

BIFMA Sustainability Assessment Standard Stakeholder Meeting
Tuesday September 19 and Wednesday September 20, 2006
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.

Day One: Tuesday September 19, 2006

I. Welcome/Introductions/Anti-trust Statement and NSF Announcements

Bill Stough called the meeting to order and welcomed the group. Jaclyn Bowen read the anti-trust statement. The group went around the room giving self-introductions. Bill Stough congratulated Jaclyn Bowen on completing her Master's of Public Health in Management and Policy from the University of Michigan.

II. Review of Agenda and Meeting Goals

Bill Stough reviewed the agenda.

Larry Dykuis questioned when the Innovation task group would meet. Bill Stough responded that the Innovation task group would possibly meet after the meeting adjourned on the second day. However, if there wasn't enough time, time would be arranged for a conference call or to be held during the next stakeholder meeting.

Bill Stough stated that the focus of the meeting during the morning session would be to review the master draft document and address the relationship between the work groups, identify holes, inconsistencies, and other areas in need of fine tuning and clarification. He suggested specifically reviewing the prerequisites for appropriateness and look to streamline them if necessary.

III. Previous Meeting Minutes/Approval

Bill Stough reviewed the August 2006 meeting summary and questioned if any corrections/changes needed to be made.

Motion: Matt Earnest motioned to accept the August 2006 meeting summary. Ann Saliers seconded.

Discussion: None.

Vote: All in favor.

Motion passed. July August Meeting Summary is accepted.

IV. Improving the Master Draft Document

Bill Stough opened up this part of the agenda by stating that the timing and development of the BIFMA SAS is becoming strategic. He referenced recent acknowledgement by the energy industry to address carbon emissions; the European Union is addressing human health impacts of chemicals in its new REACH requirements; and the creation of an international guideline on corporate social responsibility as examples of its importance. He pointed out that the various BIFMA SAS work groups are also evaluating some of these issues, and by addressing sustainability issues early and thoroughly, stakeholders have the potential to achieve a competitive advantage in the market place. Bill Stough asked stakeholders to consider such relationships when evaluating the draft document. He then reviewed the updated draft with the stakeholder group.

Bill Stough first went through Section 1, Foreword and Goals. Anne Saliers asked about the Board of Directors position on the issue of multiple levels of achievement. The 4th goal states:

4. *The standard should allow for multiple levels of achievement*

Bill Stough clarified that this is still a point of discussion as the exact point structure and distribution has not yet been solidified. Tom Reardon added that the BIFMA Board still has some reservation about this multi-tiered approach. All past BIFMA standards were pass/fail and therefore these multiple levels of conformance is a new concept to the organization. As such, the pros and cons of this multi-tiered approach will need to be presented to the board. The stakeholder group discussed the multi-tiered approach and how to present the information to the board.

Jim Kozminski suggested having a group of stakeholders put together a position paper. Tom Reardon said that there is a 5-person subset of the Board who has taken an oversight role of the development of this standard. A conference call was held at the end of August and 2 of the 5 board members attended. The next opportunity for a formal presentation to the Board would be in November in Chicago. At that time, Tom Reardon would bring them up to speed on the evolution of the standard. Jane Wilson responded to a question regarding how the other sustainability initiatives were approaching the issue and she reported that they are all proposing a multi-tiered approach at this time.

Brad Miller stated that there is a 2-week window of opportunity between the September BIFMA meeting and the October meeting. The optimal time would be the week of October 6th.

The stakeholder group next discussed Section 3, Scope. Peggy Jenkins stated that 3.7 was awkward. As written in the 9-13-06 version of the draft standard, 3.7 reads:

The manufacturer of the applicant product can determine the scope of the certification to the extent that the scope can be clearly communicated to potential purchasers of the product.

Jane Wilson stated that the scope of the standard is different than the scope of the certification. The manufacturer can determine the scope of the certification based on discussions with their third-party certifier but not the scope of the standard. Larry Dykhuis suggested the two concepts be separated by moving 3.7, 3.8, and 3.9 under section 4, Assessing Conformance. Peggy Jenkins stated that she would draft language for discussion at a later meeting. One suggestions for 3.7 was:

The manufacturer of the applicant product can determine the scope of the certification provided that the scope is clearly communicated to the potential purchasers of the product.

