Welcome:
Dr. Matthew Realff, Joint Committee Chairperson

Dr. Realff welcomed everyone to the JC meeting for Sustainable Furniture. He asked everyone to introduce themselves and on the phone. Dr. Realff introduced himself as an Associate Professor of Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering at Georgia Tech and the current chair of Joint Committees in Sustainable Assessment of Carpet and Resilient Flooring.

Ms. Mindy Costello read the antitrust statement – all agreed.

Overview of Appeal panel decision:
Dr. Matthew Realff

Dr. Realff reviewed the agenda for today. It is focused around resolution to appeals where the starting point was to review the appeals decision and to address through three specific sessions addressing these recommendations. Membership training, review of general membership of the JC specifically the interest categories and solicitation for members, and the wood credit 5.6 content. He proposed adjournment to 3:15 pm. He asked for additions to the agenda. Ms. Laura Rauwerda asked about last meeting minutes that will be emailed to the group for review. They can then be motioned to approve around 1pm during this meeting.

The main purpose of the meeting was to address the appeals determination for those two responses. Dr. Realff stated he was a member of the appeals panel which was thought to be beneficial to this group having that perspective.

Dr. Realff reviewed the responses of the appeal panel individually. SFI training and membership and AFPA and Weyerhaeuser decision was related to reconsideration with technical comparison and training. He asked for comments on the summary of the appeals panel decision.

There was a question about what were appropriate items to consider during discussion and the training was the issues to ensure they were aware of procedure and policy. The training slides will be posted for those not in attendance online via the JC group page.

Membership Training:
Ms. Jane Wilson and Ms. Mindy Costello

Ms. Jane Wilson presented the first portion and Ms. Mindy Costello presented the NSF procedures. ANSI ER and NSF Standard Development and Maintenance policy are posted online under a procedure folder for thisJC.

There was a question about if this Standard was ANSI and it has not completed the ANSI process, it is a BIFMA Standard at this time.

There was a suggestion to create a training log to show that this has been completed. Mr. John Kaufman also suggested having a record and must complete prior to voting or making motions as an active JC member. He also asked that if proxy has to complete a training module prior to proxy designation at a meeting. Proxy was not always in the online system as a user.
Under the Group’s home page: training slides, ANSI ER, NSF policies will all be located in a training folder for reference at any time by committee members.

Dr. Realff asked for comments from the appellants – SFI had no comments. Ms. Cassie Phillips said the training was helpful especially the emphasis on content, commercial terms, and patent and interpretations as part of the ANSI ER. Ms. Phillips commented these are important and go to the issues that create this difference of opinion for the Standard content.

**Membership of the Joint Committee:**
Ms. Jane Wilson

Dr. Realff thought the requirements for membership during the training were highlighted and the interest categories - industry, users and public health regulatory distinguished.

Ms. Wilson went through her PowerPoint presentation. The current balance of the JC is: 7 industry, 8 user, and 7 public health/regulatory which is a good balance among the categories. For a non-safety standard, any one interest category shall be less than 50%. This is actually balanced among all three categories. NSF policy recommends 33 total membership and this committee is at 22 members. This has room for additional members. ANSI expects ongoing outreach for JC membership which is reviewed during audits for NSF. Additional stakeholders should be solicited during outreach throughout the project.

BIFMA has a contact list of about 400 interested stakeholders that are notified of actions of this Joint Committee through BIFMA. NSF does annual review of membership to determine needs of the committee.

Ms. Wilson stated the 'waiting list' purpose and that the JC chair decides to add members based on the needs of the committee and balance and expertise.

Appeal continuance findings was that NSF should ensure stakeholders that are specifically impacted should be at the table for discussion.

**Suggested JC actions:**
- Form a task group to target recruitment and outreach
- Solicit members for additional stakeholders form the appellants
- Create additional interest categories to diversify the membership
  - i.e., Supply chain or distribution

NSF cannot solicit market information from applicants to be used as the basis of membership decisions. This could be disclosure of confidential business information or antitrust issue. The JC Chair has discretion in making membership decisions, not NSF.

