

BIFMA Sustainability Assessment Standard Stakeholder Meeting
Thursday July 26, 2007
Draft Meeting Summary

This document is part of the NSF International standard development process. This document is subject to change and may be a draft and/or non-final version. Committee members may reproduce, quote from, and/or circulate this document to persons or entities outside of their organization after first providing NSF International with written notice of to whom and for what purpose this document is to be shared.

Please go to <http://BIFMA.org/public/SusFurnStd.html> for BIFMA Sustainability Assessment Standard documentation.

I. Welcome/Introductions/Anti-trust Statement

Larry Dykhuis welcomed the group to the Marigold Lodge, Herman Miller's Executive Conference Center in Holland, Michigan.

Brad Miller called the meeting to order and welcomed the group to the first official Business and Institutional Furniture Joint Committee meeting. Jaclyn Bowen read the anti-trust statement. The group went around the room giving self-introductions.

Bill Stough stated that Laura Rauwerda is the new chair of the Business and Institutional Furniture Joint Committee. Having a chair for the formal consensus body brings the committee one step closer to having an ANSI standard. Laura Rauwerda stated that this meeting would be the first day of a transition period and she would be looking for Bill Stough's leadership while she learns the ropes.

II. Review of Agenda / Previous Meeting Minutes/Approval

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

Motion: Lou Newett moved to accept the proposed agenda as written. Denise Van Valkenburg seconded.

Discussion: None.

Vote: All in favor.

Motion passed.

Bill Stough then reviewed the April/May meeting summary with the stakeholders and asked for a motion to approve the minutes.

Motion: Anne Saliers moved to accept the April/May meeting summary as written. Lou Newett seconded.

Discussion: None.

Vote: All in favor.

Motion passed.

III. Joint Committee Orientation/ Overview of Procedures

Bill Stough gave an overview of what has happened since the last face-to-face meeting in April/May. Prior to the April/May face-to-face meeting, the draft standard was circulated to stakeholders for their review and comment. Their comments were sent to Jaclyn Bowen to be compiled and circulated prior to the face-to-face meeting. This was completed and during the April/May face-to-face meeting, task group chairs were charged with responding to the comments in the comment spreadsheet. (*Important note: It has come to my attention that a few comments were not incorporated into the comment spreadsheet. Jaclyn Bowen will be circulating an updated comment spreadsheet for task group review and response.*) Based on the comments received, the task groups have held several conference calls since the April/May meeting and worked to incorporate the suggested revisions. The task group chairs also had a few meetings where they generated a list of overarching issues that needed to be addressed in an open forum. The next Business and Institutional Joint Committee meeting is scheduled for Thursday September 6th from 9am-5pm (ET) and Friday September 7th from 8am-12pm (ET). The goal is to have the final draft standard complete in time for that meeting with the focus of the meeting being to tie up loose ends. The BIFMA board is meeting a few weeks later and BIFMA staff plans to get the approval of the board to proceed with balloting the standard to the trade association.

Jaclyn Bowen gave an overview of the transition of the group from a stakeholder group to the Business and Institutional Furniture Joint Committee (BIFJC); the formal ANSI balanced governing body over the Sustainable Assessment Standard. The stakeholder group was an unbalanced group of participants dominated by industry that was managed by Bill Stough. In a stakeholder group, anyone could make motions and anyone could vote on that motion. With a formal consensus body (Joint Committee), the group is balanced and has equal representation from the regulatory/academia, user, and industry sectors. Laura Rauwerda from the regulatory/academia sector would preside as chair to be consistent with NSF's Standard Development Policies. Motions and voting can only come from the Joint Committee, but all stakeholders are encouraged to voice their opinions and take an active role in meetings and task groups. If anyone has questions on the NSF Standards Development process, please contact Jaclyn Bowen (bowen@nsf.org) for a copy of the NSF Standard Development policies.

IV. Review of Overarching Issues

Laura Rauwerda facilitated the overarching issues discussion.

Issue #1 The Standard should provide point reductions for significant violations.