Anne Saliers questioned 3.8. As written in the 9-13-06 version of the draft standard, 3.8 reads:

The scope of certification can be defined based on geographical location. Product that is manufactured in one location can be included, while the same product manufactured in another location can be excluded. In this case the credits that are based on "facility" or "corporate" characteristics (such as energy use, water use or health and safety management) will be evaluated based on the activities only at the location included in the scope of certification.

She questioned how a specific product line would be certified if it were produced at various locations. Gabe Wing stated that it would be necessary to clearly communicate which product lines are certified. Ultimately, it will be up to the third party certifiers to have the due diligence to ensure the label claims. It was suggested that the issue of who bears the responsibility of market claims could be addressed by including a discussion on values and integrity in either the preamble or as an addendum in the guidance document.

V. Brief Update on (REACH) from the European Union

Clinton Boyd gave a presentation on the European Union's REACH program. The European Union's Registration, Evaluation, and Authorization of Chemicals (REACH), when formally adopted, will require manufacturers and importers of chemicals to submit hazard, use, and risk data for substances manufactured or imported in quantities of more than one metric ton per year. Certain low-risk substances such as polymers, intermediates, and substances regulated by other legislation may be totally or partly exempted from registration requirements.

REACH is a major reform of EU chemicals policy. REACH will affect all global supply chains that produce and use chemicals. U.S. exporters to Europe should carefully consider this proposed piece of EU environmental legislation as the adoption of REACH is imminent (over 99 percent probability at this stage) and could become law in the 25 Member States of the EU as early as 2007.

The details of the REACH Regulation are still being negotiated within the European Institutions (including the Commission, Council and Parliament). New information will be posted as REACH is finalized and implemented. Several members commented that

REACH directly relates to the work of the BIFMA SAS Human and Ecosystem Health Work Group. The slide presentation will be posted on the BIFMA website.

Mark LaCroix questioned how this would affect the supply chain. Clinton Boyd encouraged those interested in more information to go to the following website:

http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/reach/index_en.htm

VI. NCMS Assessment Tool Update

Paul Chalmer presented his NCMS Automotive Materials Design Guide. This guide can be found at (<http://Ecm.ncms.org/autoguide>) and it can assist in evaluating alternative materials for specific automotive components for performance and sustainability. He suggested that a similar tool could be devised for the furniture industry, or by developing a module to the existing tool that has furniture-specific materials data.

Paul stated that choosing the right material for an auto part could involve a long and costly technical evaluation. The philosophy behind the Design Guide is simple in that it makes no sense to go through a complete technical evaluation of a candidate material, only to have to reject it in the end because of regulatory or liability concerns. A manufacturer can save significant design time and money if you take Step 1, Screen Materials for Sustainability, before going on to Step 2, Evaluate Materials for Performance.

He asked for the stakeholder group to state a part of a car to research using the Automotive Materials Design Guide. Jaclyn Bowen suggested a steering wheel. Paul Chalmer clicked on <select a part> and under the steering section of Power Train and Chassis, dropped down the steering wheel/column menu and clicked on steering wheel and clicked view. A chart is produced giving an overview of selected design aspects for the frame of a steering wheel.

Paul Chalmer stated that this type of database could be created for furniture, however he would need assistance from the industry. Deborah Dunning questioned how the numbers were created. Paul Chalmer stated that for the time being, the numbers are rather qualitative in that they only have the numbers from a very limited quantity of sources. The numbers could change once more variables are introduced.

Paul Chalmer stated that for a 2 Drawer Lateral File the rough estimates of its Life Cycle Assessment would be as follows:

- 70 Pounds of Steel containing
 - 14.5 MJ of embodied energy involving the generation of
 - 82 Kg of Carbon Dioxide
 - 46g of Volatile Organic Compounds
 - 111g of Nitrogen Oxide
 - 19g of particulate matter

Day Two: Wednesday September 20, 2006

VII. General Whole Group Wrap-up Session

The stakeholder group decided that it would be more valuable to continue walking through the draft standard rather than break into individual work groups. Topic of discussion were as follows:

A. Section 5- Definitions

Laura Rauwerda stated that during the Human and Ecosystem Health work group meeting, they suggested adding the terms:

- Design for the Environment (the definition as written in the Carpet standard)
- Green Chemistry
- Green Engineering

Mark LaCroix suggested waiting until the standard was closer to completion to focus on definitions. He thought it would be appropriate to have a definitions committee review the final list at that time.

