Welcome
Jennifer Costley, Chair, welcomed everyone to the meeting of the NSF Joint Committee (JC) for the Electronic Common Criteria Standard.

Andrea Burr, NSF, conducted Roll Call using the Joint Committee Roster and asked individuals on the call to confirm their attendance. Burr confirmed that quorum was reached. 27 of 42 voting members were in attendance, plus observers. The attendance record is located at the end of this document.

Burr read the NSF Anti-Trust Statement. Costley asked that the meeting summary reflect that the Anti-Trust Statement was read, and that no concerns were raised.

Review Agenda
Costley reviewed the agenda. She noted that the agenda distributed to the JC two weeks ago included a continuation of the discussion from the January call about adding language on how a criterion declaration applied to product category declarations. This conversation has been deferred to the next call since there are criteria recommendations ready to go and more work is needed on the proposed language.

Costley noted that the agenda for the meeting is full. There are 6 TG recommendations, including 4 new criteria, 1 criterion revision and 1 recommendation to remove a criterion. There is an expectation that it will exceed the time allotted. The March 5th meeting will be used to complete this agenda, if needed.

Costley asked if there were any other modifications or additions to the agenda. There were none.

Agenda
- Welcome
- Roll Call
- Anti-Trust Statement
- Review/Approval of Meeting Agenda
- Approval of Meeting Summaries
  - January 16, 2020
- Governance Team Updates
  - IEEE Update on copyright request
- Criteria Discussion and Approval
  (time permitting; criteria will be covered in the order listed)
  - End of Life Management
    - Electronic Straw Ballot results
  - Removal of criteria on Public reporting of Toxics
    - NSF 426 - 12.2.3
    - IEEE 1680.2/.3 - 4.7.2.2
**Responsibility Minerals**
- 9.2.2 Optional – Sourcing conflict minerals from responsible smelters/refiners
- 9.2.3 Optional In Region Conflict Mineral Program

**Carbon Footprint & LCA**
- Additional text to one criterion -5.1.2 Optional - Scope 1, 2 and 3 Corporate carbon footprint
- X.1.1 Optional - Greenhouse gas emissions from product transport

**Corporate Social Responsibility**
- 9.1.1 Manufacturer Supplier Code of Conduct

**Next Steps and Action Items:**
- Upcoming Meeting Schedule
  - March 5, 2020 - overflow from this call
  - March 19, 2020 – standard JC call
  - April 9, 2020 (pending reschedule) overflow from March 19

**Adjourn**

**Motion:** Costley asked for a motion to approve the agenda

a) Motion: Mary-Rose Nguyen  
b) Second: Susan Herbert  
c) Consensus: All in favor – no objections; meeting summary approved

**Approval of Meeting Summary**
Costley asked if there were any comments or revisions to the January 16th, 2020 Meeting Summary. There were none.

**Motion:** Costley asked for a motion to approve the January 16th, 2020 Meeting Summary.

a) Motion: Stephanie LeClerc  
b) Second: Mary Rose Nguyen  
c) Consensus: All in favor – no objections; meeting summary approved

**Governance Team Updates**
Costley provided the following updates.

**IEEE Update**
Costley informed the JC that the IEEE copyright request is still outstanding and that escalation within NSF management is underway. Burr noted that there is a call scheduled between IEEE and NSF on February 21st 2020.

**Updated draft document**
Costley reviewed the status of approved criteria using slide 6 of the meeting slide deck (NSF 487 JC Meeting Slides Feb 20 2020.pdf). A total of 6 criteria have now been approved; 5 of these criteria were approved at the face-to-face meeting in December, the 6th, was approved thru straw ballot and will be discussed later in today’s call. Costley advised the JC that the document which was created in January to include all approved criteria for the standard, which is available to the JC on NOW workspace has been updated to include the EOL criterion. The current document is available for the JC to review (Electronic Products Sustainability Standard - Common Criteria - Approved Criteria DRAFT Feb 12 2020) As additional criteria are approved, they will be added to this document. Costley noted that the total anticipated criteria count has increased due to splitting of some topics at the TG level during drafting.

A TG member made a request to the Governance team to provide a project update on the next JC call, including the timeline for TG activities.

**Meeting Schedule**
Costley asked Gilders to review the upcoming meeting schedule on slide 14 of the meeting slide deck (NSF 487 JC Meeting Slides Feb 20 2020.pdf) highlighting that there are several overflow meetings scheduled in order to keep to the project timeline. Overflow meeting will be cancelled if not needed.

