V Scope/Generalities

J. Wammack led a discussion on the comments received during the March 2008 straw ballot. She stated that several comments were received on the definition of first-, second-, and third-party. The proposed solution was to use the same definitions that the BIFMA sustainability assessment standard uses. These would fall under the “conformity assessment” definition, which would give more guidance to the applicant and harmonize the Standard with the BIFMA standard. The following language was proposed:

Conformity assessment: Demonstration that specified requirements relating to a product, process, system, person, or body are fulfilled.

First party conformity assessment: conformity assessment activity that is performed by the person or organization that provides the object.

Second party conformity assessment: conformity assessment activity that is performed by a person or organization that has a user or purchaser interest in the object.

Third party conformity assessment: conformity assessment activity that is performed by a person or body that is independent of the person or organization that provides the object, and of the user or purchaser interests in that object.

J. Wammack then addressed S. Tweedys’s comment, which related to the issue of the supply chain as it is addressed in the different scopes throughout the standard. J. Wammack agreed that there might be confusion in the way that these two scopes are written. She explained that the overall scope of standard (1.2) is supposed to set umbrella for the Standard as a whole. This scope intentionally does not specifically state where in the supply chain the Standard applies. The rationale was that different sections might have more logical start/end points (i.e., The credit in Safety of Materials obtained by inventorying the constituents to 100 ppm determines how far back in the supply chain a manufacturer must go.) In other words, the criteria themselves will dictate how far back into the supply chain one must go.

It was also discussed that because it is difficult to create equivalent starting points for synthetic and natural fiber starting points, this might be cause for each section’s scope to be reviewed and further clarified so that each states exactly to where in the supply chain the section applies (exclusions may also be helpful in the scopes). There was a suggestion that modifications be made to each section’s scope for clarity.

S. Tweedys explained his thought that the term “throughout the supply chain” in the general scope is still misleading even if the sections’ scopes were to be clarified. He suggested that each section’s scope should support the main scope, not detract from it. H. Sullivan suggested restating that part of the scope as “selected aspects throughout the supply chain.” He also proposed including an annex to further clarify the boundaries. This was provided to Sarah Kozanecki via email (and will be discussed at a later date with the whole stakeholder group).
J. Wammack explained that there was a comment received from Allen Hawks (Glen Raven) requesting that the boundary line in Annex C be adjusted. J. Ewell explained that the diagram was provided as an example only and was only meant for clarification so that applicants understand where they fit in the supply chain. S. Tweedy recommended discussing that further during the Fiber Sourcing discussion.

J. Wammack explained that a comment had been received from N. Keyes suggesting a change in the title. She asked N. Keyes to explain her comment. N. Keyes began by asking whether the terms “commercial” and “contract” were interchangeable. If so, she suggested that the term “contract” may be better. C. King explained that the term commercial is spelled out in the scope. Some discussion ensued about the scope and terminology of the descriptor for fabrics in the title. N. Keyes suggested that whatever term is used, it should be defined in the scope. After some discussion, it was suggested that the title be changed to “Sustainability assessment for commercial furnishings fabrics.”

It was also suggested that exclusions be added to the scope to add clarity. J. Wammack explained that the intent of the Standard is to be inclusive, not exclusive; she also explained that the Committee should be sensitive to the fact that there are other areas of the industry that may be able to use this standard. However, if a different industry wanted to use the standard, but was excluded by the scope, the goal of moving the industry forward would be hindered. She expressed the opinion that users of the Standard should be able to decide if it applies to their industry or product based on their expertise. However, B. Beaty explained that some sustainability criteria depend on a product’s life after leaving factory, which may change dramatically outside of this specific area of textiles. It was discussed and agreed that wording in the Scope (1.2) should include exclusions to the Standard but should be worded in such a way so non-commercial furnishings users would not be discouraged from using the Standard as a tool if it proves useful for their products.

**Motion:** J. Wammack moved to change the title to “Sustainability assessment for commercial furnishings fabrics.” Seconded by J. Ewell and T. Mak.

**Vote:** 22 in favor, 1 opposed. (6 observers were also in favor, with one abstention.)

*Motion carries.*

P. Wakelyn asked if the term “public occupancy” could somehow be incorporated into the title. An alternative offered was to include that in the scope and/or definition section. This issue was referred to the existing task group.

J. Wammack stated that two comments were received on the definition of synthetic fibers (3.37). It was also suggested that a definition be added for “landfill gas”. The group also discussed whether a definition should be included for “monomer”. J. Ewell explained that this was already covered under Safety of Materials.

J. Wammack asked if a definition should be included for “sustainable development.” She stated that this was previously removed and wondered if it was the intent to add it back in. The group had previously opted not to define “sustainability” or “sustainable” because of the variations in definitions that exist. She read the UN definition for all to hear. E. Harrington pointed out that the term “sustainable development” is not used in the Standard. M. Reaff disagreed that the definition should be included since the standard itself is defining sustainability assessment. However, by virtue of meeting the standard, a product cannot be determined to be “sustainable,” only that it meets the criteria set by the Standard. B. Burke agreed and stated that since only certain factors are being measured, the Standard cannot say it measures “sustainability.” J. Wammack stated that a lot of comments are received regarding the lack of definition of “sustainable” or a related term. B. Stough cautioned that the group must remember that customer expectations may be that the standard addresses “sustainability” and that is in fact what the document is trying to move the industry toward. For time purposes, this question was referred to the task group. J. Wammack also explained that the task group would also address the Normative Reference comments.
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