I. Welcome/Introductions/Anti-trust Statement

Laura Rauwerda called the meeting to order and welcomed the group to the Business and Institutional Furniture Joint Committee meeting. Lorna Badman read the anti-trust statement. The group went around the room giving self-introductions.

II. Review of Agenda / Previous Meeting Minutes/Approval

Bill Stough reviewed the proposed meeting agenda with the stakeholders and Laura Rauwerda asked for a motion to approve the proposed agenda.

Motion: Norman Christopher moved for the agenda to be accepted. Bill Stough seconded.

Discussion: None.

Vote: All in favor.

Motion passed.

Laura Rauwerda reviewed the September meeting summary with the stakeholders. The BIFMA acronym needs to be corrected on pg. 1. Laura Rauwerda asked for a motion to approve the amended minutes.

Motion: Bill Stough moved to accept the amended September meeting summary. Kathy Jo DeVault seconded.

Discussion: None.

Vote: All in favor.

Motion passed.

III. Review

Action items

Tom Reardon informed the stakeholder group that the BIFMA Board gave some feedback on the absolute/normalized value recommendation. The Board questioned the use of absolute values as it would be difficult to show improvements during times of business growth. They requested that each WG review the their proposal and justify either using the absolute value or normalized
value. A question was asked about removal of supplier diversity language but there was no record of language existing on supplier diversity.

**Solid Waste Goals**

The WG is proposing one point for establishing a solid waste reduction goal and an additional point for achieving the goal. This requires the company not only to set a goal but also show progress towards that goal. Some believe that the original credit language of just establishing a goal to receive a credit point is too easy. Large companies will set a zero waste goal but small companies might not have a goal or a goal of a 10% reduction. The group was reminded that progress will be made towards goals and that companies will not claim 100% reduction.

Following significant discussion, it was suggested that a point be given for a 100% goal and a 2nd point when the goal is achieved. The proposal is written as a corporate credit but the language can be changed to reflect product credit or facility credit. To be consistent with other domestic and international Standards, the credit should be given to the product. A product credit could work in 7.5.4 and 7.5.4.1. Product focus vs. Corporate focus. If trying to drive change across corporate, then keep the credit at corporate level and strike extra point/target. An additional point could be achieved with a 0 goal with certain percentage of facilities meeting that goal.

The solid waste issue will be tabled until after the discussion on absolute vs. normalize. Jim Kozminski will draft language for discussion. Currently, 2 points can be achieved and would be a corporate credit.

Note – The format used should be consistent between energy and waste.

**Legal review/unresolved issues**

Tom Reardon reviewed the concerns raised in the memo from the Legal Counsel. Legal raised 10 - 12 points that facilitated changes to the document. Many of the points made were minor. The memo was circulated to the WG chairs to deal with comments relative to their sections. The Human and Ecosystem Health WG and Social Responsibility WG addressed the concerns pertaining to their section.

The memo suggested including definition references for carcinogens (EPA terms of environment) and hazardous materials (consistent with EPA). References should also be included in the Guidance Document. Other terms of concern include: chemicals of concerns (the company would define), cradle to gate, and gate to gate. The terms ‘child labor’ and forced labor were added to the definition section. ‘Total direct product spent’ was not added to definitions.

Legal had concern with the use of the term ‘element’. Currently, ‘element’ is being used inconsistently throughout the documents. BIFMA staff has made the appropriate changes to 4 – Assessing conformance, evaluation, and assessment criteria. It was noted the Guidance Document does not include the updates from the September meeting for elements, credit, points, absolute etc. This work will be completed in the near future.

Clarification is needed for company credit vs. product credit. Legal suggested product credits but that did not work well. An applicant would be rewarded the credit. Applicant meets the need whether product or company is used.

All Legal comments have been addressed or are being addressed and the documents have been refined.
IV. Work Group – Absolute value vs. normalized value decisions

Task Group 1: Materials

Jim Kozminski reported on the decision of the Materials task group. The WG decided that evidence must be provided to demonstrate an absolute reduction.

