

**BIFMA Sustainability Assessment Standard Stakeholder Meeting  
September 6 & 7, 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**

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

Tom Reardon stated that Jaclyn Bowen would soon be leaving NSF in Ann Arbor and relocating to San Diego, California for a new position as General Manager at Quality Assurance International, a division of NSF International that focuses on organic and food safety certification. Jaclyn Bowen assured the group a smooth transition and introduced Lorna Badman, the new BIFMA Joint Committee Secretariat.

Bill Stough stated that Laura Rauwerda, the new chair of the Business and Institutional Furniture Joint Committee, was unfortunately unable to attend the meeting in person. One order of business mentioned during the last BIMFA JC meeting was to nominate and select a vice-chair. The vice-chair would be responsible for filling in as chair in the event that the Joint Committee chair is unable to attend.

**Motion:** Brad Miller moved to nominate Anne Saliers as the Vice-Chair. Lou Newett seconded.

**Discussion:** Other nominations were requested and none were made.

**Vote:** All in favor.

***Motion passed.***

Jaclyn Bowen stated that with Laura participating in the meeting via conference call, it might be difficult for her to facilitate the discussions. Laura agreed and suggested that Anne Saliers act as chair on her behalf.

**II. Review of Agenda / Previous Meeting Minutes/Approval**

Bill Stough reviewed the proposed meeting agenda with the stakeholders and Anne Saliers asked for a motion to approve the proposed agenda. Tom Reardon stated that Larry Dykhuis had some macro issues he was hoping to discuss with the group and encouraged the group to reduce the time spent discussing the specifics of the task groups chair reports by half to accommodate this.

**Motion:** Brad Miller moved for the agenda to be revised as stated by Tom Reardon. Bill Stough seconded.

**Discussion:** None.

**Vote:** All in favor.

***Motion passed.***

Bill Stough then reviewed the July meeting summary with the stakeholders and Anne Saliers asked for a motion to approve the minutes. Larry Dykhuis encouraged Jaclyn Bowen and/or Lorna Badman to include page numbers in the meeting summary for easy reference. He also questioned why the potential inclusion of the ergonomic credit was listed within the context of the Weighting of Chemicals discussion in the July summary. Bill Stough stated that the meeting summary was correct and that the ergonomic credit was just a tangent discussion.

**Motion:** Brad Miller moved to accept the July meeting summary as written. Lou Newett seconded.

**Discussion:** None.

**Vote:** All in favor.

***Motion passed.***

**III. Overarching issues overview**

Larry Dykhuis stated that the following overarching issues that were mentioned during the July BIFMA JC meeting were not adequately incorporated into the standard.

- Issue #3
  - Some credits in the standard may be perceived as complex because of confusing terminology, formats, multiple levels and categories with excessive points.
- Issue #5
  - Referencing 3<sup>rd</sup> Party Standards
- Issue #7
  - Grouping of Products
- Issue #8
  - Integrated Companies vs. Assembly Manufacturers

Larry Dykhuis expressed his concern about the consistency in the language and the scoring. Bill Stough stated that one of his action items from the last meeting was to look to incorporate more continuity in the language. He encouraged the stakeholders to bring any inconsistencies to his attention.

The stakeholders discussed the fact that not all the normative references have been incorporated into the normative reference section. During the July meeting, Larry Dykhuis made the following 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.”*

The group also discussed the fact that the guidance document has not yet been updated. They encouraged Bill Stough to review the July meeting summary and ensure that all the suggested revisions from that meeting were incorporated into the draft.

## **IV. Work Group Reports**

### ***Task Group 1: Materials***

Jim Kozminski reported on the progress of the Materials task group. Highlights of the revisions included:

- Incorporated climate neutral language
- Added reference to ISO 14040 and 14044
- Added efficient use of material language to clarify that material efficiency is calculated for the materials comprising 80 percent by weight of the product(s) to be assessed.
- For the Bio-based renewable materials – sustainable wood credit, the language was adjusted to clarify that in order to qualify for these points, the product to be assessed must contain at least 5 percent wood by weight.
- The Table on the Recommended Recovered Materials Content Ranges was updated
- Packaging language was incorporated (but packaging toxics fell more under the scope of the Human and Ecosystem Health task group)
- Incorporated a solid waste management credit to award organizations for publishing and implementing a solid waste diversion program for all forms of disposal

The committee discussed how to handle waste-to-landfill and waste-to-incineration. There was some concern about the new solid waste management credit since it requires an organization to set a diversion goal and to show progress, but the organization does not have to achieve that goal. In other words, there is no numeric threshold. There was some concern that the credit could be perceived as too easy, and suggested that a baseline or quantitative threshold be established. John Kauffman stated that it, conceptually, is a good addition however he agreed that a threshold would be more appropriate. It could be treated as a goal or a measurement to show where an organization currently stands and be transparent enough to show that they are making progress.

**Motion:** Lou Newett move for 1 credit to be awarded for setting a 50% diversion goal and a bonus point to be awarded for exceeding that goal. John Kauffman seconded.

