Tab 2
This page is intentionally blank.
NSF Standard Development Process

Benefits of the ANSI process

- ANSI process helps ensure the development of a single American National Standard that does not overlap or conflict with other American National Standards
- Use of an accredited, audited process enhances credibility of the resulting standard
- ANSI requirements ensure the opportunity for all affected stakeholders to participate in the standards development process
ANSI Ensures Due Process

Due process means that any person (individual, organization, company, etc.) with a direct and material interest has a right to participate by:

– Expressing a position and its basis
– Having that position considered
– Having the right to appeal

Requirements for Due Process

• Openness
• Lack of Dominance
• Balance of interests
• Notification of standards activity
• Consideration of views and objections
• Evidence of consensus
• Appeals procedures
What is a Consensus Standard?

“Consensus” means substantial agreement has been reached by directly and materially affected interest categories. This signifies the concurrence of more than a simple majority, but not necessarily unanimity. Consensus requires that all views and objections be considered, and that an effort be made toward their resolution.

NSF Policies Implement ANSI Due Process Requirements

- NSF policies describe how NSF ensures due process in its standards development activities
- Operation and structure of NSF standards committees
- Defines at what points in the NSF process required ANSI notifications take place
- Numerical requirements for consensus (balloting)
- Defines NSF appeals process
NSF Joint Committees

- Consensus body that oversees a specific standard or set of related standards
- Balanced membership of external stakeholders
  - Public Health
  - Producers
  - Users
  - Other categories as indicated by the standards project
- Membership is based on applicant’s experience and expertise

JC Member Responsibilities

- Provide expertise on one or more subjects covered by a standard
- Participate actively by attending meetings and by reviewing documents
- Return ballots within prescribed deadlines
- Minimum 3 year commitment
Task Groups

• Formed to evaluate a specific technical issue for a Joint Committee (JC)
• Develop a draft standard or other recommendation for review by the Joint Committee
• Membership appointed by a TG Chair
• Membership not limited to JC members
• May be formed ad hoc or may be a standing group

JC Balloting Requirements

• Affirmative ballot of at least 2/3 of those who voted, excluding abstentions
• Affirmative ballots must represent at least a simple majority of the JC membership (> 50%)
• All negative votes or comments have been considered
Council of Public Health Consultants

• NSF advisory body for standards development and program implementation
• Elects its own membership
  – Regulators
  – Academics
  – Public health professionals
  – Others who have demonstrated leadership in public health and the environment
  – No manufacturers

CPHC Ballot Requirements

• At least 80% of the membership must return a ballot
• Affirmative ballot of at least 90% of the combined affirmative and negative votes must be attained
• All negative votes or comments have been considered
• Any unresolved negative votes from the JC are provided to the CPHC for review
ANSI Public Review Process

- Concurrent with NSF standards committee process
  - PIN - Notification that an American National Standard standard will be initiated or revised (at start of project)
  - BSR 8 or 108 - Draft available for comment, public notice in Standards Action (at JC ballot)
  - BSR 9 or 109 - Final version of standard is approved, public notice in Standards Action (at completion of CPHC ballot)

The NSF Standards Process

Consensus body

- Request to Initiate Project
  - Develop Draft Standard
    - Joint Committee (Consensus Body) Ballots
      - Resolution of Appeals (if Submitted)
        - CPHC Ballots Standard
          - Adopted NSF/ANSI Standard

ANSI Public Comment

- Announce Project Initiation (PINS)
  - Public Review and Comment
  - Public Review of Draft Standard
    - Public Commentor’s Right to Appeal
      - Appellant’s Right to Appeal to ANSI

CPHC Technical Committee
Joint Committee Structure

CPHC

Joint Committee on Sustainable Textiles

Task Group Chairs

Recycling TG
Energy, Water and Air TG
Scoring TG
Safety of Materials TG

Social Responsibility TG
Fiber Sourcing TG
Scope & Generalities TG

Questions?

Sarah Kozanecki
Standards Specialist
kozanecki@nsf.org
Jaclyn Bowen called the meeting to order, read the anti-trust statement and took attendance. She stated that she circulated the draft standard and two document request forms in the reminder email and those documents would be the focus of the discussion. The agenda was as follows:

1. Background of the issue
2. NSF and Pilot company goals open discussion
3. PMI and documentation forms
4. Minimum information needed
5. Next steps

Jaclyn Bowen stated that during the face-to-face Sustainable Textiles meetings in May, the Joint Committee and NSF International felt it would be valuable to conduct a pilot on the draft standard. The purpose of this pilot program would be to assess the practicality of the credits and weigh the costs of implementation and compliance. Additionally, NSF International would be involved to simulate third-party certification with the pilot manufacturers.