What would be the impact of bringing a new facility on-line or a new product? How can a company show a reduction without 3 years of data? Would a credit be given for a water treatment system that limits the use of the water or reuses the water? In 5.12.2, if a water system were incorporated into a new line that helped with water efficiency, the company would be eligible for a point. If a company implemented a wash line using a phosphate-free soap instead of phosphate soap, a point should be awarded. Each scenario would need to work through the process some credits would apply. A brand new line could help or hurt depending on the credit.

Points could be alternated: 1 point for having system and data and 1 point for absolute reduction.

A baseline for a new facility will need to be addressed at some point.

Guidance should be provided or a separate set of points created for facilities/companies without baselines. If a baseline was not available, a facility/company could demonstrate a reduction by comparing a non-efficient system to a more efficient system for a possible point.

Task Group 2: Energy

John Shank reported on the decision of the Energy task group. The WG decided to allow the company to use an absolute value or normalized value. This approach is currently being used by the USEPA.

In the development of the carpet standard, Energy is the only section in which a choice between absolute and normalized can be chosen. All other sections require absolute. The volunteers developing the Standard felt moving towards absolute would help them get to eventual regulation since regulatory schemes deal with absolute reductions. With absolute being the goal, a reduction will be seen.

The group was concerned about providing consistency in marketplace and feel that giving an option is the best way to go. Giving an option allows flexibility for companies. It was noted that a company would not choose a harder route if a point could be awarded via an easier route. There is a lower threshold for absolute reduction. The power industry has been normalizing but this has not worked from a regulation standpoint.

A company could be given the option of one point for normalization and 2 points for absolute across the standard. The number of points would increase and the point structure would change. A common denominator would be needed to normalize. Credits could be adjusted to demonstrate absolute reduction was harder to achieve. Thresholds for absolute could be doubled. For example: 2, 4, 6% reduction absolute and 4, 8, 12% for normalization.

Motion: Bill Stough moved to allow each of the affected credits to use either absolute or normalization and the percent reduction for normalization should be 2 times the percent reduction of the absolute. Anne Saliers seconded.

Discussion: None.

Vote: All in favor.
Motion passed.

6.4 - Companies should be allowed to define their own unit and then “unit” would need to be used throughout the standard. The group decided to strike ‘per unit’ in 6.4.2 and 6.4.3. The group was unsure of how the term ‘embodied energy’ was defined in the market place and decided to delete the term from the body but leave in the title of 6.4.

Percentage credits should be deleted from the headings in the Guidance document.

The group discussed the terms ‘cradle to gate’ and ‘gate to gate’ and the following motions were made:

**Motion:** Larry Dykhuis moved to modify the term ‘gate to gate’ to the following:

3.20 gate-to-gate: a term used to describe the LCA boundary encompassing the life cycle stage of manufacturing, fabrication and assembly of furniture components and units.

Kathy Jo DeVault seconded.

**Discussion:** None.

**Vote:** All in favor.

Motion passed.

**Motion:** John Shank moved to modify the term ‘cradle to gate’ to the following:

3.10 cradle-to-gate: a term used to describe the LCA boundary encompassing the life cycle stages of raw material extraction and conversion to a bulk form or generic shape.

Kathy Jo DeVault seconded.

**Discussion:** None.

**Vote:** All in favor.

Motion passed.

**Motion:** Bill Stough moved to create a 4.4.2 – Normalization to section 4:

4.4.2 Normalization

Some points require improvements against a baseline. Applicants can define the unit they use to demonstrate improvement, but the definition shall be used for all points.

Kathy Jo DeVault seconded.

**Discussion:** Chairs can vary from small to tall, arms to armless etc. Customers demand specific on furniture for comparison reasons. Manufacturers are providing to the customer a summary of the LCA.
The same criteria should be followed to earn a point. The Standard should be sent to the Association ballot and comments compiled.

Units have never been defined. A unit can be a screw to a bracket, pounds, dollars, etc.