**Discussion:**
Dr. Realff asked the group to comment on the task group- formation for recruitment and outreach. Mr. Brad Miller commented on the text of the appeal decision regarding the 'handed a list' for participation of those in the BIFMA standard. During transition, BIFMA did share their list of
stakeholders from their process for NSF to consider for membership. BIFMA has a list of 400 stakeholders that are interested in the standard development separate from NSF and the online workspace. He felt the process of recruitment was vigorous from the beginning. He thought the recruitment was continual and ongoing. The third indication about proper vetting process – NSF procedures established the interest categories and that no applicant was refused Joint Committee membership. He continued that the application was sent out through many publications and announced at trade shows and other venues. He stated that to represent every person that would be affected by each credit would be a much larger list of stakeholders and too large to achieve progress.

The purpose of the meeting was to address the decision by the appeal panel, not to defend what happened prior to appeal. The intent at this JC meeting was to address those that should be made aware specifically through outreach to those groups as they were directly referenced in the Standard.

Ms. Cassie Phillips added that membership was an issue because it was not overlapping to the forestry industry and that outreach should be specifically to them as they were directly affected by the formation of the wood credit. The point is that a distinct group that could have provided technical information to this discussion earlier rather than at the public comment period should have been at the table originally.

Mr. Jason Metnick of SFI added that membership issues were around that the JC continued to have members that were certified to a specific standard or had ties to that same standard which gave SFI concern. There was strong interest by many JC members to that standard that was weighted heavier as the industry preferred it.

Dr. Realfiff stated as SFI was specifically mentioned, there was no direct evidence that they were solicited to participate. Moving forward, this outreach should occur. He asked about increasing the membership as this group is not close to the recommended maximum (33). He asked for specific recommendations from all those in attendance (including the appellants) on who should be added. There were three applications that were submitted and will be considered by the JC chair for membership. Mr. Miller commented that all that has previously applied had been accepted and what the max should be for a JC committee. Mr. Miller did not support the membership / outreach task group be formed. He did support to reach out to those that are directly affected to the process. Mr. Miller commented on the interest categories- he said that NGOs are underrepresented in this JC. Mr. Miller also commented that he has done this outreach in the past and could continue with this. Ms. Wilson commented about those that are not active in the process. NSF has correspondence to address inactive members that may lead to create openings as well. Dr. Realfiff was supportive of reviewing active member participation to solicit active memberships. He continued that all JC members and observers should be considering new stakeholders. Dr. Realfiff asked for appellants to provide a list of those that may be interested from their perspective. Cassie stated that membership was an historical issue and that there was no need for additional recruitment at this point. She thought there should be additional membership depending on the outcome of the discussion relating to the wood credit. Laura stated that there was confusion with the two bullets- a named entity is different that different than outreach to that specific entity. Ms. Wilson commented that NSF references specific standards commonly and those are not specifically solicited. The SFI program is referenced which is
different than a test methodology reference. This created a different approach to outreach with this specific reference to a program.

There will not be a task group formed to review membership.

June 25, 2009 JC meeting summary:
Dr. Matthew Realff

Dr. Realff suggested a change to the agenda to review the June 25, 2009 JC summary. He asked the group to review the summary. Ms. Laura Rauwerda commented that the majority of the summary was for the presentations and the discussion was the appellants providing their background. Mr. Randy Carter asked about the building rating system group that passed via motion and yet to be balloted. Once the appeal process has been resolved, these ballots can move forward to the JC for consideration. Ms. Wilson stated that this particular issue could be balloted to the JC while the remaining issues are under discussion. Mr. Carter suggested revisions to the summary that the group were presented (page 6).

Mr. Miller commented on the first paragraph on page 5 of 7, Bill Stough’s comments on the work group went with the marketplace preference as recognized. The materials work group was assigned this task group. Ms. Mindy Costello recommended adding ‘materials work group’ as opposed to ‘group’. Mr. Tom Reardon asked when they work group meetings occurred April 2009 before or after. Mr. Bill Stough his recollection was this was the original deliberations before April 2009. Mr. Brad Miller expanded that the original work groups had a variety of factors consideration not just the marketplace preference. After April 2009, the specific sub task groups reviewed in detail the information related to the wood credit.