The meeting attendees discussed the goals of the pilot program. Ivy Berman stated that one of the goals is also to ensure that the standard is feasible and certification is not cost-prohibitive. David Ryan stated that the group needs to consider what information is readily available and what is more proprietary. Additionally, the data should be simplified and the forms standardized. Additionally, the industry needs to weigh how 1st or 2nd party certification would be viewed. A discussion ensued about the feasibility of getting certain formulation percentages from suppliers. Some concern was also expressed for how MBDC certification would be treated. NSF responded that if MBDC cradle-to-cradle requirements fulfilled the requirements of the Sustainable Textiles standard, then that manufacturer would already have the documentation prepared and would be one closer to certification to this standard.

Jaclyn Bowen stated that she had requested minimum information that NSF would need to tailor the data collection forms such as formulation requirements and process diagrams. Milliken had already submitted some of this information, but NSF is still looking for additional examples.

Jaclyn Bowen summarized the call by stating that
1) There seems to be some standing concerns about suppliers voluntarily submitting their formulations. Jaclyn Bowen would speak with NSF staff on ways to overcome this obstacle.
2) It appears as though the scope of available data doesn’t go to the level of detail that the standard specifies. These unattainable requirements will need to be identified and adjusted in the standard.
3) The pilot task group will reconvene every other Tuesday from 10am-11am (ET) with the next call scheduled for Tuesday July 24, 2007 from 10am-11am (ET).
4) The pilot task group still needs to discuss NSF’s draft data request forms and the possibility of a field trip to check out vertically/non-vertically integrated textiles manufacturing centers.
Sustainable Textiles Pilot Task Group  
Draft Meeting Summary  
July 24, 2007

This document is part of the NSF International standard development process. This document is subject to change and may be a draft and/or non-final version. Committee members may reproduce, quote from, and/or circulate this document to persons or entities outside of their organization after first providing NSF International with written notice of to whom and for what purpose this document is to be shared.

Attendance:

Ivy Berman- Raxon  
Jaclyn Bowen- NSF International  
Angie Ewing, NSF International  
Dave Fox- Raxon  
Mark Holloway- NSF International  
Kurt Kneen- NSF International  
Clif Mclellan- NSF International  
John Michaels- Sunbury  
Jim O’ Brien- Wearbest  
Janan Rabiah- ACT  
David Ryan- Craftex Mills  
Naumann Sheikh- Weave  
Jeff Silliman- Milliken  
Hardy Sullivan- Crypton, Inc.  
Jennifer Wammack- Milliken  
Jane Wilson- NSF International  
Lee Woodard- Next Right Decision, L.L.C.

Jaclyn Bowen called the meeting to order, read the anti-trust statement and took attendance. Prior to the call, Jaclyn circulated the July 10, 2007 meeting summary, the updated PMI form, and the updated draft standard. The agenda was as follows:

1. Discuss the value in holding an optional conference call with suppliers on NSF, third-party certification, and NSF’s confidentiality policies.
2. Review of the attached draft data submittal sheet.

Jaclyn stated that during the last call, it was requested that the Safety of Materials section be updated. Several of the other task groups including Social Responsibility, Scope/General, Safety of Materials, and Recycling also made some headway so the document circulated showed all the changes made to date. However, Jaclyn indicated that the Scoring section had NOT been updated to reflect the shift in numbering that has taken place since the addition/deletion/modification of existing credits since the last version of the standard. Additionally, the circulated data submittal sheet had not been updated to reflect the most recent changes to the draft standard.

During the last conference call, it was evident that there was some overall concern about suppliers voluntarily submitting their formulations. After speaking with some people at NSF, Jaclyn Bowen questioned the group if it would be valuable for NSF to hold an optional conference call along with online capabilities, to introduce NSF, explain third-party certification, and review NSF’s confidentiality policies. Some of the pilot task group members felt that this would be valuable, others were uncertain about revealing who their suppliers were which may happen if they were all on a conference call together. While Jaclyn Bowen assured them that this could all be kept confidential, the group generally felt that it would be best if NSF would just circulate this information to the pilot task group members for them to circulate onto their suppliers. Clif Mclellan gave an overview of the confidentiality documents that would be circulated.

- A supplier form to send to supplier's that instructs them to send their data directly to NSF International. This has the minimal CBI agreement that is used about 99% of the time and is satisfactory to most material suppliers.
- A non-disclosure agreement - This is used in 1% of the cases where the companies have particular sensitivities about their formulation.
- NSF CBI policies on how information is handled.
NSF agreed to circulate these documents along with an updated data submittal sheet. The pilot task group members discussed next steps.

