

**NSF 426 Environmental Leadership and Corporate Responsibility Assessment Standard  
for Servers Joint Committee  
Meeting Summary  
September 18, 2018**

*This document is the property of NSF International (NSF), part of the NSF standards development process and is for NSF Committee purpose only. Unless given prior approval from NSF, it shall not be reproduced, circulated, or quoted, in whole or in part, outside of NSF.*

## **Meeting Summary**

### **Welcome**

Jennifer Costley, Chair welcomed everyone to the Joint Committee for Environmental Leadership and Corporate Responsibility Assessment Standard for Servers. Jessica Slomka, NSF Secretariat, is unable to join the call today; Laura Lamb will be filling in.

### **Roll Call/ NSF Anti-Trust Statement & IEEE Call for Patents**

Lamb took attendance using the participant list generated by BlueJeans, and then asked those on the phone only to state their name and affiliation. There were 23 JC members in attendance. The meeting attendance record is located at the end of this document.

Laura Lamb read the NSF antitrust statement. There were no comments or questions raised; all in agreement.

### **Review Agenda**

Costley reviewed the agenda, noting that the meeting has been shortened and is scheduled for 90 minutes, and not 3 hours.

#### **Agenda**

- Roll Call / Anti-Trust / Review Agenda / Approve July 17, 2018 meeting summary
- Review of Ballot Results
- Review of Ballot Comments and Proposed Responses
- Next Steps & Wrap Up
  - Publication timeline
  - Future meetings
- Adjourn

There were no comments on the agenda.

### **Approval of July 17<sup>th</sup>, 2018 Meeting Summary**

**Motion:** Costley asked for a motion to approve the July 17<sup>th</sup> meeting summary.

- a. Motion: Mark Schaffer
- b. Second: Wayne Rifer
- c. Consensus: All in favor – no objections; meeting summary approved

### **Review of Ballot Results**

Costley reviewed the ballot results. All of the 5 ballots have passed. NSF Ballot 426i3r1, 426i4r1, 426i6r1 and 426i7r1 all received 100% approval (of those who voted, percentage of affirmative votes excluding abstentions), and can continue to the NSF Council for Public Health Consultants (CPHC) for final review and approval.

One ballot, NSF Ballot 426i5r1, also passed with 88% approval, but received 3 negative votes with comments, and therefore responses to the comments need to be developed and discussed by the JC. There are two possible paths forward for responding to the comments:

- 1) The JC agrees to make revisions to the standard/ballot (r2 for issue 5) which would then result in a revision and adjudication ballot
- 2) The JC does not find the arguments persuasive, and makes no revisions; the ballot will still need to be recirculated as an adjudication ballot

For either path, the recirculated ballot will be open for a minimum of 14 days and members have the opportunity to respond, reaffirm or change their votes.

The publication of NSF 426 will be held until 426i5r1 is resolved.

Costley asked if there were any questions. There were none.

Costley explained that we did receive a couple questions about the “Total percentage of affirmative votes” which was included in the email with information about the ballots. This % refers to the total percentage of affirmative votes received from JC members (all members, not just those that voted). This is essentially a participation/quorum requirement of greater than 50%, and for the 5 ballots ranged from 51% - 62.2%. The two-thirds threshold for approval still holds – it is two-thirds of those JC members that voted.

Costley asked if there were any questions. There were none.

### **Review of Ballot Comments and Proposed Responses**

Pamela Brody-Heine summarized that 6 ballot comments were submitted and shown in the spreadsheet “NSF 426 Server Ballot Comments 180905.xlsx”:

- Two editorial comments were submitted on NSF 426i4r1. We proposing that we accept these revisions.
- The remaining 4 comments are associated with NSF 426i5r1 – the supplier scope issue. Three of the comments are associated with negative votes. All 4 are flagged as “JC to discuss”.

Brody-Heine reviewed the 2 editorial comments and proposed a modification to the EnMS comment proposal. She asked if there were any comments or concerns with the proposed responses. Paul Scheiling, DOE, supported the revisions.

Costley asked for a motion to approve the 2 editorial comments.

- a. Motion: Holly Elwood
- b. Second: Lucian Turk

c. Consensus: approved by affirmation.

Brody-Heine reviewed the comments associated with NSF 426i5r1. Brody-Heine then asked each of the commenters if they would like to provide a statement:

Derek Hellar (approve with comment): Recognizes the perception that the changes modify the scope of the criterion, but the original intent was never affirmed. Derek searched for “supplier” and its predominant use appeared to apply to Tier 1 applicers. He also recognizes that some stakeholders might want to drive this down the supply chain, which could be accomplished with a new criterion.

Cate Berard (disapprove): There were numerous discussions on this issue that were unresolved before going to ballot. She is uncomfortable with such a significant change since the edits in this continuous maintenance round were supposed to be limited to minor cleanup items.

Holly Elwood (disapprove): EPA’s major concern is not following the process laid out for this continuous maintenance round. The integrity of the system is at issue if major changes occur after a balanced group of stakeholders agree on the content of the standard, and then major changes are made to the standard before the product registry even launches.

Wayne Rifer (disapprove): Concerned that the scope change was significant.