Ms. Phillips added that the consideration is not the content of the summary, but that the summary captures what was said at the meeting. Mr. Miller recommended changing the wording to ‘considered’ instead of ‘went with’. Mr. Stough iterated that the intent was that it was considered as one of the alternatives. Ms. Wilson stated there are independent records that support the material work group meetings.

Dr. Realff stated there were two changes to consider: adding ‘materials work group’ and Mr. Carter’s suggested changes.

Motion: Motion for approval of summary from June 25th meeting by Randy Carter, John Kaufman seconded.
Vote: Majority affirmative, Gabe Wing (proxy for Larry Dykhuis) and Brad Miller abstention.
Balloting requirements were not met so this will be posted online to allow for all JC members to vote.

Section 5.6:
Dr. Matthew Realff

Dr. Realff reviewed the original language for section 5.6 with the sub sections of 5.6.1 and 5.6.2. He opened the meeting for discussion on the credits.
Ms. Cassie Phillips commented that they did not believe the weighted points which create a preference for FSC wood could not be supported by a technical basis. She said the FSC standards are variable from different parts of the world and that variability was no understood by the JC and they therefore should rate the systems the same. She said that if differentiated that the JC would need to develop a technical basis for this justification of weighting. She said she could provide background on the technical differences in the forestry standards.

Mr. Jason Metnick presented that there should be good faith efforts for harmonization with ANSI standards where he maintained that they give equal treatment to forestry standard programs so this should harmonize with these standards. Since the June meeting there is now 4 ANSI standards that treat the programs equally. These are ICC 700 Green building rating system for residential dwellings and the ASHRAE 189.1 code adoptable standard for building and the green globes ANSI GBI 2010, and ASTM 2612 and under development is the NA, forest carbon standard. Mr. Stough asked for an independent study that supports these programs are equivalent. It was asked what was meant by ‘these programs’. Mr. Stough asked about what was equivalent to FSC. Ms. Phillips responded that the challenge is not that the standards are the same all the time to each other. The issue is that a product in different locations adheres to FSC for that region. The equivalency was questioned as to what was FSC. The argument was that it does not state FSC has equivalency standards.

Mr. Jason Metnick supported option 2 for this committee to recognize equivalency of the forestry programs. Mr. Stough commented that the options were presented and why should they be reconsidered. The basis for the remanding was technical comparison and also to reconsider this issue in a technical basis for the current language.

Ms. Phillips stated she would like to settle the appeal and support the standard that treated the forestry programs the same. She asked for an unbiased way to support this credit as currently written. There was no record to support this decision. She stated there were clearly inaccurate statements about the forestry programs in the historical summaries. She said the group was probably not adequately informed about the differences between the programs.

Mr. Stough agreed and asked for independent documentation to support the equivalency of the forestry programs. Ms. Phillips said she would be prepared to present these comparisons. Chain of custody for FSC and SFI and Weyerhaeuser are the same for the most part. To use the label for chain of custody, it has to be mandatory to follow the standard. Under SFI program there could be certification without the chain of custody claim as part of that certification.

SFI and all certifications – by stating SFI certification – could that mean multiple things? Chain of custody issues for forestry programs are the same however claim SFI certification can be completed without chain of custody claim.

FSC reference as a single program or a multitude of Standard and that by referring to SFI certification has a meaning that is clear. SFI with chain of custody and all others with that chain of custody to show equivalency among the forestry program standards.
Mr. Chris Marozzi asked about a standard for controlled wood; FSC has this do not use as sourcing; SFI addresses this non-certified fiber; PFEC addresses it through the non-controversial sources. The non certified fibers are part of an audit.

Ms. Petie Davis recommended adding ‘chain of custody’ for SFI and other forestry programs as FSC has it has a requirement. There was some support to this suggestion.

