Welcome & Introductions
Jeff Olsen, Joint Committee Chair, welcomed the Joint Committee and thanked the EPA for hosting the space for the face to face meeting. Harry Lewis of the EPA welcomed the group. The JC participants introduced themselves. The secretariat read the anti-trust statement and noted that a quorum had not been reached and therefore all action items motioned will be followed up by electronic notification to the rest of the voting members not present. The secretariat announced membership openings in the regulatory/public health and user categories.

Motion to Approve Agenda
J. Olsen asked for a motion to approve the March 2015 agenda as written with no additions or corrections
Motion: G. Dunn
Second: C. Franklin
Vote: All in favor – no objections

Motion to Approve 2/3 & 2/10 Meeting Summaries
J. Olsen asked for a motion to approve the 2/3/15 and 2/10/15 meeting summaries
Motion: J. Farber
Second: C. Franklin
Vote: All in favor – no objections

NSF Standards Development Refresher Presentation & Meeting Strategy
There are new members that have recently joined the Joint Committee and requested an overview of the process. M. Leslie gave a brief presentation on NSF standards development and the ANSI process. ANSI’s benchmarks for due process, membership selection and responsibilities, and balloting requirements to achieve consensus were discussed. The question was raised on how membership outreach was done. M. Leslie described the various ways that NSF attempts to encourage participation by all materially affected organizations (e.g., announcements at meetings and Standards and NSF websites, direct email to trade organizations, etc.). J. Sloomka explained the importance of meeting attendance and reaching a quorum. She stated that she will be contacting those members that have not been participating to reevaluate voting membership.

Meeting Strategy
J. Olsen explained that the original task groups (economic, social, and environmental) were put on hold until the scope was better defined. An ad hoc group was created to address scope development. One option under consideration was for the standard to cover all service providers in general and then include appendices to outline requirements for specific occupations. Ultimately, the group recommended publishing a series of standards, each focusing on a different area of service provider professions. NSF 391.1 defines the professional service providers. The ad hoc group has been working to develop a recommended scope and address issues that have come up in the past. J. Olsen reported that at the last meeting, the group drafted five or six questions and came to a consensus on the language to recommend to the JC today. These questions will be presented and recommended for motioning to ballot during today’s meeting. The second goal today will be to break into the three task groups and to consider how the current sections of the standard align with the presentations from today’s meeting.
Sustainable Purchasing Leadership Council Update
C. Macken, Director of Programs for SPLC, provided an update on the SPLC guidance and pilot program. June 11th there will be an open discussion and feedback webinar specific to the professional service sector. The meeting information will be circulated to this committee. When 391.1 is completed, SPLC would like to review the standard and consider it for reference in the guidance. The potential reference would streamline the process in the guidance. SPLC is currently seeking ANSI Standards Development Organization status.

Survey Results
H. Burns indicated that the survey was created to obtain feedback from the new members. The survey was open to all participants, observers and members. There were 19 responses received, however it was sent out to 56. The survey result presentation will be circulated to the Joint Committee. B. Miller of BIFMA noted that it is promising to see that 44% feel strongly about equally weighting the sections of the standard, i.e., Social, Economic, and Environmental. The group discussed how to use these results to drive the direction of the standard and if there was the opportunity to obtain consensus and then use this feedback during the breakout. G. Dunn suggested a straw poll. J. Slomka noted that participants should consider ideas on the table and motion items to ballot in order to determine a general direction. J. Olsen indicated there are certain issues that have received consensus and can be decided on today. J. Farber asked if a response from 19 people was significant. The group discussed how the sections should be weighted and whether a working lunch could address this. C. Macken stated that weighting credits does not have to be done beforehand; you do not have to stop the process for this.

Action Item: It was suggested that the social task group create a new definition for social during the breakout session.

Procurement, Governance & Supplier
GSA Procurement
B. Conaway from GSA provided an informational presentation on procurement. A new executive order was released focusing on greenhouse gas emissions and clean energy. GSA currently does not have a product level standard and is looking to the 391 standard to identify preferred status that could be identified in contracts or evaluation factors. GSA is still trying to determine how to evaluate this (Green Procurement Compilation). EPEAT is another example of a successful standard based initiative that was eventually included in federal requirements. The 391 standard could eventually be a federal requirement.

The group discussed third party certification versus self-certification. The standard can contain labeling requirements, however, certification bodies are responsible for the third party certification requirements, which is outside the scope of the standards development process.