**Next Steps**

1. NSF to circulate supplier form, a non-disclosure agreement, NSF CBI policies, Product Materials Information (PMI) request form and an updated checklist to cover the requirements in the standard not addressed in the PMI form.
2. Pilot task group members are encouraged to send this documentation to their suppliers for review and response. Please have them contact NSF with questions.
3. Pilot task group members should review this documentation and forward any questions onto Jaclyn Bowen. Jaclyn Bowen will forward the questions onto the appropriate contact at NSF.
4. After review of the documents, pilot task group members are encouraged to select (1) product to undergo a review. Please send the name/identification number of this product to Jaclyn Bowen at NSF International.
5. After receiving the name/identification number of the product, NSF International will expect to begin receiving the above documentation from the suppliers.

Any issues/concerns encountered along the way can be discussed during the bi-weekly scheduled conference calls.

The task group agreed to reconvene in 2 weeks.
Sustainable Textiles Pilot Task Group
Draft Meeting Summary
August 21, 2007

Attendance:
Ivy Berman- Raxon
Lori Bestervelt- NSF International
Jaclyn Bowen- NSF International
Angie Ewing, NSF International
Dave Fox- Raxon
Kurt Kneen- NSF International
Clif Mclellan- NSF International

John Michaels- Sunbury
Jim O’ Brien- Wearbest
Janan Rabiah- ACT
Hardy Sullivan- Crypton, Inc.
Jennifer Wammack- Milliken
Jane Wilson- NSF International

Jaclyn Bowen called the meeting to order, read the anti-trust statement and took attendance. Prior to the call, Jaclyn circulated the following documents:

1) The Product Materials Information (PMI) request form - This form would be filled out for each product. You can use this information request form for your product. NSF would also appreciate input into how the questions can be asked to make them more relevant and easier to understand.

2) A checklist to cover the requirements in the standard not addressed in the PMI form. This is fairly self-explanatory. This includes the requirements not included in the material requirement section.

3) A supplier form to send to your supplier’s that instructs them to send their data directly to NSF International. This has the minimal CBI agreement that is used about 99% of the time and is satisfactory to most material suppliers.

4) A non-disclosure agreement - This is used in 1% of the cases where the companies have particular sensitivities about their formulation.

5) NSF CBI policies on how information is handled.

6) The summary from the last conference call on July 22nd.

She stated that the focus of the call would be to discuss any questions that the task group participants have on the documents provided.

Ivy Berman stated while she acknowledged that NSF would not be charging a fee for this pilot program, she did wonder who would be responsible for the certification costs. The confidentialy documents tells suppliers that they would not be invoiced by NSF, but the topic of supplier certification has come up in the past. Clif Mclellan explained that those types of details can be worked out in time. Additionally, product manufacturers can work with their suppliers and perhaps share the cost of certification. Since suppliers may be supplying to other manufacturers that also will want sustainability certification, being a certified Sustainable Textiles supplier may be appealing to manufacturers down the supplychain.

Some task group participants questioned how the various water and energy efficiencies from the manufacturing plants would be considered in certification. Clif Mclellan responded that these kinds of details would be worked out during certification. Hardy Sullivan stated that he would try to pull together a Fabric Construction Specification form. This could be used to clarify what a company does and help define the boundaries of certification. Clif Mclellan stated that NSF would still be interested in potentially visiting some manufacturing plants to get a better idea of how textiles production works. Ivy Berman encouraged NSF to visit Raxon and said that there are many companies in North Carolina like Krypton and Unifi.

Next steps:
- Jaclyn Bowen to circulate to correct forms to the pilot participants.

Next call: Take the PMI request form and explain line by line. Email Clif Mclellan with questions. (mclellan@nsf.org.)

The task group agreed to reconvene in 2 weeks (Tuesday September 4, 2007 from 10am-11am (ET)).
This document is part of the NSF International standard development process. This document is subject to change and may be a draft and/or non-final version. Committee members may reproduce, quote from, and/or circulate this document to persons or entities outside of their organization after first providing NSF International with written notice of to whom and for what purpose this document is to be shared.

**Attendance:**

- Jaclyn Bowen – NSF International
- Jim O’Brien – Wearbest
- Dave Fox – Raxon
- Janan Rabiah – ACT
- Eric Harrington – Interface
- David Ryan – Craftex
- Mark Holloway – NSF International
- Nauman Sheikh – Weave Corp.
- Sarah Kozanecki – NSF International
- Jeff Silliman – Milliken
- Beth McInnis – Victor
- Hardy Sullivan – Crypton, Inc.
- Clif McLellan – NSF International
- Jennifer Wammack – Milliken
- John Michaels – Sunbury
- Jane Wilson – NSF International

Sarah Kozanecki called the meeting to order and read the anti-trust statement. Janan Rabiah took roll call. Prior to the call, Jaclyn circulated the following documents:

2. The Product Materials Information (PMI) request form.
3. The summary from the last conference call on September 4, 2007.