Dr. Realff asked about adding ‘or equivalent’. Mr. John Kaufman stated that by adding this term it added the burden to the certifier and lead to problems. He was opposed to this option.

Mr. Jason Metnick dovetail partners study that shows these programs are equivalent; central point of timber purchase in UK did analysis of the programs very 2-3 years; national association of state foresters did an analysis of forestry certification programs specifically in the US and are good programs that provide value. NCASI (National Council for Air and Stream Improvement) national stream of is looking at updating their studies. Those will be circulated to the JC for review.

Ms. Phillips commented on the equivalent subject. She felt that these discussions were covered under section 3.2 commercial terms and that there should be careful consideration about the comparison of two programs. Mr. Stough asked the appellants to take on this burden to show equivalency. Ms. Phillips said this language can have an effect on competition by preferring one program over another and specifically mentioning a brand. She suggested having a specific set of criteria instead of mentioning a certification program unless in a footnote and adding ‘or equivalent’. She expected that the JC to consider the criteria of FSC wood can be met through SFI certified wood as well.

Mr. Kaufman said that the appeal panel did not find there was violation of the commercial terms and conditions in their decision. Mr. Carter said the task groups were formed after the original appeal which was revisited at the June 2009 JC meeting. He stated that the questions were revisited again today. The JC considered the information presented by the appellants. He continued that there was adequate distinction between the programs. Ms. Wilson asked for those technical comparisons that create those differences.

Mr. Carter stated that the common parameters in FSC are different than SFI program where they were different. He stated that there were differences between FSC and SFI where FSC was less stringent than SFI. FSC overall was thought to be more stringent. Steelcase is in favor as being more utilized FSC programs. SFI can be achieved without chain of custody which in his opinion was more equivalent to FSC. But to define equivalence, is broad and arrived at by that consensus body for that particular standard. The appeal findings are that this committee was to determine what the technical differences are to weigh these differently. Mr. Kaufman said the JC should create that technical basis for this difference. He said the chain of custody that could be resolved and could make these both equivalents in the draft.

Dr. Realff reiterated the JC will have to show the technical differences to make the weighting in the Standard. With this basis, it can weigh them differently than other ANSI Standards.
Mr. Carter said that the JC did articulate the differences. He said the Yale Study and presentations that showed those differences between the forestry programs. These could be cataloged. Ms. Phillips stated they want to be treated fairly in the Standard, a legitimate technical basis. Mr. Carter felt that the debate could be endless over details of comparison of the technical basis.

Mr. Carter also spoke about the marketplace preference. The panel was given historical meeting summaries from the work groups. Mr. Gabe Wing suggested that it is a subjective evaluation of the differences between the forestry programs. He said this will be a drawn out debate. SFI takes a performance approach ‘healthy’ and FSC may have different approach with how far away from the waterway. The experts that apply these Standards should be consulted. It should be based on science. The JC should consider the analysis of the ANSI standards and studies. A literature search of the studies could occur for independent sources for studies can be consulted to review the technical basis for the current language.

Mr. Miller proposed to change a language in the Standard instead of a path to review the technical basis. He proposed to eliminate the differential between the different programs. One point for a min of 20% of total wood weight conforms to FSC or equivalent forest practices and eliminates the first bullet point. And the 5.6.2 state FSC or equivalent forest practices and eliminates the first bullet point.

Mr. Kaufman supported trying to make this equivalent. SFI program is the one that was debated; other programs have not been considered. He thought the chain of custody should be added to the proposal. He proposed FSC, SFI (including chain of custody through the value of chain) with out equivalency.

Ms. Phillips did not support Mr. Miller’s suggestion because it did not address the technical differences and the specification of which FSC standard the credit was referring to. They would continue their appeal on the basis of commercial terms condition without the technical basis for naming FSC specifically. She thought all certification programs be recognized for the time being and that in the future with comparison.

Mr. Miller stated the current language is the preference of the JC and that to add SFI in the list of standards he was opposed to and did not consider it equivalent. Mr. Kaufman stated the unintended consequences are that a certifier can see that the two standards equivalent and that a different certifier finds them not to be equivalent. Mr. Carter had concern but would rather move forward than have this to continue with ANSI.