Anne Saliers suggested adding the following terms to the definitions section:

- Life cycle thinking
- Life cycle assessment

Mary Ellen Mika suggested the following revisions to 5.1- Air pollutant

- remove the word “man” and replace with “human” and remove the word “other”

She also stated that 5.2 should say “contaminants” not “contaminates.” She also suggested that 5.11 be removed.

The stakeholder group stated that the term “sustainable” also be defined.

It was also suggested that a list of acronyms would be useful in the guidance document.

A discussion ensued on whether a definition for BIFMA and NSF was required. Jaclyn Bowen stated that the mission statement of each organization and vision for this document could be captured in the Foreword and didn’t have to be in the body of the standard.

B. Section 6- Elements, Prerequisites and Credits

The stakeholder suggested dropping the reference to “water” in 6.1 Water and Natural Resources.

The stakeholder group also suggested changing the references to certification to conformance. The stakeholder group discussed the future creation of guidance documents.

C. Element Updates

Gabe Wing updated the stakeholder group on Section 7: Human and Ecosystem Health. Key points of discussion included:

- Corporate versus Individual plants EMS programs
- 7.5 Chemical Management Plans has new impetus now with REACH
- 7.6 needs more discussion between groups 1 & 3 on the DfE impacts

John Shank and Anne Saliers gave an update on Section 8: Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy. Key points of discussion included:

- Introductory information on the difference between the need for a corporate-wide energy policy and credits available for facility-specific activities.
- Choose between Green or Renewable Energy in the heading of 8.16 and provide a definition
- Reclamation in the heading of 8.19 means from waste sources.

Mark LaCroix gave an update on Section 9: Natural Resources. Key points of discussion included:

- Changing the term “data” to “threshold”
- LCA/LCI workshops
- The need to organize a conference call with key stakeholders, including Rob Watson at USGBS, on how to address the highly contentious issue of FSC certified wood.
 - Will look to work with the Green Building Council
 - suggested that the BIFMA SAS could set a baseline of achievement but defer on the final wood certification until there was national consensus

The stakeholders suggested the possible need for the BIFMA Supply chain committee to provide guidance to the BIFMA SAS on this issue.

Action Items

- Bill Stough- plan time for the Innovation task group to convene during the next face-to-face meeting or look to set up a conference call
- Jaclyn Bowen- send BIFMA Clinton Boyd’s presentation on REACH to post on the BIFMA website
- Peggy Jenkins- Draft language to clarify that manufacturer can determine the scope of their certification based on their business, but manufacturers cannot determine the scope of the standard.
- Bill Stough- incorporate suggested draft revisions and new definitions
- Jaclyn Bowen- Send an email prompt to all task group chairs questioning when the next conference calls are to be held

Attendees:

In Person:

Bowen, Jaclyn- *NSF International*
Carter, Randy- *Steelcase Inc.*
Chalmer, Paul- *National Center for Manufacturing Sciences*
Dykhuis, Larry- *Herman Miller Inc.*
Earnest, Matt- *Interface Fabrics*
Foley, Bill- *Interface Fabrics*
Fraser, Mary- *BASF Corporation*
Kozminski, Jim- *Haworth*
LaCroix, Mark- *Interface*
Lang, Ron- *National Center for Manufacturing Sciences*
Miller, Brad- *BIFMA International*
Rauwerda, Laura- *State of Michigan DEQ*
Reardon, Tom- *BIFMA International*
Saliers, Anne- *izzydesign*
Shank, John- *Kimball International*
Stevens, Fred- *Group Dekko*
Stough, Bill- *Sustainable Research Group*
Van Valkenburg, Denise- *Steelcase Inc.*
Wilson, Jane- *NSF International*
Wing, Gabe- *Herman Miller Inc.*
Zimmerman, Michael- *Sauder Woodworking*

Via Conference Call:

Boyd, Clinton- *Sustainable Research Group*
Bren, Craig- *Tuohy*
Burgoyne, Dan- *California Department of General Services*
Dunning, Deborah- *IDCE*
Hansen, Jean- *Chong Partners Architecture*
Jenkins, Peggy- *CA Air Resources Board*
Manzo, Catherine- *USEPA*
Mika, Mary Ellen- *Steelcase Inc.*
Miller, Scott- *Knauf Insulation*
Newett, Lou- *Knoll Inc.*
Rabiah, Janan- *ACT*
Stein, Toni- *California DHS*
Worthy, Karen- *Global Contract Inc.*