Governance & Supplier Comparison
D. Haworth from NSF provided an informational presentation on the comparisons of governance criteria and purchasing criteria from multiple sources. The presentation compared NSF sustainability standards, SPLC V1 pilot and the HIGGS index sources. The presentation will be circulated to the group. It was suggested that the group identify which criteria is already included in 391.1 and which needs to be added.
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Hotspot Study & Crosswalk – Quantifying the impacts

B. Conaway from GSA presented a professional service hotspot quantifying the environmental hotspots in GSA purchasing from a lifecycle perspective. The presentation (Title: Prof. Service Hotspot Presentation) was included in the meeting packet. Hot spots they found – electricity (both consumed and embodied in supply chain); waste (end of life, building, airline travel, food), packaging and printing; and shipping (transportation from shipping specifically). Other things not listed – electronics (may be embedded under electricity). The committee asked if employee commuting was included. The report is focused on expenditures, so that is probably a gap – B. Conaway agreed.

B. Conaway also reviewed the criteria hotspot/crosswalk document to categorize the existing 391.1 standard against other standards. The document compared the Carbon Disclosure Project, BIFMAe3, PSSR criteria, NSF 426 Server standard and GRI.

**Action Item:** B. Conaway will add D. Haworth’s NSF Standards Governance & Supplier comparison to the master criteria hotspot/crosswalk document.

Scope Working Group Report & Recommendations

B. Conaway presented the NSF 391.1 Scope Consensus document that was circulated in the meeting packet.

**Motion 1: Professional Services Definition** - Ballot the following recommendation for professional services definition.

NSF 391.1 shall adopt the following as a definition of professional services: *For purposes of NSF 391.1, Professional Service Firms are identified as organizations generally characterized by high knowledge intensity, low capital intensity, and with a professionalized workforce.* This definition will be supplemented by additional guidance, including a list of NAICS codes that represent providers of professional services. Additionally, the phrases appearing in **bold** will be added to the glossary as defined terms within the standard (final wording of the definitions subject to further revision).

**Motion:** J. Farber  
**Second:** G. Dunn

**Discussion:** J. Edelman presented the Edelman teams findings. They agree with the presented definition, which came from SPLC, but do they want to include all professional services, or does this need to be defined further. J. Olsen asked if there was a proposal to change the definition. G. Dunn was not sure that we are required to build this right now and suggested moving forward with the general definition. C. Macken stated that this is currently how it is defined by SPLC. A. Bayard stated that for the purpose of today’s meeting, this is a very good definition. Whether or not we ultimately shift it, is fine, but this is good for right now. The committee may want to list a few examples in the future.

**Vote:** All in favor – no objection  
**Motion Passed**
Motion 2: NSF 391.1 Scope - Ballot the recommendation that 391.1 apply at the professional service-line level.

NSF 391.1 will apply at the professional service-line level. A professional service-line is defined as the materials, activities and portions of the company centered on delivering a professional service. For companies that only offer professional services, the service line is essentially equivalent to the entire company. For companies that offer a mix of professional and non-professional services NSF 391.1 will not certify the non-professional services-line; however, given the nature of the life cycle impacts associated with professional services, NSF 391.1 will include criteria applicable to the entire company, facilities and other boundaries that may impact the non-professional service-line.

Motion: C. Franklin
Second: G. Dunn

Discussion: The service provider level applies to the organizational entity, which supports the contract for service. However, where is the service being performed addresses the local provider rather than the large corporation with multiple facilities. There was a suggestion to break the scope motion into separate questions. This is the area of greatest disconnect within the group. Some see this as the parent company. K. Alsegaf indicated that Deloitt tracks their separate entities. They choose what entity to have certified.

The group discussed consulting services. H. Lewis asked; who is this going to apply to; what portions of the commercial entities; how are we going to use this information; how do we make the information relevant? J. Edelman stated this was the most critical part of the standard. Edelman is a parent global company with corporate policies that everyone follows. H. Lewis noted that large hotel chains have thousands of properties, yet a number of ecolables (Green Seal) provide certification at the hotel level, not the corporate level. C. Franklin indicated that service level came out of cleaning companies that might offer standard cleaning services. Service provider refers to the main corporate provider and will work for many organizations. G. Dunn noted that H. Lewis is the outlier on this topic. G. Dunn asked that the group consider the definition of service line. It was suggested that the group move forward with the current motion and then revisit this topic when we move into the criteria.

Amendment to motion: C. Franklin amended motion with the following revision: Replace “service line” with “service provider”. G. Dunn seconded the motion.

Vote: 7 in favor; 1 abstention (H. Lewis)
Motion Passed

Motion 3: Consider Allowing Certification of a Sustainable Professional Service Offering when a Company Offers both a Sustainable and Non-sustainable Professional Service Offering – Ballot the recommendation to defer to a later time the proposal to consider allowing certification of a sustainable professional service offering when a company offers both a sustainable and non-sustainable professional service offering.
The Joint Committee shall discuss the merits of allowing companies to offer both sustainable and non-sustainable professional service offerings after the criteria are substantially completed.