Ms. Rauwerda said there are other criteria beyond the chain custody that need to be considered such as tree harvesting that are pertaining to the standard such as energy issues and climate change and equity issues. There needs to be the experts to debate these technical differences. The JC members can discuss this in detail and determine more differences.

Mr. Tom Reardon commented there are some the key differences between FSC and SFI as cited in the Dovetail Partners report previously mentioned by Jason Metnick. One of those cited differences was the fact that FSC has a comprehensive ban on all GMO’s and SFI does not. Jason Metnick responded that FSC has a comprehensive ban on GMOs – these are not part of
consideration in the US and Canada so this is not a valid difference. The contention by Mr. Metnick was that since GMO trees are not being planted anywhere that distinguishing the certifications on this basis was not a significant difference. Logically this is a correct statement, since you can always make a logical statement seem more restrictive by adding more terms but if those terms are never falsified by any state of the world then the restriction is spurious.

Mr. Wing stated the work group took the precautionary approach in considering this and other issues. Ms. Phillips added that there are differences related to the supply chain, there will need to be experts to discuss the details.

Mr. Reardon continued with identified differences in the Dovetail report. FSC has a ban on (not in US) harvesting on public lands requirements. The report stated there are differences but they are closer.

Ms. Toni Stein said the forestry practices are imbedded in the Standard. She said a user would have no idea which practice was better only that forestry programs were directly referenced in the specification requirement. She said there are those that want to use this Standard for purchasing. She said maybe that this credit be revised to be transparent and allow for choice of forestry program certification. She proposed to disclose and visibly state which forestry program was chosen for credit through certification marking.

Mr. Kaufman agreed that the standard needs to move forward and transparency. Ms. Davis said the certification could add which program was utilized in the Standard.

A proposal was made to consider which states no specific forestry standard by name. Mr. Josh Jacobs stated this was against the BIFMA intention and was a single attribute. Mr. Scott Lesnet stated that this was a single attribute to the multi attribute standard. Mr. Gary Dodge suggested removing the reference to third party certification and giving this a bio-based content. Mr. Miller asked what was meant by a bio-based wording. Mr. Dodge suggested to include a specific value of the content is wood as opposed to other materials that are not renewable. He stated there were some challenges with this approach. The public declaration would need to be made per the suggestion. On a website or via a certification mark or listing would comply with the publicly available portion of the proposal.

The labeling is different than the certification to a forestry program or a specific claim. There are different types of labeling for each forestry program.

SFI would support the language without specific reference to a program by name. SFI may also support a bio-based claim for credit. The heading of the section is bio-based 5.6. The most important is to reward certified wood as this is important.

Ms. Phillips asked for the language to be read.

5.6.1 Basic Level
The applicant shall receive one point if:
Min 20% total wood weight of the product conforms to a 3rd party certification program for responsible forest practices including chain of custody practices through the supply chain and

Third party certif. program is publicly declared by the application.

FSC supports option 2 and the new proposal above is similar to the second option. Ms. Phillips supported Ms. Stein’s option to recognize that all forestry programs are acceptable. SFI could support this proposal as well. AFPA could also support this concept. Mr. Metnick was interested in the publicly available concept and hearing more about how that would be implemented. NSF could support this from a certifier.

Mr. Jacobs reiterated the point of BIFMA origination and the point of the level program was to get away from single attribute call outs. He thought this was going backward from this approach. He agreed this does solve the issue with the weighting. He also through it put the onus back on the purchasers. He also thought this should be easier on the purchasers.

Mr. Miller believed the intent and purpose was intact with multi-attribute standard. If the standard can recognize the responsible forestry practices can solve the issue of the appellants and will request that it be publicly available is the only additional burden. Where the rating system is specified in other parts of the Standard, is this going to require all declarations publicly. Mr. Wing stated this could be complicated with implementation. Mr. Miller responded that for each product there are different certifications that are publicly available. If multiple certifications are required to get to the percentage to meet the credit, they all must be listed according to the new suggestion. This could be the company’s website or other publicly available source. The wording was proposed to be changed from ‘publicly declared’ and ‘publicly available’. The contrary to this was it does not force the disclosure for those to determine if certification programs are important of the user. The applicant can determine the scope of the product and conformance and make declared.