**Vote:** All in favor.

*Motion passed*

**Task Group 3: Human and Ecosystem Health**

Gabe Wing reported on the decision of the Human and Ecosystem Health task group. Companies will be able to choose normalization or absolute for 7.5.2.1, 7.5.3 and 7.5.4. The percent reduction for normalization will be 2 times the percent reduction of the absolute.

The Human and ecosystem health section includes re-certification language. The group questioned the need for re-certification requirements. The Human and ecosystem health WG was trying to make it more difficult for a company to double dip. Re-certification was based on a credit-by-credit basis. LEED becomes tougher. Currently, there are no requirements for re-certification in the Standard for the other elements. Should language be added to the guidance document for re-certification? Re-certification needs to be determined by point and not applied across the board.

NSF has some programs with 3-year retest period. ISO requires 2-year retest period.

Views were expressed against giving a company a choice between normalization and absolute. Normalization will not be used for toxic chemicals.

The hyphenated bullets do not include inhalation toxins, which effect people with inhalation issues such as asthma. Inhalation factors should be added. The group felt the term ‘toxic compounds’ would better address the issue. Additional categories, including smog, have been added to 7.5.2.

Some chemicals can cause damage to eyes kidneys, etc. The WG focused on the key issues. Occupational hazards (worker health, ecosystem impacts) are an issue. Safety criteria is documented in a healthy workplace and addressed in the prerequisites in section 8.

Denise Van Valkenburg will revise section 7 according to the motion.

**Task Group 5: Tools**

The Tools Workgroup intent was to create working spreadsheets. The sheets can be utilized for any consumable. The basic requirements have been repeated in several areas so that credits can be easily understood. There is a level playing field for higher issues. Tools creating mechanism creates links back and forth. Guidance documents tie things together. This is a straightforward process to allow people to claim a minimal level green product. The tools will be available on BIFMA website.

**Solid Waste Goals, cont’d.**

Note – Due to the end of the meeting, several members had left and a quorum was no longer present thus a recommendation was made for this agenda item.

**5.11 Solid Waste Management**
The organization shall receive a maximum of two points based on its published and implemented solid waste diversion program for landfill disposal. The organization shall receive:

One point for a 100 percent diversion goal.

One point for achieving 100% diversion, for product to be assessed to the SAS for solid waste generated from fabrication and assembly of product components. Not included are solid waste generated from raw material extraction and conversion; process aids (for example: sandpaper, gloves, spray booth filters); and packaging.

Process aid has been removed. The proposed language achieves the goal of allowing companies to set goals and reward for achieving the goal. Not included are solid waste generated from raw material extraction, i.e. sandpapers, gloves, spray booth filters. This is a product credit and corporate credit.

Presentation of Draft Guidance Document

A standard for format was determined for each of the credits, red text from standard and the black text for WG language. Each WG reviewed credit by created and answered questions. The Guidance Document is longer because of the expanded format; the previous draft contained only the main credits. This draft used the same format for additional credits, therefore doubling the document size. The Standard language in the draft is from the September Standard draft.

A large percent of the language in the Guidance document has placed in the document as a placeholder. The language has been cut and pasted from other documents. More information needs to be included on how to obtain the credit – the methodology statement (1, 2, …) was to provide that information. Guidance should be written as simply as possible to allow other companies to better understand the requirements. It was suggested to group the scope, boundaries etc once, minimize font, eliminate page breaks, and line-up credits. Confusion existed regarding the requirements – requirements are difficult to distinguish and the repetitiveness in the document. A consistent format should be used throughout the document. The LEED document utilizes shading to indicate requirements, which makes the document appear more professional. Some felt the Standard language should remain in the Guidance document. The group was reassured that the Guidance would not be distributed until the correct information was included.

The group moved to discussing where the document should reside. Where the document is housed should depend on whether it is auditable or non-auditable? Guidance documents are not included in the Standard. LEED has the Standard and Guidance as one document. ISO and ANSI guidance documents do not contain standard test. The inclusion of the Guidance in the Standard would make it easier certifying companies. It was noted that the textiles group was planning on having a guidance document.