- Next Conference Call:
  - March 5, 2020 – 1-3 pm EST as required - overflow from this call
  - March 19, 2020 – standard JC call
  - April 7, 2020 (pending reschedule from April 9) - standard JC call, 1-3 pm eastern

- Face to Face meeting
  - Tuesday April 28 – Wed April 29th in Washington DC

**Face to face meeting - Hotel block**
Andrea Burr, NSF, informed the JC that a room block at Courtyard Marriott at Downtown Convention Center has been arranged for the April 28 – 29 face to face meeting in Washington DC. The details will be sent out following the JC call. There are a limited number of rooms for Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday (for those planning to attend the Network Equipment meeting.) Burr noted that this was a different hotel, slightly further from the ITI office than the Renaissance Marriott which was used for the December face to face meeting.

**Criteria Discussion and Approval**
Costley took the group thru the criteria which are before the JC in today’s call, noting that the first two items had been included on the agenda for the January 16th JC call.

**End of Life Management**
Costley advised the JC that the Straw Ballot to approve the End of Life Management EOL processing criterion passed. The Ballot, which ran from January 3rd to 22 indicated 86% of JC members in favor of approving the balloted language (as noted in Balloted Language X.3 Required - EOL Processing Requirements). There were 25 votes in favor, 4 opposed and 4 abstentions. The balloted language has, as previously noted, as now been added to the updated approved criteria document.

Costley noted that there were four comments received in the ballot and they are included in the slide deck at the end (NSF 487 JC Meeting Slides Feb 20 2020.pdf). One comment identified an oversight in the Verification Requirements. The balloted language removed the requirements for exempt programs but didn’t make the corresponding edits to the Verification Requirements. Costley stated that this change to the Verification Requirements is editorial and will not impact the approval of the criterion. She will ask the EOL TG for its recommendation on modifying the language, and the JC will be asked to approve that revision in the final editorial cleanup before the standard goes to ballot.

Costley asked if there were any questions.

Discussion

The exact wording of the motion was questioned. In reviewing the motion, it was determined that the motion was to approve the language but did not explicitly state that it would be moved into the draft standard. Costley stated that the meeting summary made it clear that the intent was that the language would go into the draft standard. However, going forward motions will explicitly include such intent.

Following the discussion of the straw ballot outcome, the purpose of a “straw ballot” was clarified. Patty Dillon noted that a ‘straw ballot’ is an electronic vote of the JC which is used for making a binding but interim decision in the process, however it is not the same as a “Ballot”. NSF reserves the term “Ballot” for the final vote to approve the standard. It was further clarified that the term ‘straw poll’ means an informal gauge of where the group stands on a topic.

Corporate Reporting and Public Disclosure

- Removal of criteria on Public Reporting of Toxics

Costley noted that this topic had been included in the January 16th JC call but had not been presented due to time constraints. Costley then invited Dillon, acting chair of the Task Group on Corporate Reporting and Public Disclosure, to present the TG recommendation. Dillon provided the JC with a short synopsis of the CRPD TG discussions on this criterion from the November 21 JC call. A document was distributed to the JC two weeks in advance of January JC call, providing additional details and the criteria language (see file NSF 487– Removal of criteria on Public reporting of Toxics Jan 3 2020.pdf). This topic was initially included in the scope of the CRPD TG as it was listed as potential criterion for harmonization and inclusion in the standard. Following TG discussions on this topic, the group recommended to the JC that this topic be removed from the scope of NSF 487.
Costley opened the floor to discussion.

**Discussion**

A TG member raised a question about the status of these criteria in the product standards. Dillon stated that the removal of this topic from the scope of NSF 487 had no impact on the existing requirements in product standards (servers and imaging equipment), as this JC cannot modify other standards. Action will need to be taken by the specific product standards to remove these criteria, if the respective committees want to take this action.

*Motion:* Costley asked for a Motion to remove the Public Reporting of Toxics criterion from consideration in NSF 487.

1. Motion: Holly Elwood
2. Second: Lucian Turk
3. Consensus: All in favor – no objections; a criterion on Public Reporting of Toxics will not be included in the draft standard

**Responsible Minerals Sourcing**

Costley welcomed Responsible Minerals Sourcing TG Chair, Cate Berard, to present to the JC. Berard reviewed the status of the Responsible Minerals TG. The TG has drafted two additional criteria for JC review and approval. These criteria are both optional. Berard reminded the JC that at the December F2F a required criterion was approved for inclusion in the draft standard.

1. **9.2.2 Optional – Sourcing conflict minerals from responsible smelters/refiners**

Berard walked the group thru the proposed draft criterion, noting that drafting of new text for this topic had occurred following the review of the existing criteria on this topic. The TG drafted and updated the references in the criterion to include references to the OECD Due Diligence Guidance.