Some stakeholders felt that if a product has conformed to the standard, but if significant violations take place, points should be taken away. Others felt that the standard should be positive and award points in areas where a company seeking certification excels. Larry Dykhuis reminded the group that the length of certification hadn't been discussed as well as what would happen if a significant violation occurred after certification was awarded. John Shank questioned how much time people would have to resolve these types of issues. Laura Rauwerda stated that violations are regulatory issues and therefore regulatory requirements would dictate the length of time companies must come back into compliance. Jaclyn Bowen added that a certifier's policies would also likely have a continued compliance and monitoring component to ensure that a manufacturer stays in compliance. Denise Van Valkenburg stated that this issue was also being addressed in the pre-requisites of the Human and Ecosystem Health section.

Motion: Norman Christopher motioned to not provide point reductions for significant violations. John Kaufmann seconded.

Discussion: It was suggested for the Human and Ecosystem Health task group to establish a definition for “significant.”

Vote: All in favor.

Motion passed.

Issue #2 ***The Standard may be too difficult for smaller member companies.***

The stakeholders discussed the proposed certification levels.

- 35 percent of all possible points for Silver
- 50 percent of all possible points for Gold
- 70 percent of all possible points for Platinum

Points are not assigned for meeting the pre-requisites. Bill Stough stated that the proposed numbers are more inclusive of small companies, but still not a cakewalk for all large companies to get platinum. The proposed certification levels keep the bar high for Platinum, but lowers the requirements for Silver and Gold. John Kauffman questioned how these numbers were derived. Bill Stough stated that the number were a compromise between the BIFMA board and the task group chairs. Anne Saliers added that when performing the pilot, companies were able to assess the original levels and based on the pilot recommended an alternate point structure. Mike Zimmerman questioned if the new certification levels would allow for a company and their products to get certified to the Silver level without meeting any product specific requirements. Jaclyn Bowen suggested tabling this issue until that assessment has been done. Scott Lesnet questioned if it would be valuable to perform another pilot before balloting, as it is likely that a lot more companies will hit that 35 percent number. Tom Reardon stated that another agenda item is to discuss marketing and building awareness around the standard.

Gabe Wing encouraged the Joint Committee to entertain a motion to accept the proposed numbers, as they are a starting point thoroughly thought through. Jaclyn Bowen added that since the standard is a living document capable of being revised at any time, it would be better to tighten the standard over time in the spirit of continuous improvement rather than loosen it because the standard isn't being used.

Motion: John Kauffman motioned to accept the proposed numbers. Larry Dykhuis seconded.

Discussion: None.

Vote: All in favor.

Motion passed.

Issue #3 ***Some credits in the standard may be perceived as complex because of confusing terminology, formats, multiple levels and categories with excessive points.***

The stakeholders discussed how the task groups have approached each of their sections in silos which has led to inconsistent terminology and framework. Jaclyn Bowen stated that NSF could help facilitate discussions to harmonize each sections approach, however the inconsistencies in terminology would be too technical for NSF to interpret what is attempting to be stated. Jim Kozminski suggested establishing the rules of the road. For examples, use consistent language for assigning points. Brad Miller suggested pulling together the specifics at the next work group chair's meeting. Jaclyn agreed to supply the task group chairs with example point language.

Motion: Anne Saliers motioned to have the task group chairs work with NSF to standardize language. Lou Newett seconded.

Discussion: None.

Vote: All in favor.

Motion passed.

Issue #4 **Harmonize the Standard and Guidance Manual and clarify references to 3rd Party “validations.”**

Motion: Larry Dykhuis motioned to use the definition specified by ANSI for third-party validation that is consistent with Randy’s Carter’s motion adopted on June 22, 2006. John Kauffman seconded.

Discussion: None.

Vote: All in favor.

Motion passed.

Issue #5 **Referencing 3rd Party Standards**

Motion: Larry Dykhuis motioned to cite the document being referenced in the normative reference section and include a detailed reference of the normative text in the body of the standard, including date of publication and revision date if applicable. John Kauffman seconded.

Discussion: None.

Vote: All in favor.

Motion passed.