**Discussion:** None.

**Vote:** 2 opposed.

### ***Motion passed.***

Scott Lesnet questioned where to find the reference of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalence per pound. He was concerned that the climate neutral credit could be a prime spot for greenwash. In the previous meeting, a motion was made to reference the LEED standards where appropriate; perhaps this is a good spot.

A discussion ensued about the number of product, facility, and company specific credits in each section.

### ***Task Group 2: Energy***

John Shank reported on the progress of the Energy task group. Highlights of the revisions included:

- The Building Energy Performance credit was updated to clarify that an organization shall receive points for conducting a building energy inventory for facilities such as warehouses, office building, showrooms, supply partner facilities (other than final assembly), that are associated with the product being assessed
- An Embodied Energy section was created with Cradle-to-Gate and Gate-to-Gate Analysis credits being made available
- A credit was incorporated for those organization that voluntarily choose to get involved in a voluntary carrier and shipper program such as the EPA's Smartway Transportation Partnership
- The renewable energy credit was revised to clarify that these points could be achieved for on- and off-site means that help reduce greenhouse gases and other environmental impacts associated with fossil fuel energy use
- Additional language and credits have been made available for reducing greenhouse gas emissions

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

Gabe Wing reported on the progress of the Human and Ecosystem Health task group. Highlights of the revisions included:

- The Product Level section has been updated to clarify the inventory expectations for the chemical constituents of the materials as well as the process chemicals used directly in the manufacture of the product
- Section 7.5.3 awards credits for various levels of reduction of chemicals of concern
- The indoor air credit has also been clarified

### ***Task Group 4: Social Responsibility***

Larry Dykhuis reported on the progress of the Social Responsibility task group. Highlights of the revisions included:

- Incorporating a credit for looking at the Social Responsibility of the supply chain by awarding a credit for organization's that establish a documented supplier assessment tool

### ***Task Group 5: Tools***

The Tools Workgroup has prepared and submitted a synopsis to the Workgroup Chairs for confirmation/and or correction of the interpretation of scope and boundaries of each Credit. We have also developed draft spreadsheets for calculating water, energy, and greenhouse gas baselines. We are now on hold pending resolution of normalization versus absolute basis for measuring progress.

### ***Task Group 6: Marketing***

Mark LaCroix stated that this task group was charged with developing a plan to communicate this standard to the marketplace. This may come in the form of a communication plan and marketing strategy to initially secure BIFMA membership approval and in the long run, ensure that the document is known about and used in the marketplace by specifiers, manufacturers, and consumers. The group has been working on the following:

- Discuss branding of the standard
  - Pros/cons of BIFMA vs. NSF standard

- With BIFMA's name recognition in the industry for quality products and NSF's name recognition for public health and safety, it may be a good compromise.
- Communication/education plan for BIFMA membership
- Communication/education plan for other stakeholders
- FAQs

## **V. Conformance levels/ Scope/boundaries/ Innovation credits/ Guidance Documents**

Scott Lesnet stated that the standard needed to more clearly identify boundaries. The standard currently doesn't state how different companies within the supply chain would evaluate a product. The sustainability of a product would be variable depending on the manufacturing model being used- manufacturing, fabrication, purchasing the components, purchasing the end product or reselling the product, etc. The standard needs to more clearly differentiate the depth of the product. It was suggested that at the conformance declaration point, the manufacturer place their product in a defined category. Then the elements of the SAS that relate to that particular business model be used for the evaluation. This would allow people with multiple operations and business models to show if the product is assembly only and if applicable, collect information on the suppliers and show how the product moves through the manufacturing stages.

**Motion:** Brad Miller moved to make the following change to the scope of the standard:

### **1.2 Scope**

*This Standard provides a pathway towards sustainability by establishing measurable criteria for multiple levels of achievement and/or performance. ~~It allows a significant amount of flexibility in identifying the boundaries that should be used to an applicant's strategic advantage in defining the scope of the applicant's conformance.~~*

*This Standard is applicable to all business and institutional furniture; this includes but is not limited to moveable walls, systems furniture, desking systems, case goods, tables, seating and accessories. The Standard is also applicable to materials and components manufactured by suppliers to furniture manufacturers.*

*This Standard is applicable to business and institutional furniture manufactured in one facility or multiple facilities, one country or multiple countries. It addresses product-based characteristics in the general areas of materials, use of energy, human and ecosystem health, and social responsibility impacts.*

He further moved to instruct the workgroups to analyze which credits would need to have defined boundaries (Is it applicable at the company, product, or facility level?) in the credit wording itself. Lou Newett seconded.

**Discussion:** Jim Kozminski suggested that the score sheet have a separate column added for company, product, or facility. Gabe Wing questioned how far back in the supply chain does a company have to go. The stakeholders agreed that this motion might affect the new greenhouse gas credit and a few credits in the Material section. Brad Miller clarified that the motion, as it relates to the future work of the task groups, is to identify what credits need boundaries and if the credit is applicable to the product, facility, or company.

**Vote:** All in favor.

**Motion passed.**

**Motion:** Larry Dykhuis moved that for credits that require a % improvement, that absolute values be used to measure improvement from a baseline. Lou Newett seconded.