The group began reviewing the Product Construction Specification provided by Hardy Sullivan (he noted that the name the name change from “Fabric” to “Product”). Hardy walked the group through the form, beginning with the section on Product and Sustainability Scope. He explained each of the processes listed and stated that the objective is to define the construction of the product. This section specifically addresses the question of to which processes the points apply. He recommended that another row be added for recycling processes, and Jennifer Wammack recommended adding an additional row for “other” to add flexibility for processes that are not covered. Jeff Silliman stated that “Safety of Materials” should be applied to Yarn Formation as well. It was also added that it should be recommended to the Joint Committee that “Water” be applied to synthetic and natural fiber sources. However, there was some debate over this because the boundaries of where the standard applies is yet unclear in some cases and is still being discussed by various task groups.

The group then began discussing the section entitled “Fiber, Yarn, and Colorant(s).” Hardy Sullivan stated that the objective of the information obtained in this section is to garner a list of supplier’s ingredients and CAS # information to cross reference with more detailed lists. This would enable suppliers to keep their proprietary information confidential from the manufacturer (at least in the case of a third-party certification). The column entitled “Status of Assessment” is laid out to provide the status of each ingredient’s with regard to certification to the NSF standard. It was suggested that the full name of the standard (when published) is used in the description. However, it was argued that there may be other appropriate standards that the ingredients could be certified to, which should also be included in this section as an option.

Hardy Sullivan then walked the group through the section entitled “Colorants: Piece Dyes. It was asked whether the information provided for this section would be required to be SKUs or if construction information would suffice. It was recommended that a similar section be added for yarn dyes.

The group also discussed how the form would be used. Hardy pointed out that this table is to be used by the manufacturer to identify the suppliers and construction information to the certification agency and that this would be used in addition to the PMI request form. He stated that his idea is that it would be a normative section in the standard. Jaclyn Bowen suggested incorporating it as an informational annex as a suggested method of collecting supplier information.

The task group agreed to continue this discussion at the next conference call and to resume the previous conversation about the PMI request form, starting at the top of page 3 of 9.

The task group will resume meeting every other Tuesday from 10-11 am EDT. The next call will be scheduled for September 25, 2007.
Sarah Kozanecki called the meeting to order, read the anti-trust statement, and took roll call. Prior to the call, Sarah circulated the following documents:

1) The Product Materials Information (PMI) request form.
2) The summary from the last conference call on September 12, 2007.

Kurt Kneen began by giving some background information on the PMI request form. He stated that it was a checklist that was derived from the requirements of the standard (both optional and mandatory). There are some notes throughout where additional clarification may be necessary. He stated that the goal of the conference call would be to go through the PMI request form and clarify any sections where there were questions, and also allow the manufacturers present to voice any questions or concerns about the form. He also clarified that this form would be used for each supplier as well. The following summarizes the discussion that followed:

- **Section 7.2.** Kurt Kneen asked whether the Scope section was intended to be a core requirement without points awarded. Ivy Berman stated that the scoring task group is still working on those details, but there has been some discussion about making the core requirements prerequisites, for which no points would be awarded. Eric Harrington pointed out that either way, it would be necessary to meet this requirement in order to meet those listed in 7.3.1. He suggested moving the requirements here to 7.3.1.

- **Section 8.** Kurt asked whether the table for the chemicals listed in Section 307 of the Clean Water Act (CWA) should be provided or if the manufacturers will have to look up the most recent version. This raised a question as to whether all or just some of the chemicals on that list would require documentation. Jane Wilson stated that as it is written, all of the chemicals must be tested for. However, it may be that it doesn’t make sense to test for them all. If that is the case, though, that will need to be clarified in the standard. Another question was raised as to whether it made sense to test for the constituents of the CWA at all if the manufacturers are already required to comply with it. It was pointed out that Henry Boyter is leading the charge on that section and he should be consulted.