**Motion:** K. Franklin  
**Second:** B. Conaway

**Discussion:** G. Dunn asked if we can separate these out at the client level. Some cases are not possible and we have not put this out for public comment yet; we do not if it will apply yet. There was a suggestion to postpone the recommendation. The group agreed to table the issue. A. Bayard suggested for the economic group.

**Vote:** All in favor – no objection  
**Motion Passed**

**Motion 4: Change the Organization of the Standard from ESE (Environmental, Social, Economic) to “Impact Centers”** Ballot the proposal to change the organization of NSF 391.1 from ESE to “impact centers.”

The point section of NSF 391.1 shall be organized by “Impact Centers”, and the ‘social’, ‘economic’ and ‘environmental’ impacts shall be addressed within each identified Center (see Appendix) rather than as separate sections within the standard.

**Motion:** B. Conaway  
**Second:** J. Farber

**Discussion:** H. Lewis stated it is important to focus on areas of most impact. It would be beneficial to look at the environmental impacts in each area (environmental, social, and economic). C. Macken explained that SPLC currently organizes their guidance from a product standpoint. D. Haworth noted that most standards are based on a lifecycle approach. The group discussed the lifecycle approach and the triple bottom line. Sustainable services will share some lifecycle aspects, however, to assign, for example, energy to just computers is limiting. We do not want to limit this upfront. Consider how to harmonize and promote adoption. Creating broader buckets for the products may be the best approach to include.

**Vote:** Consensus not achieved  
**Motion Failed**

**Motion 5: Continued use of Pre-requisite and Point-based Criteria across all Categories** - Ballot the recommendation to reaffirm that the structure of the standard continue to include prerequisites and point-based criteria.

NSF 391.1 may include both prerequisite and point-based criteria within any category of the standard. Prerequisite criteria are mandatory and must be achieved in order for a professional service provider to be certified to the standard. Individual point-based criteria are optional but include points that cumulatively allow a service provider to achieve certification and higher tiers of performance.
Motion: G. Dunn  
Second: K. Franklin  

Discussion: G. Dunn noted that for a certain category like the governance, it may not be a prerequisite, but points should be awarded.  

Vote: All in favor – no objection  
Motion Passed  

Motion 6: Include Management and Governance Criteria in NSF 391.1 - Ballot recommendation to include management and governance criteria under NSF 391.1.  

NSF 391.1 shall include management and governance criteria.  

Motion: J. Farber  
Second: K. Franklin  

Discussion: There was discussion about defining management and what the difference was between governance and management. It was questioned whether management falls under governance. It was clarified that this motion is meant to address the direction of the group and to indicate that management criteria should be included in the standard. H. Lewis stated that governance and management are important and should not be allotted points but should be prerequisites instead.  

Vote: All in favor – no objection  
Motion Passed  

Breakout Session  
J. Olsen announced that the task groups are open for new members. Observers and members can join the task group. Task groups typically meet every 4 to 6 weeks. The goal of the breakout session is to determine the starting point for the task groups.  

J. Olsen announced that the timeline for completing the standard is 4th quarter 2015. Charles Franklin suggested identifying the KPIs and metrics for the entire standard.  

Task Groups – Background and Previous Challenges  
It was proposed that rather than follow the previously approved agenda for breakout sessions, the committee should continue with a general discussion on the issues and challenges that the task groups have faced in the past. J. Olsen asked the group if anyone opposed the deviation from the current agenda. None were noted.  

Historical Challenges for Social Task Group  
Social has been historically difficult to identify. Some historical sticking points have been charitable contributions, pro bono work, and volunteering in community initiatives. There have been discussions whether economic should be absorbed into social. In addition, labor laws
are covered in laws and regulations; therefore, we are requiring items that are already required – what is the value of that approach? Other issues discussed included:

- How does the group make the standard valuable beyond the government needs?
- What are the thresholds and how do we create value without making it too difficult to achieve?
- How do you make the standard effective for both large and small organizations? There needs to be clear boundaries and definitions before creating KPIs.

There is the opportunity to reference other existing standards to address these issues. The question was raised whether there is any consensus on social criteria existing in the market relating to professional services? J. Edelman noted that the PSSR white paper does include consensus-based KPIs – this will be circulated to the committee.

The draft hotspot matrix scoring sheet is the new direction and is the format the group is trying to achieve in 391.1. The group suggested adding D. Haworth’s analysis to this document.

There was a request to send out an updated draft from 391. Updated drafts are located on the NSF workspace and can be found under the documents tab, in the folder labeled “Draft Copies of Standard”. The group discussed combining the crosswalk, D. Haworth’s analysis, and then putting it into the ANSI format.

