Meeting Summary

Welcome
Matthew Realff, Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting of the NSF Joint Committee (JC) for the Resilient Flooring Standard.

Review Agenda
Realff reviewed the agenda.

Agenda
Meeting Launch:
- Welcome
- Review call agenda
Roll Call and Anti-Trust Statement
Review of May 12, 2020 Meeting
Proposed Task Group on Environmental Impacts
NSF 332 Topics for Discussion
Next Steps and Action Items:
- Upcoming Meetings
- Next Steps
Adjourn

No other changes, objections or additions to the agenda were noted

Joint Committee
Realff noted that some JC members were unable to attend today. A complete list of Committee members is on the Committee workspace. Realff asked Burr if quorum was reached. Burr stated that quorum was met. There were 13 out of 24 JC members in attendance, meeting quorum requirements. The meeting attendance record is located at the end of this document.

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

Task Groups
Environmental TG will be set up to examine Section 5.

**NSF 332 Topics for Discussion**

We are seeking input from specifier/designers on the group:

How do you use certifications to specify product?

Many standards are available, tend to return to the same products over time. Very difficult to assess, unless LEED certified, tend to look at durability – appropriate product for appropriate setting. (Cost, function, color)

Products may not be differentiated sufficiently. Product category rules are product specific and encompasses the latest thinking in sustainability, each manufacturer can take product X, and provide specific information to the user. EPDs developed from a PCR may not be fully comparable, but it can demonstrate that the company has done its due diligence in sustainability. A company that has not completed an EPD has difficulty demonstrating that due diligence. Can be industry average or product specific.

Product specific cradle-to-grave vs cradle-to-gate lifecycle assessment, comparison should only be made of cradle-to-grave assessments.

Typically, 2 user groups, companies use to improve lifecycle, and designer/specifier community. When plant specific data is used, the resulting EPD is therefore plant specific.

One of the things coming out of this discussion, perhaps the standard could put requirements around where an EPD has to be found. If it can be easily found it can become an evaluation characteristic, but if not available across the board then the information may not be used.

Manufacturers may use the data, but the designers are using it as a check box – complete or not. It is valuable to have the boxes checked, but beyond that it may not be useful.

In discussions with designers, they don’t know about NSF 332. There is too much stuff out there that designers have to dig through, it is just too much – don’t have the time to drill down to that level. VOCs are of some importance.

If it were easy to identify the superior product, then the sustainability attributes could be helpful, but that data is not readily available.

From a manufacturer’s point of view, completing an EPD, LCA is good practice, and they get credit within the organization for making progress. Each company has their own version of an EPD. In its current form it is not a large factor in the decision making.

Designers need better tools for comparison.
NSF 332 standard from a designer perspective – do we talk about where things are available. Look at the value proposition. It is a summarization of data, transparency around certain attributes, consider requiring product specific webpage containing appropriate data.

Transparency in itself and summary of data is not sufficient, thresholds have to be set.

If it’s a pass/fail to know all aspects have been met, if there is a stratified standard, more levels of information must be provided. Would various levels of certification be beneficial? It was suggested that data be laid out, look at the distribution, and go from there. NSF 140 has a scoring system in it (so does NSF 332).

If you are going to define a sustainability leadership standard, there will be some portion that will pass, and a certain portion would be expected to fail. If a gradated scale is provided it gives a path forward.

We hear that there is more confusion in the market that was realized.

Discussion of BIFMA uptake, FACTS. Looking at various standards, some have had more market reach while others have not. Maybe as part of the assessment, consider the model that consumers really use and consider taking on those characteristics

In one study Floor Score certification was the most searched for in the A & D community (VOCs and environmental quality).


[www.Epeat.net](http://www.Epeat.net) is a good resource from another industry, helpful for federal procurement.

How do we create the correct information reduction? Pass/fail vs tiered - problem tends to be with commitment that 90% of products in the end will fail.

**Next Steps and Wrap Up**

Before we reconvene, what are the issues that should be considered by the project team?

Should NSF 332 be US or globally centric?
Rohde offered probably not US only – much resilient floor covering production occurs outside of the US. Constituents may come from all over, throughout Europe, Asia and US. Realff suggested that we will want to consider how it is applied internationally.

**Adjourn:** Realff asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting.
   a. Motion: Rohde
b. Second: Charles Kibert  
c. All approved: no objections
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