

**BIFMA Sustainability Assessment Standard
Work Group Three- Water and Natural Resources
Conference Call
Monday November 6, 2006**

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.

Attendees:

Jaclyn Bowen- *NSF International*
Mary Fraser- *BASF*
Jim Kozminski- *Haworth Inc*
Mark LaCroix- *Interface Fabrics*

Clare Lindsay- *USEPA*
Brad Miller- *BIFMA*
David Surface- *Loth*

Shayla Workman- *EPA*
Karen Worthy- *Global Contract Inc*
Mike Zimmerman- *Sauder Woodworking*

Jaclyn Bowen called the meeting to order, took roll call, and read the NSF Anti-trust statement. The task group reviewed the agenda items for this call.

Mark LaCroix began the meeting by giving the group an update on the BIFMA Board meeting. Nine members of the board were present and provided valuable input on the standard. The macro issues in relation to the standard were also discussed.

The agenda at the Board meeting basically covered the following topics:

- Multi-tiered (Bronze, gold, silver) vs. single tiered pass/fail standard
- Certifying a company to the standard

Mark LaCroix stated that after walking the board through the standard, they were better able to appreciate the multi-tiered approach. There were some descending viewpoints that suggested possible alternatives including a reduced number of tiers and offering a company certification. When reviewing the mandatory requirements in the standard, many of the components are based on company specifications and not an individual product's specifications. The Board suggested possibly having a BIFMA "green" company and then having the individual products certified. Jaclyn Bowen stated that she would have to speak to Jane Wilson about this to see how this affects the standard and the PINs. The task group agreed that this could result in a lot more work. Jaclyn Bowen added that if the group was looking at certifying a company, would they still be interested in using a "mark" on the product? ISO standards are company based and the products generated under those do not bear a "mark." The benefit of a "mark" is consumer recognition. Additionally, the labeling involved in a company certification as well as product certification could be confusing to consumers.

The task group members walked through the various sections of the standard.

Mike Zimmerman reviewed section 9.4. Mike Zimmerman also walked the task group through Clare Lindsay's 7.7 Optimizing EOL management section.

The task group agreed that they still needed to hone in on measurable auditable points.

The task group discussed recycling and a product's shredding characteristics versus landfill. The task group discussed how products could be labeled to show what could be recycled versus reused. The task group suggested describing material characteristics of what is recyclable/non-recyclable.

Mark LaCroix is to provide feedback to Clare Lindsay on 7.7 specifically on the durable reconfiguration modular.

Mary Fraser walked the group through Section (?). The focus of this section is to encourage manufacturers to produce lower weight, stackable products. This affects the efficiency considering the reduction in fuel and energy consumption during transport.

Karen Worthy gave an update on water efficiency.

The task group next discussed pre-consumer content vs. post-consumer content in section 7.5. The task group suggested possibly including content ranges for individual process categories. They reviewed pros and cons of including metals

The next call is set for Thursday, November 30, 2006 1pm-4pm.