Wording of chain of custody- implied or require? It was implied to be a requirement. This wording could be worked on this.

Dr. Realff asked for objections to this path forward. Mr. Wing iterated there were two options- pursuing this path with new language and clarifying the differences to keep the existing language. Mr. Carter said the JC had to create a list of basis if this approach is to keep the comparison language as written. Mr. Carter asked about creating the basis would go back to the continuance of the appeal. With this new approach, Ms. Phillips said this new approach would eliminate the need to make a comparison approach and continue this appeal.

Mr. Miller said he heard of the appellants favorably of the new proposal. If motioned, the language could be balloted to the JC with a 30-day comment period and 14 to 21 day ballot to lead to the ANSI status of the Standard. The sub task group on wood could begin meeting on the criteria to discuss the basis for technical reasons to keep a weighting proposal.

NSF will provide a report of the actions taken relating to the appeal to the extent that it satisfies the appellants issues. The appellants would have the opportunity to accept this path and the appeal would be closed. The appellants could also determine if the ANSI appeal would continue.
To continue with the basis and technical support, the appellants would have to review this basis and determine if they need to continue their appeal.

Ms. Stein suggested adding back in 'sustainable' and an additional bullet for chain of custody as separate item. Publicly and visible declared was the suggestion, meaning on the certification logo with the forestry program used to gain that credit. A declaration could be made without logo; the specific certification program has control of use of their logo. Mr. Miller stated there was a request for the restricted scope of performance for publicly available. The interpretation BIFMA committee made the determination of what that meant.

Dr. Realff asked for consensus on using this path forward and follow with wordsmith of the proposal. The additional intent was to continue with the sub task group for wood basis of the current language. There was support from the appellants and members to move forward with wordsmith of this new proposal.

Mr. Hardbridge-Beam recommended that there are other instances in the 7.6 credit where there is possible to include third party oversight, throughout the standard should a similar approach be taken where this is third party certification is publicly declared.

Discussion began on the language as proposed.

- Sustainable/Responsible was suggested to revisit
- a bullet list of specific items needed including chain of custody.
- including but not limited.
- And conformed but not certification required

Third party was not a requirement of the Standard; the level program does require third party certification for the whole standard. FSC commented that sustainable was not part of their claim; they are striving toward sustainable. ASTM 7612 defines certified forest product. FSC certified products that do not come from a general FSC standard certification would not be included. FSC asked to for time to add comments. Mr. Stough asked the group to review the introduction to be included in the discussion. Mr. Kaufman proposed to use the language from the introduction in the sub items. If there are other items that can be added on that list, chain of custody could be a separate bullet.

Socially responsible was added to the environmentally responsible forestry management language. The forestry programs have social components so this highlights that point. By referencing the ASTM 7612 it ties into certification, it may makes this easier for third party certification for forestry products.

The last sentence was suggested to be relocated and the CITES was suggested to be a pre-requisite to meet those below. The last sentence was thought that it should be located closer to the CITES sentence. This language will be reworded using the suggestion from AFPA in his comments. This was under filename: CITES options 5-7-09.

There was wording suggested by Mr. Jeff Bradley AFPA to consider in place of original language for CITES. Dr. Realff read through the new language proposal shown below: 
5.6 Bio-based Renewable Materials - Sustainable Wood

The organization shall encourage environmentally and socially responsible forest management and will not specify species listed in CITES Appendices I.

Wood specified in the product, other than recovered or reused wood, shall not contain endangered wood species, unless the trade of such wood conforms with the requirements of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) Appendix I or II, and is harvested according to the applicable laws and regulations of the country of origin.