Issue #6 **Weighting on Chemicals**

A few of the comments received on the draft standard stated that the standard focused too much on chemicals. The work group chairs felt that there should be no change in the format or weighting of chemicals in the BIFMA SAS. The approach designed and adopted by the Human & Ecosystem Work Group and BIFMA stakeholders is an essential element of success for the validity and credibility of the standard to the outside world. It places a strong but not unreasonable emphasis on the chemistry of products, which many furniture industry customers and OEM representatives believe to be one of the most important future issues the industry will have to face. Bill Stough reminded everyone that weighting between Elements of the SAS was validated many times in stakeholder meetings directing the standard to keep its point allocation targets at 30 percent for Human & Ecosystem Health; 30 percent for Materials; 20 percent for Energy (GHG); 15 percent for Social Responsibility; and 5 percent for Innovation (based on a 100 point system). Clinton Boyd stated that the standard’s focus on chemicals is justified in that the chemicals are responsible for causing the environmental impact. While smaller companies may not have chemists on staff, the standard does provide other avenues for achieving points. Gabe Wing added that Human and Ecosystem health encompasses 30% of the standard and that is reasonable. The market is expecting it, and regulatory agencies are expecting it. Paul Murray encouraged the Human and Ecosystem Health to consider having products meet the

requirements of the ergonomic standard. The stakeholders agreed that it was an interesting approach.

Motion: Denise Van Valkenburg motioned to not change the format or weighting of chemicals in the BIFMA SAS. Brad Miller seconded.

Discussion: Larry Dykhuis agreed to have the Social Responsibility task group entertain the idea of having an ergonomic pre-requisite.

Vote: 1 opposed- John Kauffman.

Motion passed.

Issue #7 *Grouping of Products*

The stakeholders discussed how certification might be for a single product or group of products. To earn a credit toward a product or group of products, the credit should be specifically associated with the value chain of that product or group of products(s) being certified, unless it is not feasible without a corporate directive being in place. For example, to earn a credit for facilities related criteria, that facility must be involved in the management, manufacturing, or delivery of the specific product or group of products being certified. To group products, the assessment for each credit must be completed for the product in the group that has the worst-case results for that product grouping.

Jaclyn Bowen stated that certification agencies would use the term “bracketing” for this approach and it would be a certification and a policy issue, not a standard issue. It could be placed in an informational annex, but it has no place in the body of the standard.

Motion: Lou Newett motioned to accept the recommendations in Issue 7 and they should be further defined in the guidance document. Norm Christopher seconded.

Discussion: None.

Vote: All in favor.

Motion passed.

Issue #8 *Integrated Companies vs. Assembly Manufacturers*

The stakeholder discussed how all references to the manufacturing value chain should be based on the activity that takes place and not subject to ownership or outsourcing strategy of the company. All references to manufacturing activities should be delivery, final assembly, component, raw material, and not terms such as owned facility, Tier 1, or Tier 2. For example, if one company out sources a finished product and another manufactures the same product, the standard ought to apply equally to both companies for that products environment footprint.

Laura Rauwerda suggested that this issue be tabled and encouraged all task groups to re-examine their language. Anne Saliers suggested possibly requiring documentation from 20% of a company's suppliers. The stakeholders agreed that the boundary of operation needed to be established. Task groups were asked to look at their language and get the chairs new approach. The task group chairs agreed to revisit this topic when they discussed the wording standardization and harmonization issues discussed in Issue 3.

Issue #9 *Carbon Footprint*

Mark LaCroix stated that he has stressed his concern that the standard does not make enough of a statement about how products affect climate change. He felt that changes should be made in the scope and perhaps in the innovation section about how the standard encourages carbon neutral products.

Motion: Bill Stough motioned to accept the recommendations in issue 9. Norm Christopher seconded. Mark LaCroix offered to provide the Energy Work Group with wording he has collected from his colleagues at Interface, Inc.

Discussion: None.

Vote: All in favor.

Motion passed.

Issue #10 Recognize USGBC's LEED Criteria in the BIFMA SAS

The stakeholders discussed how The BIFMA SAS may use criterion available in LEED specifications when it is consistent and beneficial to the BIFMA SAS's Goals and Scope, however when LEED criterion is inconsistent, Work Groups should develop their own criterion for credits.

Motion: Norm Christopher motioned for the BIFMA SAS to recognize LEED Criteria where applicable. Lou Newett seconded.

Discussion: None.

Vote: All in favor.

Motion passed.

