim can only be made for tantalum today. Other metals will lag for several years for a complex assembly like a server.

Motion: Berard asked for a motion to approve revised language as noted on screen (addition of sentence “Independent private sector audit is required to verify manufacturer’s control systems and justification for determination, conducted in accordance with Rule 13p-1 under the U.S. Securities Exchange Act of 1934.”)

a. Motion: Barbara Kyle
b. Second: Sarah Westervelt
c. Consensus: All in favor – no objections; motion approved

Action Items:
- Brian Martin will verify the Rule 13 reference.
- Brian Martin will arrange a call with Seagate expert and Barbara Kyle.

Responses to Comments from the December Straw Ballot
Slomka reminded the group that during the Feb. 5th call, the JC reviewed many of the comments from the December straw ballot and proposed responses but did not have time to complete the review.

Slomka reviewed the few of the remaining responses that merited further discussion by the JC.
1) There were 6 comments regarding the deletion of the innovation section. The JC discussed this at length during the previous call and considered the following three options:

1. Consider LCA reduction criteria – 2 in support of this option
2. Add back innovations section – no one supported
3. No changes – 4 in support of this option

An action item was given to Brian Martin and Ralph Buoniconti to review the existing LCA criteria and the draft “Demonstrated Reduction in Product Environmental Impacts” criterion, and come back to this meeting with a recommendation on whether the JC should consider further changes in this section.

Buoniconti reported that they did not have time to connect to work on this. Martin did have the Seagate LCA expert review, and would like to review with Buoniconti. Elwood asked about next steps, and whether this issue needs to be resolved now, or can this be handled through balloting. Brody-Heine explained that it is up to the JC on whether they would like to consider prior to balloting. She also noted that the straw ballot response can be approved in the meantime, since the response says that the JC will address the issue, which is accurate.

**Action Items:**
- Brian Martin and Ralph Buoniconti will meet with Seagate’s LCA expert, and bring a recommendation back to the JC at the next meeting.

2) Brian Martin submitted a comment on 6.2.1 that provides information that was not specifically considered by the TG or JC. Slomka presented the comment from Martin and asked the JC whether they would like to take any action based on this comment.

**Discussion:** Brian Martin further explained his comment. It’s been his experience that based on annual, mass-level data, a company could claim compliance. However, based on extensive data collection at Seagate, they find that on a batch by batch basis you’ll periodically find failures for lead using XRF analysis, which is often not confirmed with wet chemistry. Dillon asked if Martin’s recommendation was to remove this criterion or add additional data requirements. Martin stated that it’s easy for companies to say that they eliminated exemptions, but this is not necessarily the case with credible testing. It’s difficult to establish a data system that will demonstrate conformance. Sarah Westervelt asked if Martin had any suggestions for revising the language. Since this is an environmental leadership standard, she’d like to add additional test requirements. Martin offered to go back to his team and request high level requirements. Walter Jager pointed out that the discussion was focused on contaminants, while the intended focus of the criterion is driving companies to stop purposely using lead exemptions. Dillon suggested that the JC consider restructuring the criterion to give one point to eliminating lead exemptions, and the 2nd point to providing additional data to demonstrate conformance. Brody-Heine noted, and Jager confirmed, that TG6 thought eliminating all exemptions was difficult.

**Action Items:**
- Brian Martin, Walter Jager, and Barbara Kyle will work on recommendation to address straw ballot comment.
**Motion:** Berard asked for a motion to approve the responses to straw ballot comments.
   a. Motion: Barbara Kyle
   b. Second: Dmitriy Nikolayev
   c. Consensus: All in favor – no objections; motion approved

**Definitions**
Brody-Heine introduced this agenda item. Definitions were submitted by each of the task groups for terms applicable to the criteria in their sections. The definitions were compiled into the document, “Section 3 Definitions 012915 UPDATED.docx”, which was distributed with the materials for today’s call. Comments on Section 3 were submitted from Elwood and Westervelt prior to the call.

Brody-Heine walked through the revised document with edits to address Elwood’s and Westervelt’s comments, highlighting proposed revisions to the following terms:
- Authorized accreditation body. Elwood provided comment that the definition did not apply to Section 13. The JC reviewed use of the term in Section 12 & 13. Sarah Westervelt proposed to delete the definition since it is not applied consistently in sections 12 & 13 of the standard. There were no objections.
- Declaration. Brody-Heine noted that change is to make definition consistent with Section 4, where the term is already defined.
- Environmental management system. Westervelt proposed additional sentences be added since the definition says “part of an organization’s management sentence”. Dillon reviewed the use of the term in Section 13, which require ISO 14001. There were no objections to modify definition to align with ISO 14001.
- Postconsumer, preconsumer and recycled content. EPA submitted a comment requesting that each of these terms be defined separately. The postconsumer definition was modified to define end users as found in ISO reference. There were no objections.
- Recovery. Pamela noted an oversight in including TG 12 definition. There were no objections to going with TG 12 proposed definition.
- Reuse. The JC considered 3 options, and chose one.
- Treatment. No objections to using the TG 12 approved definition.

**Motion:** Berard asked for a motion to approve the definitions to move into the draft standard.
   a. Motion: Holly Elwood
   b. Second: Sarah Westervelt
   c. Consensus: All in favor – no objections; motion approved.

---

**Meeting Wrap Up & Next Steps**
- Berard reviewed the outstanding items from today’s call
  - Weighting and scoring
  - TG 6 recommendations on responses to comments
- Brody-Heine reviewed the next steps
  - JC will be asked to do thorough review of the draft standard (with redline/strike out from last few calls) and provide comments focused on editorial changes, errors, clarifications. Substantive comments should be held for ballot.
  - Scheduling calls in March. A Doodle Poll will be sent out.
Face to face meeting at Seagate in Cupertino, CA, June 25th - 26th. The purpose will be to address straw ballot comments. The meeting is a placeholder pending whether we get substantial comments during balloting.

**Motion to adjourn meeting**
Motion: Fareed Ferhut
Second: Holly Elwood

**Attendance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Interest Category</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>Dillon Environmental Associates</td>
<td>Patty Dillon</td>
<td>General Interest</td>
<td>Observer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBH International</td>
<td>Tim Earl</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>NSF International</td>
<td>Jessica Evans</td>
<td>General Interest</td>
<td>Observer</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>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 / Regulatory</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyrcle Consulting/UN University</td>
<td>Federico Magalini</td>
<td>Public Health / Regulatory</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seagate Technology</td>
<td>Brian Martin</td>
<td>Industry</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>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth of MA</td>
<td>Dmitriy Nikolayev</td>
<td>User</td>
<td>Member</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 / Regulatory</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSF International</td>
<td>Jessica Slomka</td>
<td>General Interest</td>
<td>Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basel Action Network</td>
<td>Sarah Westervelt</td>
<td>Public Health / Regulatory</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of the Environment Food and</td>
<td>Jonathan Wood</td>
<td>Public Health / Regulatory</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>