- **Section 8.4.2.** Some believed that daily testing for effluent pH was excessive and may be cost prohibitive. The following section on effluent temperature specifies a monthly average for the preceding twelve months, so there is an argument to use the same frequency for pH for consistency. The group agreed to ask Henry Boyter what the intent of that requirement is and to clarify how far back the documentation should date. Jane Wilson stated that as it is written, all of the chemicals must be tested for. However, it may be that it doesn’t make sense to test for them all. If that is the case, though, that will need to be clarified in the standard. Another question was raised as to whether it made sense to test for the constituents of the CWA at all if the manufacturers are already required to comply with it. It was pointed out that Henry Boyter is leading the charge on that section and he should be consulted.
Section 9.4.2. Kurt posed a question regarding the range of offsets available for renewable energy. He felt that the range was very limited and asked the group whether they felt that it could be expanded. The group discussed it and it was suggested to add a 25% and 75% range as well, with 10% being the first starting point. The new ranges would be 10-25%, 26-50%, 51-75% and 76-100%. The issue of rounding was brought up, but Kurt recommended using absolutes. All agreed to this suggestion. The question of how to achieve the renewable category requirements was asked, and Janan Rabiah noted that there were three ways defined in the standard: 1) onsite generation, 2) direct purchase, and 3) purchase of certificates.

Section 12.4.8. Kurt asked whether the training program specified in this section should be specific to SA8000 compliance issues. The group agreed that a language change would be necessary to clarify the intent, which is that training be supplied for manufacturers in identifying suppliers that meet the requirements of SA8000.

Section 10.2. This section requires provision of documentation regarding disposition of pre-consumer materials. Kurt asked if it would be appropriate to add some additional description of what kind of documentation would meet this requirement. Janan Rabiah stated that this section is similar to the issue that arose in Section 7.2 and that further sections developing this point need to be added. She stated that she would contact Henry Boyter with this regard as well.

Kurt opened the discussion to other questions that manufacturers had with regard to implementing the standard. He stated that while the group has been previously caught up in the details of what the documents would look like for collecting this information, what should now be focused on are the goals of each section and whether they are feasible to put into practice. The group should begin to identify and work through any hurdles that are uncovered by a careful review of the standard. Jane Wilson echoed this, and stated that it should not be the information collection tools, but the standard itself that drives the pilot study. She suggested that each manufacturer attempt to collect the information called for in each section of the standard, and make note of whether the documentation addresses the intent of the standard. If some things cannot be implemented, they may warrant changes to the standard.

Janan Rabiah suggested that if suppliers are not cooperative, that NSF can contact them directly to secure the necessary information to overcome that obstacle. Ivy Berman suggested that manufacturers ask themselves whether a) the information is obtainable, b) they are able to meet the standard, and c) the requirements are cost prohibitive.

The group agreed to review sections 4, 5, and 7 before the next call and to bring their questions or comments to the next conference call, scheduled for October 23, 2007 (10-11 am EDT).

Other action items:
Sarah Kozanecki – compile a list of concerns that should be addressed by the Joint Committee.
Sarah Kozanecki called the meeting to order, read the anti-trust statement, and took roll call. At the previous meeting, the group was asked to try to implement sections 4, 5, and 7 of the draft standard and report back on any clarification needed, issues encountered, etc. The following points were discussed:

Section 4

The group discussed how far back the manufacturer flow chart should go. Beth McInnis brought up the issue, asking if a flow chart for a dye facility is needed if yarn is dyed offsite. It was pointed out that the reason for requiring the flow chart is to give the certifier a sense of what parts of the supply chain might need to be investigated further. In the most recent version of the standard (dated 7-23-07), there is an example in annex C. The example includes the boundaries of the manufacturer’s process including first tier suppliers only (but not individual flow charts for each supplier). NSF confirmed that this would be sufficient.

Section 5

5.3.7 Heavy metal-free fibers: David Ryan stated that he had received a question from a supplier regarding heavy metal-free fibers. It was not clear to them whether this section pertained also to recycled fibers. It was indicated that 5.3.7, Heavy metal-free fibers, does not apply to recycled content.

Jane Wilson pointed out that this section leaves the possibility for fractional points, which she suggested might not be desirable. The group agreed that a change was appropriate such that the credits earned would be two (2) for 100% heavy metal-free and one (1) for 50-99% heavy metal-free. This recommendation will be forwarded to the task group on fiber sourcing.

5.3.6 Recycled Content: It was asked whether pre-consumer had been defined. There is a survey to go out to the ACT membership and the Joint Committee from the task group on recycling that will ask for input in the definition, but it had not yet been defined. It was also suggested that if a definition could not be agreed to, credit could still be provided for the use of wide-spec chip.

Section 7

In this section the requirement is for five years of water consumption data. One question that came up was when data collection should start if five years of data are not available. It was mentioned that this section was to be rewritten such that some points are attainable if a conscientious effort has been made in the past.