Issue #11 Marketing Use of the BIFMA SAS

Tom Reardon stated that there are varying levels of awareness and understanding when it comes to this standard. Mark LaCroix stated that there is a need to provide consistent education and marketing about this standard. What does it mean? What does it entail? What is the scope? Tom Reardon encouraged the development of a Marketing task group. Mark LaCroix volunteered to chair the task group and encouraged interested members to get corporate involvement from IT and Marketing.

Marketing Task Group Members:

- Mark LaCroix- Interface- CHAIR
- Mike Veal- Allsteel
- Craig Bren- Tuohy Furniture
- Tammy Mayrend- NSF International
- Tom Reardon- BIFMA
- Brad Miller- BIFMA
- Karen Worthy- Global Group
- Amy Mulhern- Global Group
- Vesna Hitrec- Global Group
- Kristy Sherlund- Interface Fabric
- Anne Sailers- izzydesign
- Craig Bren- Tuohy Furniture
- John Shank- Kimball

Motion: Brad Miller motioned for the #11 be delegated to the Marketing task group. Norman Christopher seconded.

Discussion: None.

Vote: All in favor.

Motion passed.

Issue #12 Provide a Structured Rating Criteria Methodology for each Credit

The stakeholders discussed the concept of a structured rating criteria methodology. And while it is an excellent idea and the ultimate goal of the BIFMA SAS, unfortunately there are many new areas of practice with too little industry experience in each of them to develop a reliable methodology at this early stage of its existence of the standard. It was suggested that calculation methodologies be added to the existing guidance document to the extent it is feasible to provide them, with a goal of having all credits have a calculation methodology in the guidance document by the second revision of the ANSI Standard. The stakeholders felt that in the interim, if optional credits deal with performing calculations, examples should be provided.

Motion: Lou Newett motioned to use the calculation methodology where appropriate. John Kauffman seconded.

Discussion: None.

Vote: All in favor.

Motion passed.

Issue #13 Defined Weighting/Normalization Values/ Issue #14 Consistent Input and Output Reporting

Tom Reardon stated that the work groups have been working for some time to prepare for these meetings. In previous discussion, it was mentioned that in addition to a Marketing task group, it would also be helpful to have a Tools task group. The focus of this task group would be to developing standardized spreadsheets and checklists to assist manufacturers in conforming to this standard and provide some consistency when disseminating this information to customers. Collectively, it was decided that an implementation tools team would be valuable to have a small group of volunteers to attack these issues. Scott Lesnet has been proactive in bringing these issues to the forefront and agreed to be the chair of this task group moving forward. Scott Lesnet stated that each manufacturer involved in this project would ultimately be asking suppliers for information and potentially the same vendors for the same information. If we developed templates, suppliers and vendors could fill these out and only have to assemble this data once, ideally. The task group would be charged with creating a standardized data collection and management tool that can so be manipulated for/by third parties. If/when the standard evolves into an LCA mode, the task group can potentially look at creating a tool for cradle to gate information as well.

Tools task group members:

- Scott Lesnet- HNI Corp.- CHAIR
- Doug Heitkamp- Teknion
- John Shank- Kimball International
- Toni Stein- State of California Department of Health Services

- Stowe Hartridge-Beam- SCS
- Jaclyn Bowen- to recruit NSF staff
- Kathy Jo DeVault- Knoll Inc.
- Eric Harrington- Interface
- Paul Chalmer- NCMS

Gabe Wing stated that originally the Human and Ecosystem Health task group was suppose to target their credits to be around 30% of the standard. Because of the limited number of credits generated by the Social Responsibility task group, this changed a little bit. The task group chairs agreed to revisit their scoring breakdown to update the numbers.

Denise questioned if the Tools task group should deal with the normalization and point allocation issue. Scott Lesnet responded that focus of the Tools task group will be how to document improvements over baseline and will not deal with points or allocation. Scott Lesnet stated that his work group would look to identify the type of information they can reasonably expect to get from their suppliers and what is required to validate that information received. Ideally, the data would be consistent and reusable. John Shank questioned if the Tools group will look to establish a template for each credit. Scott Lesnet responded that he was uncertain at that time, and would see the will of the task group. Denise also asked if the products of the Tools Task Group would be part of the standard or guidance. Scott agreed that the work products would be guidance.