Costley opened it up for JC discussion:

- A JC member said that the most important aspect is driving towards clarity on this criterion, but will not speak to whether the revision changed the intent. Solutions can be achieved in phases.
- The July 2018 meeting summary was pulled up, and it was noted that there were 3 objections to the motion.
- Brody-Heine suggested that the issue be brought up in the corporate common criteria process, and consider a sub-supplier criterion. The NSF 426 could then incorporate by reference the corporate common criteria standard.
- Costley clarified that this proposal would be to reject comments and wait for NSF 487 to be published and referred to in NSF 426.
- It was noted that we don’t know how long NSF 487 will take. Can we develop a criterion to add to NSF 426?
- Brody-Heine indicated that if the JC would like go this route, we would set up an ad-hoc group for folks who are particularly interested. When they are comfortable with it, they can bring it back to the JC.
- It was pointed out that this revision is for 3 criteria, and would a single criterion address the sub-supplier, or would several criteria be needed? It was suggested that perhaps it could be accomplished via a definition.

The JC developed the following response to NSF 426i5r1 ballot comments:

The JC will continue to work to address inclusion of sub-suppliers either through additional criterion(ia) or through definitions. In addition, JC members participating on the NSF 487 Corporate Common Criteria JC commit to considering additional criterion(ia) or clarifying that existing criteria intentionally and clearly extend down to the sub-supplier.

Efforts will be made in future continuous maintenance to ensure that the scope of the process is vetted and agreed to by the JC.

**Motion:** Costley asked for a motion to accept the above response to comments on NSF 426i5r1.

- a. Motion: Wayne Rifer
- b. Second: Lucian Turk
- c. Consensus: All in favor, no objections.

### **Next Steps & Wrap Up**

Brody-Heine reviewed the timeline and steps to get to publication.

Below are approximate dates for each step:

- Early October – Launch adjudication or adjudication/revision ballot – 14 day recirculation
  - o Assuming the ballot is 5 pages or less, 30 day public comment period with ANSI
  - o Response letters to negative voters circulated – 14 days to respond
- Mid October – Launch CPHC ballot – 21 days
- Mid October - Right to appeal letters sent to negative voters – 15 business days to respond
- Mid November – CPHC ballot closes
- Mid November – ANSI public comment period ends
- End of December/early January publication

Brody-Heine proposed that the JC take a pause in continuous maintenance, with the exception of the ad hoc group to work in the supplier scope issue. GEC is currently reviewing “lessons learned” from both continuous maintenance development processes (server and mobile phone) as well as implementation of revised standards. Additionally, three of the four issue papers that the JC did not address have to do with adding, or major revisions to, corporate criteria. This really would be more appropriate to be tackled in the corporate common criteria initiative (now targeted for May 2019 launch). Of course, anyone is welcome to submit issue papers and requests for interpretations at any time.

It was agreed that we will keep monthly meetings on the calendar in case any requests for interpretations are submitted. If none are submitted the meetings will be cancelled.

Brody-Heine noted that an email asking for participants for the ad hoc group will go out in a few weeks. She asked interested folks to think about possible approaches to bring to the discussion.

**Adjourn:** Costley asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting.

- a. Motion: Holly Elwood
- b. Second: Sid Pendelberry
- c. All approved: Yes (no objections)

### **9/18/18 Meeting Attendees**

Proxy for Mary Jacques	Brad, Dillon		Guest
Green Electronics Council	Pamela Brody-Heine	General Interest	Observer
Cisco Systems, Inc.	Abbey Burns	Manufacturer	Member
NSF International	Andrea Burr		Guest

*NSF 426 JC September 18, 2018 Meeting Summary*

---	Canlas, Jeri		Guest
ITIC	Chris Cleet	Manufacturer	Member
ICF International	John Clinger	Public Health / Regulatory	Member
New York Academy of Sciences	Jennifer Costley	General Interest	Joint Committee Chair
Green Electronics Council	Patty Dillon	General Interest	Observer
Dell	Douglas, Frances		Guest
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency	Holly Elwood	Public Health / Regulatory	Member
Fujitsu	Dieter Feuerer	Manufacturer	Member
Green Electronics Council	Erin Gately	General Interest	Observer
Intel	Emma Gates	Other Industry	Member
HPE	Derek Hellar	Manufacturer	Member
Underwriters Laboratories, Inc.	William Hoffman	User	Member
Lenovo	Mary Jacques (sent proxy Brad Dillon)	Manufacturer	Member
ECD Compliance.	Walter Jager	User	Member
The Vinyl Institute	Richard Krock	Other Industry	Member
Huawei	Jinshui Liu	General Interest	Observer
IBM - United States	Tim Mann	Manufacturer	Member
Strategy Advisory LLC	Mary-Rose Nguyen	User	Member
Rochester Institute of Technology	Sidney Pendelberry	Public Health / Regulatory	Member
Cisco Systems, Inc.	Daisy Poon	General Interest	Observer
Georgia Institute of Technology	Matthew Realff	Public Health / Regulatory	Vice chair
Rifer Environmental	Wayne Rifer	User	Member
American Chemistry Council	Steve Risotto	Other Industry	Member
AMD	Donna Sadowy	Other Industry	Member
Schaffer Environmental	Mark Schaffer	User	Member
US Department of Energy	Paul Scheihing	General Interest	Observer
Dell, Inc.	Lucian Turk	Manufacturer	Member
Lawrence Berkeley National Lab	Vestal Tutterow, P.E.	Public Health / Regulatory	Member
U.S. Department of Labor	Jeffrey Wheeler	Public Health / Regulatory	Member