Costley opened the floor to discussion.

**Discussion**

There was a request from an imaging equipment manufacturer to consider phasing in the percentage outlined in the criterion over time, as this criterion may be difficult for some manufacturers to meet. This criterion is not currently in the imaging equipment or television standards. It was noted that this is an optional criterion. Currently 100% of manufacturers claim this criterion in UL 110, 17% for the computer & displays standard, and 0% for the server standard.

*Motion:* Costley asked for a Motion to approve the inclusion of 9.2.2 Optional – Sourcing conflict minerals from responsible smelters/refiners in the draft standard.

1. Motion: Cate Berard
2. Second: Holly Elwood
b) 9.2.3 Optional In Region Conflict Mineral Program

Berard walked the group thru the proposed draft criterion. The TG is recommending that NSF 487 directly reference conformance with IEEE 1680.1 criterion 4.10.2.2. The TG chose to specifically reference the 2018 version, and to update it if needed through the NSF continuous maintenance process as needed.

Discussion

There was a question from the TG regarding the use of a dated reference in the criterion. Burr confirmed that the reference will be to the fixed dated reference document. Any future changes to the referenced criterion would not be reflected in this standard unless the date of the reference was revised thru NSF continuous maintenance process.

Motion: Costley asked for a Motion to approve the inclusion of 9.2.3 Optional In Region Conflict Mineral Program in the draft standard.

a) Motion: Holly Elwood
b) Second: Cate Berard
c) Consensus: All in favor – no objections; 9.2.3 Optional In Region Conflict Mineral Program will be included in the draft standard

Berard also noted that the work of this TG is complete. A JC member asked about the request to add cobalt which had been submitted via an Issue Paper. Berard explained that the TG considered the request to add cobalt to the definition of conflict minerals or to the criterion. The TG agreed that a separate criterion would be needed to address cobalt. Costley stated that the Issue Paper will be deferred to the continuous maintenance process since the JC had agreed that new criteria would not be considered in this round.

A concern was raised that this criterion would require all manufacturers to purchase the IEEE standard in order to conform to this criterion. Dillon reminded JC members that GEC provides free access to IEEE 1680.1 thru the GEC website, under an agreement with IEEE.

Carbon Footprint & LCA

Costley welcomed Carbon Footprint and LCA TG Chair, Alexandra Degher, to present to the JC. Degher reviewed the status of the of the Carbon Footprint and LCA TG. The TG has two criteria for the JC to consider and approve – a revision to a criterion approved at the F2F, and a new criterion on product carbon footprint.

a) 5.1.2 Optional - Scope 1, 2 and 3 Corporate carbon footprint
Degher walked the group thru the proposed draft criterion highlighting that this criterion had already been approved by the JC during the December 3-4th face to face meeting. Degher noted that a reduction goal is proposed for this criterion because the scope of the corporate carbon footprint criterion (5.1.2) covers a broader scope of activities than the transportation criterion, which was drafted to include a reduction goal, and therefore, has the potential for a greater impact.

Costley opened the floor to discussion.

**Discussion**

The draft criteria presented was revised during the call to clearly link the GHG emission reduction goal to the CCF assessment required in Part A of the criterion. Costley noted that this change allows more flexibility not less. The updated text is noted in file (5.1.2 Optional – Scope 1 3 and 3 Corporate Footprint Part B – approved Feb 20 2020.pdf)

**Motion:** Costley asked for a Motion to approve the addition of part b and the change to verification element h in the previously approved criterion 5.1.2 Optional - Scope 1, 2 and 3 Corporate carbon footprint.

a) Motion: Alex Degher
b) Second: Holly Elwood
c) Consensus: All in favor – no objections; the updated criterion 5.1.2 Optional - Scope 1, 2 and 3 Corporate carbon footprint including the addition of part b and the change to verification element h will be included in the draft standard – no objections.

**b) X.1.1 Optional -Greenhouse gas emissions from product transport**

Degher walked the group thru the proposed draft criterion, highlighting that this optional criterion is based upon NSF 426. Degher noted that there are two open questions for the JC to weigh in on for this criterion.

The first question was with regards to the frequency of verification of the transportation carbon footprint results. Should this 3rd party verification be conducted annually or tri-annually?

Costley asked the JC to weigh in, and after some discussion, noted that there was not a clear consensus on the frequency of 3rd party verification. JC members also highlighted that the frequency of 3rd party verification is not consistent across criteria in the standard. Costley remanded the question on the frequency of 3rd party verification in this criterion to a straw poll following the meeting and noted that the larger discussion regarding frequency of 3rd party verification across the standard will be included in an upcoming JC meeting.