Paul Chalmer questioned the term “output reporting.” Does it mean communicating technical data to evaluate a product or reporting information to the outside world? The stakeholders responded that that was a good question and the Tools group should ultimately be responsible for the organizing the Output that comes in and the Marketing task group would be responsible for the output that goes out.

Motion: Bill Stough motioned for the Issues #13 and #14 be considered by the Tools work group including the output reporting but with assistance from the Marketing task group in its execution. Brad Miller seconded.

Discussion: None.

Vote: All in favor.

Motion passed.

Issue #15 *Entirety of Standard*

The stakeholders discussed the concept of not having to use the standard in its entirety. In other words, a manufacturer could just choose to comply with one section. The stakeholders agreed that the term sustainability is holistic and possesses social, environmental, and economic components and should be used in its entirety. Additionally, conformance levels are based on the total number of credits in the standard. The stakeholders agreed that after the pre-requisites are met, manufacturers could then select the best credit options from the requirements they prefer to meet.

Motion: Larry Dykhuis motioned for the standard to continue being treated as a holistic standard. Anne Saliers seconded.

Discussion: None.

Vote: All in favor.

Motion passed.

Issue #16 Innovation

Bill Stough gave an overview of the two sides of the innovation issue and the stakeholders discussed the concept of Innovation. There is a significant probability that an unanticipated innovative approach will emerge from an applicant that advances the goals of the BIFMA SAS. Such an event is an opportunity to assist the industry as a whole and should be encouraged with strict performance requirements for the use of innovation points so that an auditor can distinguish if the activity conforms. Ideas presented by the work group chairs included:

- The activity must be consistent with the Scope and Goals identified in the BIFMA SAS; Examples could include:
 - Foster partnerships between manufacturers, suppliers, end users and the science community;
 - Develop meaningful tools for quantifying and communicating progress to stakeholders;
 - Helps differentiate Environmentally Preferable Business and Institutional Furniture;
 - Establishes performance criteria that address environmental, economic and social aspects throughout the supply chain;
 - Advances product based aspects of human and ecosystem health, use of energy efficiency and renewable energy, use of materials and social responsibility.
- The activity must not already be allowed in the standard;
- The details of how the activity was achieved and how much it cost must be sent to BIFMA as a case study and made publicly available to help inform other users of the standard;
- The activity may not be used for innovation in subsequent cycles of conformance for the same product or product line; and
- Proprietary (nontransparent) products, services or standards are not allowed for innovation points.

The stakeholders suggested a variety of ideas on how to handle innovation including only allowing credits be awarded for those ideas which are made public, having third-party certifiers, present these ideas before the Joint Committee to have them put in the standard, and awarding more credits to those companies with unique ideas and a smaller number of points for companies who use this same idea down the road. Jaclyn Bowen reminded the group that it is important to keep in mind that the information shared between a company and a third-party certifier is confidential and cannot/will not be shared. She added that the philosophy behind innovation is that the credits would, ideally, later be included as optional credits. As the industry evolves, down the road the ideas that may be considered innovation now may later be pre-requisites in the standard. Further, if there is concern that the innovation credits won't be universally and consistently applied amongst certifiers, the section can award a limited number of points as to not "make or break" certification. Scott Lesnet questioned how patents and licensing would be handled as some manufacturers license ideas to their competitors. Would this information be transparent or proprietary? How would intellectual property be protected?

Mike Zimmerman question if the Joint Committee could be responsible for determining if something was "innovative." Jaclyn Bowen responded no since the Joint Committee sole responsibility is to govern, maintain, and develop the standard. The Joint Committee is comprised of potential competitor's of those seeking certification and because of confidentiality agreements it would not be possible. The stakeholders agreed that the only consistent approach would be to allow bonus points for exceeding requirements currently already established in the standard.

Motion: Larry Dykhuis motioned for the standard to allow up to 4 bonus points for going above and beyond existing credits in the standard. Work groups are to identify two of those credits in their section. Bill Stough seconded.

Discussion: Brad Miller stated that while this will not allow for new ideas, it does allow for companies to demonstrate excellence in certain areas.

Vote: Denise Van Valkenburg, Lou Newett, and John Kaufman opposed.

Motion passed.