There was a suggestion to create a governance task group; however, J. Olsen indicated that this topic will be addressed within the three existing task groups.

**Historical Challenges for Economic Task Group**

It has historically been difficult to define economic and whom it applies to. Many people think it means the economics of the company such as profitability or financial well-being; however, it is not about financial well-being of the company, it is about its affects on its stakeholders and the community around it (for example, pollution, injuries, loss of jobs). Profitably does not belong in the standard. The group agreed that this is a good topic to discuss at the task group level. K. Alsegaf stated that the group needs to be careful about scope creep. Anything that is well established we do not need to replicate (if you are already have to do it by OSHA, it does not need to be addressed here for example).

J. Farber suggested being inclusive and considering adding criteria that is already required, like OSHA. This will get more people on board at the onset. G. Dunn suggested asking only for the violations, or identifying the commonly violated aspects. H. Lewis stated that we should not be giving points to something an organization should already be complying with. However, we do not want to exclude organizations that are starting their sustainability journey.

**Action Item:** C. Franklin will review the current language for regulation that must be met.

**Historical Challenges for Environmental Task Group**
G. Dunn noted that materiality was a huge issue in this task group. How do we decide what is material for different businesses. In addition, how do we address the needs of organizations that are small versus those that are large? Do we need to set market threshold targets? G. Dunn also noted that some organizations own property while others lease property; this was an issue when she piloted the standard. H. Lewis stated that some criteria was not applicable to all groups.

There was discussion about weighting and how difficult that has been. Should all organizations be entitled to all points? B. Conaway suggested setting market share thresholds for gold, silver and bronze.

**J. Olsen announced a call for Task Group Volunteers**

**Social:**
John Edelman – Chair  
Julia Wilson – Vice Chair  
Diane Haworth  
Christina Macken  

**Economic:**
Aileen Bayard – Chair  

**Environmental:**
Kathy Alsegaf  
Gail Dunn  
Charles Franklin  

If you are interested in serving on a task group, please email Jessica Slomka at jslomka@nsf.org

**Closing Remarks**
The next steps in the standard development process include:

- **Call for participation**
  - Task Group call for participation  
  - Joint Committee call for participation  
  - Current Membership evaluation  

- **Scope Motions from F2F** (Goal is to close the ballot for April 20th)
  - Reach out to remaining members in order to achieve quorum  
  - Once quorum is reached, begin the official electronic ballot  

- **Launch Task Groups**
  - Meet with Task Group Chairs and Vice Chairs to discuss next steps  
  - Schedule meetings

The meeting was adjourned.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Interest Category</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deloitte</td>
<td>Alsegaf, Kathryn</td>
<td></td>
<td>Guest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JLL</td>
<td>Aileen Bayard</td>
<td>General Interest</td>
<td>Observer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burns &amp; Hammond</td>
<td>Heather Burns</td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US General Services Administration</td>
<td>Phyllis Carr</td>
<td>General Interest</td>
<td>Observer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edelman</td>
<td>Josh Chaitin</td>
<td>General Interest</td>
<td>Observer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US General Services Administration</td>
<td>Brennan Conaway</td>
<td>Public Health / Regulatory</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edelman</td>
<td>Shannon Doepke</td>
<td>General Interest</td>
<td>Observer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marstel-Day, LLC</td>
<td>Gail Dunn</td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edelman</td>
<td>John Edelman</td>
<td>General Interest</td>
<td>Observer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>Edelman, Shiroff</td>
<td></td>
<td>Guest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underwriters Laboratories, Inc.</td>
<td>Julia Farber</td>
<td>User</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akin Gump Strauss Hauer &amp; Feld, LLP</td>
<td>Charles Franklin</td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSF International</td>
<td>Kianda Franklin</td>
<td>User</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSF International</td>
<td>Diane Haworth</td>
<td>General Interest</td>
<td>Observer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US General Services Administration</td>
<td>Zachary Lerner</td>
<td>General Interest</td>
<td>Observer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Environmental Protection Agency</td>
<td>Harry Lewis</td>
<td>Public Health / Regulatory</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edelman</td>
<td>Long, Pamela</td>
<td></td>
<td>Guest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPLC</td>
<td>Macken, Christina</td>
<td></td>
<td>Guest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth of Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Jeff Olsen</td>
<td>Public Health / Regulatory</td>
<td>Joint Committee Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff</td>
<td>PwC, Senne</td>
<td></td>
<td>Guest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edelman</td>
<td>Simons, Maarten</td>
<td></td>
<td>Guest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSF International</td>
<td>Jessica Slomka</td>
<td>General Interest</td>
<td>Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nielsen Cares</td>
<td>Julia Wilson</td>
<td>General Interest</td>
<td>Observer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>