There was concern over the fact that the energy and water sections do not carry equal points even though the requirements seem similar. It was suggested that the recommendation be made to the task group on water requirements that points be gained by showing how a reduction was made (an optional credit) and that the minimum requirement be to show documentation of what the current usage is at the time of initial certification. Another concern that was expressed was that since points are earned simply by showing reduction, a manufacturer may gain points but still be using more water than the rest of the industry. The group was reminded that this document is not static and that in the future, more definitive boundaries can be set.
The group also discussed whether water that is used outside of the production should be considered (e.g. humidity control, lavatories, etc.). This question will be forwarded to the water task group for consideration. The group also discussed the link between water consumption and water quality and the suggestion that lower water consumption generally leads to poor water quality.

Next meeting

For the next meeting, the group was instructed to implement and report back on sections 8 and 9. Janan Rabiah suggested putting any comments or suggested revisions in writing. It was also stressed that data should be submitted to NSF as necessary for certification via Kurt Kneen (kneen@nsf.org).
5 Step Certification Process

1. Application for each plant producing final product
2. Submittal of Product Material Information and Process Checklist
   - Client Complete Product Material Information
     - Additional formulation information may be required from the product and ingredient suppliers
   - Client Complete Process Checklist
3. Documentation Review
   - Review of product material information submittal
   - Assignment of credits base on material safety review and Process Checklist
4. Plant Audit
   - Verification of information submitted in checklist
   - Tour of plant location
   - Review of production records etc.
   - Review quality assurance processes
5. Listing and Certification
   - Once all requirements are met...
     ✓ Products that meet the requirements of the standard are Certified by NSF and entitled to bear the NSF Mark.
     ✓ Certified products appear in NSF Listings.
     ✓ NSF Listing Books are published annually.
     ✓ NSF Listings are available on the Internet at: www.nsf.org/
AGREEMENT FOR NONDISCLOSURE OF CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION

THIS AGREEMENT is made by and between NSF International ("NSF"), at 789 N. Dixboro Road, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48105, and ______ (“Company”) at ______.

The Company may disclose to NSF certain information regarding its operations, processes, or products, including the chemical composition of materials or ingredients, or submit to NSF samples, in order to allow NSF to evaluate the Company or its products for certification, registration, or for specific end uses approved in writing by the Company. Any such disclosures or submissions to NSF are subject to the following terms and conditions.

1. "Confidential Information" includes all commercial or business information, manufacturing techniques, analytical methods, samples, specifications, processes, applications, formulae, equipment, inventions, toxicology studies, and related information received by NSF orally, visually, or in written form. Confidential Information also includes any and all findings, data, conclusions and other pertinent information or materials generated in the course of this evaluation (hereinafter "Results").

2. As used in this Agreement, "Confidential Information" does not include information which (a) was in the public domain prior to disclosure to NSF, (b) becomes part of the public domain through no unauthorized act or omission of NSF, (c) as evidenced by written records, was lawfully in NSF's possession prior to disclosure by the Company, or (d) was obtained on a non-confidential basis by NSF from a third party under no obligation to the Company not to disclose the Confidential Information.

3. Before submitting information or documents to NSF, the Company shall designate and label "CONFIDENTIAL" any written Confidential Information that it considers to be confidential and proprietary. In order to designate as Confidential, information which is disclosed orally or visually, Company shall summarize the information and submit the summary to NSF, designated as “CONFIDENTIAL”. If Company wishes to designate information that NSF receives from a third party as Confidential Information, Company shall specifically identify in writing the information it wishes to so designate.

4. If NSF disagrees with the confidential designation, it shall notify the Company in writing and shall state its reasons for disagreeing and provide any factual or evidentiary support for disagreeing. Until the disagreement about the confidential designation is resolved, as agreed to in writing by both parties, the Confidential Information shall be maintained by NSF as "Confidential Information" or returned to the Company.

5. Except as set forth herein, NSF will not disclose to any third party, including parent companies, subsidiaries, affiliates, or other related entities, any Confidential Information without the Company's prior written consent and will keep confidential all Confidential Information consistent with the terms of this Agreement.

6. If NSF receives a subpoena or request for production of the Confidential Information, or becomes aware of any situation in which NSF believes that release of Confidential Information is required by law, NSF will: a) notify the Company promptly of the subpoena or request unless prohibited by law; b) seek the Company's consent to release the Confidential Information; and c) inquire whether the Company asserts a proprietary interest in the Confidential Information. If the Company does not assert a proprietary interest, NSF may release the information to parties requesting the information. If the Company does assert a proprietary interest, Company shall intervene to assert such proprietary interest. At NSF's discretion, NSF may also resist the disclosure, object and/or seek to quash the subpoena, and/or seek a protective order covering the Confidential Information, and NSF may produce all Confidential Information that a court may so order. Steps taken by NSF at the request of Company will be taken at the Company's expense, including costs and attorney's fees. If a Court or Agency orders release of the Confidential Information, NSF will release the information only to parties entitled by the order to receive such information.

