

BIFMA Sustainability Assessment Standard
Work Group Four- Social Responsibility
August 9, 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.

Attendees:

Craig Bren – *Tuohy Furniture*
Larry Dykuis – *Herman Miller*
Bill Foley – *Interface*

Sarah Kozanecki – *NSF International*
Mary Ellen Mika – *Steelcase*
Brad Miller – *BIFMA*

Janan Rabiah – *Contract Textiles*
Fred Stevens - *Dekko*
Bill Stough – *Sustainable Research Group*

Bill Foley opened the meeting to discuss the various points of the Social Responsibility section that the work group has come up with. The following sections were discussed:

Prerequisite 1: Employee Health and Safety Management

The work group compared this section to Credit 2 (Comply with Health and Safety Management Standard) and agreed that the distinction between the purposes of these sections is clear. The Prerequisite requires in-house systems, whereas the Credit requires compliance with a third-party standard (but not necessarily certification).

Prerequisite 2: Labor and Human Rights Management Processes

There have been no changes to this section since the last meeting. There was discussion regarding the ILO conventions. Under requirements, the following references shall be added:

- ILO Forced Labor convention, 1930 (number 29)
- ILO Minimum Age Convention, 1973 (number 138)
- Also referenced were ILO Forced Labor convention number 105 and Minimum Age convention number 182 (from the carpet sustainability standard).

Bill Stough stated that he was trying to aggregate the master document, but most terms did not include social responsibility definitions. He is seeking help from the work group. There was also some discussion about referencing both North American standards as well as international standards. Bill Stough stated that the BIFMA standard should address whether compliance with both locally-accepted and international standards, or the more restrictive of the two would be required. It was agreed after discussion that the BIFMA standards should state in the intent that the ILO standard will be required as a minimum, however all local requirements must be met.

Credit 2: Comply with Health and Safety Management Standard

The lack of third-party auditing in Credit 2 is not a factor because it is required to be documented internally. Credit could be achieved by third-party certification, but it is not a requirement.

Credit 5: Engage in Community Outreach and Involvement

The group expressed an interest in seeing “good corporate citizen” better defined. Janan stated that she did not have any additional recommendations for what to insert under “Potential Technologies and Strategies” but it was suggested that maybe examples would be sufficient. The work group discussed whether the number of volunteer efforts/financial contributions could be increased since this section is not a requirement. It was agreed to leave the number at one at this juncture.

Credit 3: Social Responsibility Reporting

The question for this section is whether a website is enough to qualify a company for this credit. The requirements have not been defined, and are to be put on a list for follow-up. It was suggested that some examples of social responsibility might be of assistance. Credit 3b is still incomplete. Mary Ellen Mika volunteered to work with Deborah Dunning on further developing this section.

Credit 4: Diversity

The scorecard has not been updated since the last meeting. Bill Stough agreed to update it.

Credit 6: Comply with Requirements of GRI-SO1 or equivalent

It was agreed that this section would be deleted in the next draft of this document.

Credit 7: Extend Social Responsibility Expectations into Supply Chain

There was some question to whether this section was reasonable. Mary Ellen Mika suggested that each person in the work group could run this section by someone in the supply chain department of his/her company to get feedback on the requirements listed. The question is which and how many “no” answers to the survey questions will preclude a company from participating in the supply chain of another company. As this section is written, there are no specific requirements for which questions are to be used in the survey. This section needs further development.

The group wrapped up and stated that the next step to consider is which are company credits and which will be product credits. The next meeting is at NSF International on August 22-23, 2006.