The Guidance document would be an informative document. If the Guidance document is maintained separately and the Standard language included, text would need to be maintained in 2 documents.

The guidance should include intent/requirement, standard language (in box or different font), credit language, points, scope, boundaries, methodologies, documentation and related credits. A different style will allow for a more informative narrative. Inclusion of examples would be an added benefit.

The guidance could be in final form shortly after the conclusion of the conference. Proposed heading will be stated in updated version. The WG will need to ‘beef-up’ the documentation and methodologies. The guidance needs more work before it will be perfect.
Next hurdle is the absolute value issue for BIFMA board November 2, 2007.

**Timeline**

Preliminary thinking, a November meeting will be held on absolute/normalization issue. The membership ballot will run from mid November to mid February, which hopefully has a positive outcome. The ballot period is longer than the typical 30-day ballot. BIFMA leadership conference in January will feature a program to present Standard. BIFMA is planning 2 webinars – generic over view and then nuts and bolts (drill down of the Standard.) December 3 BIFMA standards webinar and December 6 broader eco labs and standards etc Webinar. January 8 and 10 the above webinars will be repeated.

The Chairs should meet before November 2nd and prep for conference call. A meeting will be scheduled on October 31, 2007 at 2 – 3 pm to prepare for Board teleconference. Status updates will also be given.

Once feedback has been received on the Standard, a JC meeting will be convened to review the comments for possible in corporation into the Standard. This meeting will occur in late February or early March.

A decision has not been made on whether to issue a Draft Standard for Trial Use. This decision will come after the Association ballot.

Excerpt from the 2007 NSF International Standards development and maintenance policies

11 Draft standards for trial use

11.1 Proposal of draft standards for trial use

A materially and directly interested party may approach NSF about the feasibility of publishing a draft standard for trial use. If a JC exists covering the scope of the proposal, the requestor will complete an Issue Paper, which will be sent to the responsible JC. This requestor may supply a draft of the standard or a suggestion that a draft be written. If no JC exists covering the scope of the proposal, NSF may decide to proceed with the publication of the draft standard prior to the formation of a JC.

11.2 Publication of draft standards for trial use

11.2.1 ANSI shall be notified via the Request to Announce the Availability of a Draft Standard for Trial Use form of the intent to register a draft standard for trial use. All public comments shall be responded to by the JC Chair, or by NSF if no JC exists.

11.2.2 After all public comments have been responded to, NSF staff will edit the draft standard document for publication.

11.2.3 The following statement, or equivalent, shall be included on the front cover of the draft standard for trial use:

"Publication of this draft standard for trial use and comment has been approved by NSF International. Distribution of this draft standard for comment shall not continue beyond ( ) months from the date of publication. It is expected that following this ( ) month period, this draft standard, revised as necessary, will be submitted to the American National Standards Institute for approval as an American National Standard. A public review in accordance with ANSI Essential Requirements is required at the end of the trial use period and before a draft standard for trial use may be submitted to ANSI for approval as an American
National Standard. This draft standard is not an American National Standard. Suggestions for revision should be directed to the Secretariat.

NSF will not use the ANSI logo or trademark on any document that has not been approved as an American National Standard, including a draft standard for trial use. If NSF complies with the ANSI Essential Requirements in connection with a draft standard for trial use, it may refer to the draft standard as a Draft American National Standard for Trial Use.

11.2.4 By the end of the trial use period, all further processing of the draft standard for trial use as an NSF or NSF/ANSI standard shall be in compliance with the applicable requirements of these Policies.

Task Group 6: Marketing

Marketing efforts will increase after membership approval of standard.

NeoCon 2008 – June 10 –13th

NSF has taken the lead on developing a presentation for NeoCon 2008 covering all the NSF sustainability projects. NeoCon limits panels to 3 presenters. Mark LaCroix, Dave Kitts and Jane Wilson will be the presenters.

Motion: Laura Rauwerda moved to adjourn the meeting. Brad Miller seconded.

Discussion: None.

Vote: All in favor.

ADJOURN
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