7. The Confidential Information shall be used by NSF only in connection with its internal evaluation of products of the Company consistent with the terms of this Agreement. However, to the extent NSF generates acceptable exposure...
limits (e.g., TAC, SPAC) from such evaluation, NSF may use such exposure limits to evaluate other products and may share such exposure limits outside NSF provided that Company’s name is not associated with disclosure of exposure limits and that no other Company Confidential Information is disclosed in connection with such disclosures.

8. NSF will limit disclosure of and access to the Confidential Information to NSF employees and representatives who are directly involved with such evaluation and to accreditation auditors who review NSF’s procedures and policies for purposes of maintaining accreditation and/or as required by law. The disclosure and access shall be limited to what is necessary to NSF’s business activities concerning the Company. NSF’s employees shall preserve the confidential nature of the Confidential Information consistent with the terms of this Agreement.

9. No license or right is granted hereby to NSF, by implication or otherwise, with respect to or under any patent application, patent, claims of patent or any other proprietary or intellectual property rights of the Company with respect to the Confidential Information. All rights, title and interest in and to any and all inventions (including discoveries, ideas and improvements, whether patentable or not), which are conceived or made during or after the term of this Agreement and are derived from or utilized in the Confidential Information, shall belong to the Company.

10. This Agreement shall take effect when executed by both parties. Either party may terminate this Agreement at any time upon thirty (30) days written notice to the other party. At the termination of this Agreement, all Confidential Information in the possession of NSF, except for those documents required by NSF’s records retention policies or practices for NSF’s legal protection, will be destroyed or, at the request and expense of the Company, will be returned to the Company. NSF shall maintain the confidentiality of Confidential Information during the term of this Agreement and for 10 years after its termination.

This Agreement shall be governed by and construed in accordance with the laws of the State of Michigan.

NSF International

By: ____________________________

Typed Name: Michael P. Walsh

Title: Chief Financial Officer

Date: ____________________________

COMPANY: ____________________________

By: ____________________________

Typed Name: ____________________________

Title: ____________________________

Date: ____________________________
Information Request - NSF/ANSI Standards - Ingredient Information

Why did I receive this request?
The attached form has been forwarded to you for completion in support of the use of one of your products in a potable water, food, or dietary supplement application. Your customer has made application with NSF to evaluate their product, which is produced in part with this material. As your customer has made application with NSF, NSF will not invoice you for any services performed in this evaluation.

What should I do with this form?
Please complete the entire form even if you do not manufacture this material.

If you own the formulation for this material, please enter the formulation for it in Section 3.

- OR -

If you are a distributor of this material, please complete the entire form, and in Section 3 enter the trade name and supplier of the material you buy. Enter the percentage as 100%. If you use alternate materials, please enter all alternates.

If you need assistance please call 1-800-252-6010.

Who is NSF?
NSF International, The Public Health and Safety Company™, a not-for-profit, non-governmental organization, is the world leader in standards development, product certification, education, and risk-management for public health and safety. For 60 years, NSF has been committed to public health, safety, and protection of the environment.

NSF Standards
NSF has developed over 50 voluntary American National Standards under the scope of public health and safety focusing on food, water, indoor air, dietary supplements, and the environment. NSF/ANSI Standards are developed through involvement of those who are directly and materially affected by the scope of the standard. The process ensures balanced input from industry representatives, public health/regulatory officials, and users/consumer representatives. NSF is accredited by the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) to develop American National Standards. ANSI’s accreditation verifies that NSF develops standards in a manner to ensure openness and due process allowing for equity and fair play.

Will my information remain confidential?
Only NSF authorized personnel are permitted accesses to the information provided on this form. The security of this form and the information it contains is maintained through our confidential business information procedures and will not be revealed or provided to applicants, their suppliers, or other parties without your company’s prior written consent.
Ingredient Information

The information requested on this form is important to your customer and to NSF.
Please complete and return this form as soon as possible, or call 1-800-252-6010 for assistance.