In order to qualify for these points the product to be assessed must contain at least 5 percent wood by weight. By fulfilling one of the two criteria below, the applicant can earn a maximum of two points in this credit, as detailed in 5.6.1 and 5.6.2. The objective evidence is the documentation provided by the supplier.

5.6.1 Basic Level

The applicant shall receive one point if either:

- A minimum of 50 percent of the total wood weight of the product conforms to SFI’s, CSA’s, or another qualified organization’s sustainable forest practices; or
- A minimum of 20 percent of the total wood weight of the product conforms to FSC responsible forest practices.

- A minimum of 20 percent of the total wood weight of the product conforms to a third-party certification program for environmentally and socially responsible forest management including but not limited to, chain of custody practices throughout the supply chain, and
- The third-party certification program is publicly declared by the applicant.

5.6.2 Advanced Level

The applicant shall receive two points if either:

- A minimum of 75 percent of the total wood weight of the product conforms to SFI’s, CSA’s, or another qualified organization’s sustainable forest practices; or
- A minimum of 30 percent of the total wood weight of the product is compliant to FSC responsible forest practices.

- A minimum of 30 percent of the total wood weight of the product conforms to a third-party certification program for environmentally and socially responsible forest management including but not limited to, chain of custody practices throughout the supply chain, and
- The third-party certification program is publicly declared by the applicant.

Mr. Miller commented on insertion of recovered or reused. Mr. Bradley commented that reused or recovered wood that is endangered. Mr. Lesnet commented that reused or recovered may not have a known origin. Waste goes into a recovered material that may contain endangered wood.
This document is part of the NSF International standard development process. This document is not a NSF International standard and is subject to change. Committee members agree not to reproduce, or circulate or quote, in whole or in part, the draft document outside of the NSF Committee or to submit a document to any other organization or standards bodies (whether national, international, or other), except with approval of the Chairman of the Committee having jurisdiction and the written authorization of NSF International.

as an unknown material. There was a question about claims made on content where there could be unknowns.

Mr. Stough thought this make the credit more difficult to achieve. He thought the DfE had some influence on the original introduction language. The word ‘specify’ should be added back into the language. There was a question about the Lacey Act and that it covers the US market for use of endangered wood species. The last sentence was an exception to the rule. There was a question for clarity of the text. There was a question how to demonstrate compliance with local laws and regulation without documentation. After more discussion and wordsmith, the language was revised to include only one bullet. The CITES appendix I and II were added back into the new language.

Motion: Motion to put the language as proposed for section 5.6 (and 5.6.1 and 5.6.2) to ballot by Mr. Gabe Wing and seconded by Mr. John Kaufman.
Discussion: Mr. Gary Dodge of FSC felt that BIFMA would lose its leadership by taking this approach relating to forestry management. He felt that there was much green-washing and there are differences in the forestry programs and there is confusion in the marketplace.
Vote: 14 affirmative, 1 negative (Chris Marozzi proxy for Lou Newett) and no abstentions.
Chris Marozzi preferred the original language as opposed to the change. Motion passed.

The previously motioned language for Building Rating System option 2 will be sent to the JC as a separate ballot.

There was a request to continue with the work group to revisit the technical basis for the original credit. NSF will provide a response to the appeal panel and appellants to determine if this resolves the appeal issues. With an ANSI appeal, the panel from ANSI would review the appellants request to determine if more information is needed or if a hearing would be needed. The JC or work group can work on this technical basis during the time period for the balloting.

Motion: Motion that the charge of the technical differences between forestry standards be remanded to the wood sub task group by Mr. Randy Carter, seconded by Ms. Laura Rauwerda.
Vote: 14 affirmative, no negative, no abstentions.
Ms. Denise Van Valkenburg is the chair of this sub task group. Dr. Realff asked this group to meet soon.

Mr. Miller thanked Dr. Realff for his direction to the Joint Committee. Dr. Realff thanked everyone for coming and their participation.

Motion: Mr. Brad Miller moved to adjourn, seconded by Ms. Laura Rauwerda.
All affirmative.
Meeting adjourned at 3:05 pm ET.
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