

GC3 Advisory Committee Call
July 20, 2009

Present: Bob Israel, Johnson Diversey; Lauren Heine, Clean Production Action; Richard Cottrell, SYSCO; Dave Long, ESS; Rich Liroff, IEHN; Roger McFadden, Staples;; Joel Tickner, Yve Torrie, and Melissa Coffin, Lowell Center for Sustainable Production.

Project Updates

Tools for Chemical Assessment Working Group

Monica Becker has completed three case studies which have now been reviewed by the companies featured and are near final. Monica has also put together a draft overview paper providing an analysis of the cases and providing some lessons learned. The Tools working group has decided that it would like to do more case studies and create a webpage on the GC3 website to act as a clearing house for case studies of interest to the GC3. The Lowell Center is working with Monica to finalize the cases and the analysis for publication as soon as is possible. Those on the call suggested that Clean Production Action's implementation guide for their chemical policy principles would be important to include in this project so as to reinforce common messages.

The second project the group has identified as priority is creating a minimum chemical data set (MCDS) necessary for making chemical decisions along supply chains. The group will survey GC3 companies to discover their current ways of acquiring information, the format they use to acquire it, and what their information needs are. The survey will also include a question about what information they would want in a perfect world, and the format in which they would like to see this information. The Tools working group has a call scheduled later this week to talk about who will take the lead on these projects and how they will be completed.

Drivers and Marketing Working Group

The Drivers working group is working on two projects; one on drafting a report on best practices in product chemicals management in the retail industry, and the other on completing a green glossary of common green marketing terms. Seven interviews with retailers have been completed as the basis of the best practices report with three more yet to be done. The group is hoping for an October publication deadline. The green glossary is currently at a stand-still as working group participants have not been actively adding to it.

DfE/Green Chemistry Working Group

The DfE working group is pursuing several projects. The joint publication between the GC3 and the National Pollution Prevention Roundtable (NPPR) about growing the green economy is complete and has been published. Hard copies are available from Ken Zarker at the Washington State Department of Ecology and electronic copies can be downloaded from the GC3 website at www.greenchemistryandcommerce.org/publications.php. The working group's partnership with EPA to draft a criteria document for the DfE program is also complete and available for download from both EPA's and the GC3 publication page (see link above). A follow up call with EPA is scheduled for later this month at which time the group will discuss how best to move forward.

The Lowell Center is continuing to work on passage of the federal green chemistry bill. Joel and Jessica Schifano, also of the Lowell Center, have spoken with Chris Pearce (SC Johnson) about how best to support the bill and are tentatively planning a September/October trip to DC to meet with various agencies and with EPA about the bill.

Additionally, two new projects for the working group emerged from this year's Roundtable meeting. A project on Partnerships Between the GC3 and Academic Institutions is being led by Andy Larson (Darden School of Business) and David Levine (Green Harvest Technologies). A thought-starter on what such a project might look like has been drafted and a sub-group met for a conference call to discuss the document earlier in July. The second project focuses on Incentivizing Green Chemistry Along Supply Chains and is being led by Bob Israel (Johnson Diversey). Bob drafted an outline of what a whitepaper on incentives might look like, but has not received any comments from the sub-group interested in participating in the project. Bob will send a reminder to the sub-group for comments and expect that little will be done through the summer months.

Discussion of GC3 Outreach Document

Melissa put together a list of potential options for increasing participation in the GC3 and for changing the way the group is funded given the Lowell Center's limited resources to carry out projects. Those on the call generally felt that the proposals brainstormed were good ones, but there was a strong opinion that the GC3 needed to be made up of at least 75% businesses rather than the 50% proposed. The group defined a business as a profit-making organization that produces a tangible good, which could include some consulting groups.

There was also some discussion over the idea of allowing GC3 participants to use the GC3 logo on their websites. Some felt that this could lead to greenwashing, while others felt it would be a useful tool for building awareness about the group.

Ford was added to the list of companies targeted for outreach, and it was suggested that we reinstate the outreach strategy that was in place for our original meeting at Darden where those attending the meeting committed to bringing along a company from their supply chain. This approach would help grow the GC3 across sectors and along supply chains. Additionally, the healthcare and education sectors were suggested as being potentially interested in participating in the GC3.

Discussion of Funding the GC3

The Lowell Center receives some foundation funding for GC3 activities, but not enough to cover all of the projects being taken on by the working groups. Registration fees to attend our annual meetings have typically supplemented this funding, however due to the economic downturn we waived many registration fees and provided additional support for attendees to this year's meeting. The Lowell Center cleared about \$10,000 coming out of the 2009 Roundtable, much of which has been allocated to existing GC3 projects. We will need to be creative about funding the GC3 if we are to expand our activities.

In addition to the two funding models proposed in Melissa's document ("pay to play" where participants contribute to a project if they'd like to see it happen, and "voluntary dues" where

companies which have a budget for group fees but not for travel could contribute without attending annual meetings), a third option was suggested where the GC3 could act as a clearinghouse for projects for a fee. For example, a GC3 company has a problem that could be solved by an academic institution. For a fee, the GC3 would act as a credible location for research to be done and facilitate cooperation between the company and researchers. The criteria for being “a credible location” would need to be determined and to some degree would depend on the specifics of the project.

A fourth option was also put forward where the Lowell Center could essentially lease the GC3 logo annually to companies who wanted to feature it on their website.

Those on the call agreed that no one option would likely solve the funding problem, rather we would need to present more than one option for companies in different circumstances.

Next Steps

- Melissa will send around a list of outreach activities and funding options based on this call and ask the Advisory Committee to vote on which options they would like to see used.