**Discussion:** None.

**Vote:** One opposed.

The task groups took some time to review the breakdown of their credits as Corporate, Facility, or Product specific. The breakdown is as follows.

<b>Number of Points Available</b>				
<b>Task Group</b>	<b>Corporate</b>	<b>Facility</b>	<b>Product</b>	<b>Total</b>
Materials	7	4	16	27
Energy	2	19	4	25
Human and Ecosystem Health	4	4	19	27
Social Responsibility	8	2	0	10

**Motion:** John Kauffman moved to set a minimum requirement of 10 product related points to achieve any level of certification. Lou Newett seconded.

**Discussion:** None.

**Vote:** One opposed.

**Motion carries. Some more discussion is potentially needed on incorporating additional requirements for the higher levels of certification.**

The stakeholder reviewed the Innovation credit discussion notes from the July meeting summary. During the July meeting, the following motion was passed:

*“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.”*

**Motion:** Brad Miller moved to not incorporate bonus points in the standard. John Kauffman seconded.

**Discussion:** The credits previously identified as being capable of being a “bonus” should be included as a regular credit. However, the stakeholders should keep innovation in mind for future revisions of the standard.

**Vote:** 2 abstain.

**Motion passed.**

**Motion:** Larry Dykhuis moved that the guidance document be updated and circulated with the standard out to the trade association. Lou Newett seconded.

**Discussion:** Bill Stough stated that he expected it to take him 3-4 weeks to update the guidance document. Tom Reardon clarified that the primary concern for the stakeholders and the task group should be to address any necessary changes in the standard first, and then look to update the guidance document.

**Vote:** All in favor.

***Motion passed.***

**Next Steps/Adjourn**

The next BIFMA SAS meeting is scheduled for Monday October 22, 2007 from 9am-5pm at the NSF International headquarters in Ann Arbor, Michigan

The BIFMA SAS task groups were instructed to work on making the necessary changes to the standard and send their revised portions to the BIFMA staff and Bill Stough by the end of the business day on Wednesday September 12th. BIFMA staff will send the updated standard to the BIFMA board members in time for the Board meeting taking place on Thursday September 20, 2007.

After completing the standard language, the BIFMA SAS task groups are instructed to continue working on updating the guidance document. It is expected that this will take 3-4 weeks. Bill Stough is to work on updating the sections such as the Scope and Normative References, in addition to any suggested revisions as stated in the July BIFMA SAS meeting summary. The BIFMA SAS task group chairs are to send Bill Stough the suggested changes to the guidance document by the end of the business day on Friday October 12, 2007. Bill Stough is to review the changes, compile them, and send the updated guidance document to Lorna Badman (badman@nsf.org) (the BIFMA SAS new point of contact at NSF International) by the end of the business day on Tuesday October 16, 2007.

Lorna Badman is to circulate the updated guidance document, the most recent draft standard, the September meeting summary, and the October 22nd proposed agenda to the BIFMA SAS stakeholders by the end of the business day on Wednesday October 17, 2007.

**Meeting Attendees:**

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

Linda Brown- *SCS- proxy- Stowe Hartridge- Beam\**  
Dan Burgoyne- *State of California\**  
Norman Christopher- *Grand Valley State University- proxy- Laura Rauwerda\**  
Larry Dykhuis- *Herman Miller*  
Jean Hansen- *Chong Partners Architecture\**  
John Kaufmann- *Kimball International*  
Clare Lindsay- *USEPA\**  
Brad Miller- *BIFMA*  
Lou Newett- *Knoll Inc.*  
Laura Rauwerda- *Michigan Department of Environmental Quality\**  
Anne Saliers- *izzydesign*  
Bill Stough- *Sustainable Research Group, LLC*  
Denise Van Valkenburg- *Steelcase- proxy- Mike Absen*

**Observers**

Lorna Badman- *NSF*  
Martin Bennett- *MAS*  
Jaclyn Bowen- *NSF International*  
Craig Bren- *Tuohy Furniture*  
Randy Carter- *Steelcase*  
Paul Chalmer- *National Center for Manuf. Sciences*  
Bob Ferguson- *NSF*  
Bill Foley- *Interface Fabrics*  
Doug Heitkamp- *Teknion*  
Kurt Kneen- *NSF*  
Jim Kozminski- *Haworth*  
Mark LaCroix- *Interface*  
Scott Lesnet- *HNI*  
Mary Ellen Mika- *Steelcase*  
Scott Miller- *Knauf*  
Jeff Musculus- *Steelcase*  
Sharon Paterson- *Veolia Water*  
Janan Rabiah- *ACT*  
Tom Reardon- *BIFMA*  
John Shank- *Kimball International*  
Karen Smant- *Milliken*  
Carl Smith- *GEI*  
Fred Stevens- *Group Dekko*  
Jane Wilson- *NSF*  
Gabe Wing- *Herman Miller*  
Karen Worthy- *Global Group*  
Ed Wyatt- *SCS*  
Mike Zimmerman- *Sauder*