1. Company information:

   Company name ____________________________ Company contact ____________________________
   Address ____________________________ Telephone number (____) ____________________________
   ____________________________ FAX number (____) ____________________________
   ____________________________ Email ____________________________

2. Product information:

   2.1. Product name/Trade designation
   ____________________________

   2.2. Additional names/designations for same product
   ____________________________
   ____________________________
   ____________________________

   2.3. Chemical name/description ____________________________

   2.4. C.A.S. Registry number: ____________________________

   2.5. Do you use any recycled or reprocessed materials when you make this product?  ☐ Yes  ☐ No
   If yes, please attach or mail documentation describing control process, quality, and purity of recycled or reprocessed material.

   2.6. On the following page please enter the formulation/recipe of your product.
3. **Formulation information:** For complete descriptions of the requested information, please see the last page of this form.

Please send an MSDS for each ingredient in the formulation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Omission of information may significantly delay the completion of the certification process.

**ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED ON THIS PAGE IS CONFIDENTIAL**
4. Please provide the following information if available:
   1. Chemical migration studies
   2. List of known contaminants or impurities
   3. Toxicology studies performed on any of the ingredients

5. Certification statement:
   I hereby certify that the information provided to NSF is accurate and complete, and that I, and the Company that I represent, know of no reason the product/material described herein should not be used in contact with drinking water or food. It is also understood that the use of the information submitted may be used as a basis for reviewing/accepting other products which contain this material.
   □ (Optional) By checking this box it is further certified that this material is intended for use in human consumption applications and that the material meets the requirements for the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act as amended.

   Signature ___________________________________________  Date __________________
   □ For forms submitted electronically, check this box to indicate agreement to the Certification Statement above (required).
   Typed or printed name ______________________________________
   Position/Title ____________________________________________
   Company _________________________________________________
   Phone (____) _______________________________  Fax (____) _______________________
   E-mail address: __________________________________________

6. Return instructions:

   To send by e-mail, completely fill out the form, and type your name and contact information in Section 4. Check the box indicating your agreement with the certification statement. Send your e-mail to SupplierInfo@nsf.org.

   To send by fax, completely fill out and sign the form, then fax to 734-827-7728. This fax number goes to a secure computer in the Toxicology Services department of NSF International.

   To send by U.S. mail or courier, insert completed form in an envelope marked "Confidential Business Information," seal in an outer envelope, and return to:

   Toxicology Specialist, Water Distribution Systems
   NSF International
   789 Dixboro Road
   Ann Arbor, MI.  48105
   USA
   Phone: 734-769-8010
Formulation information: What should I enter in each column?

[1] The CAS number (Chemical Abstracts Service registry number) is a systematic numbering convention that uniquely identifies each chemical. You may be able to find this information on the MSDS for the ingredient. If the ingredient is a mixture of several chemicals, enter the word “mixture.” There are multiple resources available on the web and elsewhere for finding specific CAS numbers (e.g., http://chem.sis.nlm.nih.gov/chemidplus/cmplxqry.html). All CAS numbers are up to nine digits, which are separated into three groups by hyphens. The first part of the number, starting from the left, has up to six digits; the second part after the first hyphen has two digits. Finally, the third part of the CAS number following the last hyphen is single digit. For example, a CAS number may look 123456-12-1. If it is not in this format, it is not a valid CAS number. If you cannot determine a CAS number for an ingredient, leave this area blank.

[2] The chemical name for each ingredient can be found on the MSDS for the ingredient.

[3] The trade name is the unique name or number of the ingredient as you buy it from your supplier. This information can be obtained from your purchasing department.

[4] The supplier is the company from whom you buy this ingredient. If you know that your supplier is a distributor, and you know the name of the company that manufactures the ingredient, please enter both company names here. Write (D) after the distributor’s name, and (M) after the manufacturer’s name. For each ingredient that you buy from more than one supplier, please enter each chemical name, trade name, supplier, and % or phr on a separate line.

[5] I, R, P indicates whether the specific ingredient is an ingredient, reactant or processing aid. If you’re not sure what to enter here, please call for assistance (800-252-6010).

[6] The parts by weight (PPW) or % must be completed for each ingredient. The total of all ingredients must always equal 100%.

[7] The 21CFR Reference is optional; if you include it on this form, and at a later date another customer applies to NSF for certification of their product to another ANSI/NSF Standard, we will not have to contact you again for this information. The 21 CFR reference should include paragraph and subchapter references when appropriate. 21 CFR is available from a local U.S Government printing office outlet or the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government, Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. Phone: (202) 512-1800. Websites that allow access to these documents: www.access.gpo.gov or www.fda.gov

An example of a completed formulation is shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12345-67-8 Polypropylene</td>
<td>Truix 680</td>
<td>Brighton Supplies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>178.9090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98765-43-2 Additive</td>
<td>PPX452230</td>
<td>Additive Corporation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>178.1212</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>