**Action Item**
– Andrea Burr, NSF will create and distribute a straw poll on this question.
The second question before the JC on this criterion was the removal of the requirement for a reduction goal and public reporting of progress toward the goal. Degher reminded the JC that the intent of the TG was to remove the reduction goal from this product transport criterion, and instead include a reduction goal in the CCF criterion.

Costley asked the JC to weigh in on the removal of the product transport greenhouse gas emission reduction goal. Some JC members questioned why a reduction goal shouldn’t be included in both the product transport and CCF criteria, since the value in creating a goal is to reduce impact. If a manufacturer only worked towards the product transport criterion, they wouldn’t be required to have a reduction goal.

Costley asked the JC if there were strong objections to leaving the reduction goal sentence in the criterion. Several manufacturers objected to leaving the sentence in the criterion. Costley stated that this question would also go out to a straw poll to gauge the preference of the full JC.

**Action Item**
– Andrea Burr, NSF to create and distribute a straw poll on this issue.

It was suggested that the JC consider the overall points allocation for criteria topics in future discussions.

**Corporate Social Responsibility**

Costley remanded this topic to the March 5th meeting due to time constraints.

**Next Steps & Wrap Up**

Gilders reviewed the upcoming meeting schedule:

- March 5, 2020 – 1-3 pm EST - overflow from this call
  
  Agenda items will include review and approval of CSR criterion 9.1.1, and continuation of the discussion of the Product Transport Carbon Footprint criterion.

- March 19, 2020 – standard JC call

**Adjourn:**

Costley asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting.

  a) Motion: Holly Elwood
  b) Second: Ted Knudson
  c) Consensus: All in favor – no / objections; meeting summary approved

**Feb-20-2019 Meeting Attendees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US Department of Energy</td>
<td>Berard, Cate</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SABIC</td>
<td>Buoniconti, Ralph</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC Rebuilders LLC</td>
<td>Cade, Willie</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITIC</td>
<td>Cleet, Chris</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York Academy of Sciences</td>
<td>Costley, Jennifer</td>
<td>JC Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP</td>
<td>Degher, Alexandra</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xerox</td>
<td>DeYoung, Victoria (Tori)</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Environmental Protection Agency</td>
<td>Elwood, Holly</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPE</td>
<td>Hellar, Derek</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Electronics Council</td>
<td>Herbert, Susan</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UL LLC</td>
<td>Hoffman, William</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apple, Inc.</td>
<td>Holliday, Kim</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ricoh USA</td>
<td>Ito, Kousuke</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECD Compliance.</td>
<td>Jager, Walter</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG Electronics</td>
<td>Jung, Chanil</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materion Corporation</td>
<td>Knudson, Theodore (Ted)</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGill University</td>
<td>Leclerc, Stephanie</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canon USA</td>
<td>Lirio, Andrew</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microsoft Corporation</td>
<td>Llivina, Raquel</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBM – United States</td>
<td>Mann, Tim</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panasonic</td>
<td>Murphy, Andrea</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMD</td>
<td>Murrill, Justin</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy Advisory LLC</td>
<td>Nguyen, Mary-Rose</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Solar, Inc</td>
<td>Sinha, Parikhit (Ricky)</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dell, Inc.</td>
<td>Turk, Lucian</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intel</td>
<td>Woodbury, Christopher</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Google</td>
<td>Young, Linda</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US DOE Sustainable Acquisition Program</td>
<td>Cannon, Sandra</td>
<td>Observer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Electronics Council</td>
<td>Dillon, Patty</td>
<td>Observer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toshiba America Business Solution Inc.</td>
<td>Escamilla, Christopher</td>
<td>Observer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fujitsu</td>
<td>Feuerer, Dieter</td>
<td>Observer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epson America, Inc.</td>
<td>Finley, Joel</td>
<td>Observer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intel</td>
<td>Gates, Emma</td>
<td>Observer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Electronics Council</td>
<td>Gilders, Andrea</td>
<td>Observer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Environmental Protection Agency</td>
<td>Larkin, Jenna</td>
<td>Observer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ricoh USA</td>
<td>Miyaoka, Yoko</td>
<td>Observer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP</td>
<td>Nakao, Juliana</td>
<td>Observer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cisco Systems, Inc.</td>
<td>Poon, Daisy</td>
<td>Observer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Konica Minolta</td>
<td>Ringo, Tim</td>
<td>Observer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSF International</td>
<td>Burr, Andrea</td>
<td>Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Institute of Technology</td>
<td>Realff, Matthew</td>
<td>Vice chair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>