V. Work Group Reports on Recommended Revisions

Bill Stough asked if the task group chairs had anything to report on.

Jim Kozminski reported on the progress of the Materials task group. It was suggested that the Materials section consider including some packaging points. Those were incorporated into the draft, however the toxics in the packaging would be better fit for the Human and Ecosystem Health section. It was also suggested that the pre-requisites be moved to the front of the section.

Larry Dykhuis stated that during the last meeting it was suggested that the Social Responsibility task group look at incorporating an economic credit. This was presented before the BIFMA board and was not supported.

Upcoming Conference Calls^{1,2,3}				
Marketing	Materials	Social Responsibility	Energy and Atmosphere	Human and Ecosystem Health
Mon. Aug. 20 9am-11am (ET)	Tues. Aug. 21 2pm - 5pm (ET)	Wed. Aug. 8 2:30pm (ET)	Tues. Aug. 14 3:30 - 5pm (ET)	Tues. Aug. 14 1:30-4:30pm (ET)
			Tues. Aug. 21 9-11am (ET)	Thurs. Aug. 23 1:30-4:30pm (ET)
¹ Tools Task Group conference call TBD ² These conference call dates/times were scheduled following the BIFJC meeting but have been included here for ease of reference and distribution. ³ The date/time of the first Tools task group conference call is TBD.				

The stakeholders discussed the timeline moving forward. Jaclyn Bowen stated that the task group chairs should now use the most recent version of the draft standard (the 7-17-07 version) and use track changes or the highlight and cross-out function to show the changes made to the draft. All task group revisions are due to Jaclyn Bowen on Tuesday August 28, 2007. Jaclyn Bowen will compile the changes and circulate the updated draft on Friday August 31, 2007. The next BIFMA face-to-face meeting will be on Thursday September 6th and Friday September 7th in Ann Arbor, Michigan. This will be the stakeholder's last chance to approve the document and suggest any last minute tweaking before the standard is put before the BIFMA board. The next BIFMA board meeting is set for September 20th, 2007. On this day, BIFMA staff will be asking for the board's permission to begin the association ballot.

Jaclyn Bowen stated that one additional formality of the Joint Committee is the need for a Vice-Chair. The role of the Vice-Chair would be to fill in for the chair when he/she is not available. The Vice-Chair must be from the Joint Committee but can be from any sector. She encouraged the stakeholders to start thinking about nominations for Vice-Chair.

Laura Rauwerda thanked the group for their cooperation.

Meeting Attendees:

Joint Committee Members (* signifies that they participated via conference call)

Norman Christopher- *Grand Valley State University*
Larry Dykhuis- *Herman Miller*
Jean Hansen- *Chong Partners Architecture**
John Kaufmann- *Kimball International*
Brad Miller- *BIFMA*
Lou Newett- *Knoll Inc.*
Laura Rauwerda- *Michigan Department of Environmental Quality*
Anne Saliers- *izzydesign*
Toni Stein- *State of California Department of Health Services**
Bill Stough- *Sustainable Research Group, LLC*
Denise Van Valkenburg- *Steelcase*

Observers (* signifies that they participated via conference call)

Jay Bolus- *MBDC*
Jaclyn Bowen- *NSF International*
Clinton Boyd- *Sustainable Research Group, LLC*
Craig Bren- *Tuohy Furniture*
Randy Carter- *Steelcase*
Paul Chalmer- *National Center for Manuf. Sciences*
Kathy Jo DeVault- *Knoll Inc.*
Deborah Dunning- *The Green Standard.org*
Jessica Eimer- *Aquinas College*
Mary Farr- *CIWMB**
Bill Foley- *Interface Fabrics*
Stowe Hartridge-Beam- *SCS*
Doug Heitkamp- *Teknion*
Jim Kozminski- *Haworth*
Mark LaCroix- *Interface*
Ben Massie- *SCS*
Mary Ellen Mika- *Steelcase*
Paul Murray- *Herman Miller*
Janan Rabiah- *ACT*
Tom Reardon- *BIFMA*
John Shank- *Kimball International*
Karen Smant- *Milliken*
Anna Wechselberger- *Haworth**
Gabe Wing- *Herman Miller*
Karen Worthy- *Global Group*
Mike Zimmerman- *Sauder*