Recommendations for updating the Committee on Information Technology (COIT) Green Technology Purchasing Policy

April 15, 2021

Chris Geiger, Ph.D., San Francisco Department of the Environment

Background

On January 17, 2019, San Francisco's Committee on Information Technology (COIT) approved an updated Green Technology Purchasing Policy based on recommendations from the San Francisco Department of the Environment (SFE) Green Purchasing Program. The updated policy provides goals and a framework for purchasing information technology (IT) equipment and services with reduced impacts on human health and the environment, in keeping with the City's Environmentally Preferable Purchasing Ordinance (Chapt. 2 Environment Code).

The policy is predominantly centered on the Electronics Products Environmental Assessment Tool (EPEAT), which is a registry of environmentally preferable IT products that meet certain established standards. EPEAT is a tiered system (Bronze, Silver and Gold) to promote environmental leadership by IT manufacturers. Because the IT industry has been advancing rapidly in the environmental arena, COIT and SFE agreed to conduct annual reassessments of the policy. The 2020 reassessment was completed but the presentation to COIT was delayed until 10/15/2020 due to the COVID-19 pandemic. At that meeting, some COIT members had questions and suggestions for improving the Green Technology Purchasing Policy further. Specifically, COIT members expressed interest in a general policy around packaging for IT equipment, and inquired about whether the third-party certification TCO could become an alternate compliance path for computer displays. SFE staff proceeded with another round of surveys and research to answer these questions.

Research

SFE staff reviewed the numbers of products registered under the various EPEAT standards in December 2020. Of particular interest was the IEEE 1680.1 standard (computers, laptops, desktops, monitors), which was a new standard as of 2019. Because IEEE 1680.1 is considerably more rigorous than it predecessor, the number of Gold-rated computers decreased sharply in 2019, and COIT agreed to reduce the City purchasing requirement from Gold to Bronze level in 2019. As manufacturers upgraded their product lines, it was expected that – as in the past – the number of Gold-level products would then rebound, opening the possibility for the City to raise the requirement from Bronze to Silver or Gold. This possibility of raising the bar for EPEAT registration became a primary goal in this year's policy review.

To support COIT's desire to increase reduction, reuse and recycling of IT packaging materials, staff contacted two industry leaders, HP and Dell, to better undertand their sustainable

packaging efforts and opportunities. Staff also surveyed IT managers' practices, obstacles and recommendations toward achieving this goal. Staff also surveyed IT managers' reception of the Green Technology Purchasing Policy overall, and whether it created hardships in their purchasing efforts. For these reasons, SFE created an IT managers survey (see below), which COIT distributed to City IT managers in December 2020. A total of 22 responses were received representing the following City departments:

- 311
- Airport
- Arts Commission
- Assessor-Recorder
- Building Inspection
- Civil Service Commission
- Controller
- District Attorney's Office
- Elections
- Environment
- Homelessness and Supportive Housing
- Human Services Agency
- Juvenile Probation
- Library
- Municipal Transportation Agency
- Planning
- Police
- Police Accountability
- Status of Women
- Technology
- Treasurer & Tax Collector
- War Memorial

Survey findings

1. IT managers are familiar with the Green Technology Purchasing Policy and most apply it to their own purchases. 86% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they are "very familiar" with the policy. 83% of respondents reported "Always" or "Usually" applying the policy in their own purchases, a decrease of 11% from 2019. This decrease reflects that one respondent "rarely" uses the Green Technology Purchasing Policy and another respondent was unaware that it existed.

2. Few managers experienced obstacles in applying the policy for computers/laptops/monitors, servers, imaging equipment, or TV's/large digital displays. For the above product categories, 81%, 95%, 100%, and 100% (respectively) of respondents reported facing "no" obstacles. Results for computers (81%) and servers (95%) in 2020 were slightly lower than they were in 2019 when 88% and 100% of respondents reported facing "no" obstacles purchasing these products, respectively.

For computers, a couple of respondents noted needing very specific products, such as industrial grade displays, that did not comply with the Green Technology Purchasing Policy and had no alternative. A third respondent noted that:

> *"Compliance takes time to study the required specifications and attempt to match our needs with what's allowed in the policy."*

For servers, only one respondent faced obstacles using the Policy, specifically to purchase Dell servers.

3. Almost all managers felt that EPEAT Gold level computers would meet their needs.
Of the 22 respondents. 95% felt that EPEAT Silver level products would meet their needs and 91% felt the same about EPEAT Gold. This is a significant improvement from results in 2019, where only 71% of respondents believed the EPEAT Gold level computers would meet their needs.

The one respondent whose needs were not met by either the EPEAT Silver or EPEAT Gold level products commented that:

> *"NEC monitors not listed, but I believe are EPEAT Gold"*.

The other respondent whose needs could not be met by EPEAT Gold level products stated:

> *"Some computer and monitor models that we purchase do not show up on this Gold list."*

4. Most managers identified reducing foam-based packaging materials as the most important action for vendors/manufacturers to increase reduction, reuse and recycling of IT packaging.

COIT has prioritized the development of a more sustainable City policy around IT packaging. To further this goal, IT managers ranked four actions that vendors and manufacturers could take to improve reduction, reuse and recycling of IT packaging. The following actions were ranked as "very" or "somewhat" important by the managers:

- Reduction in use of foam-based packaging materials by manufacturers (100%)[1]
- Bulk packaging for smaller equipment (82%)
- Improved separability of different packaging materials (82%)
- Onsite takeback of packaging materials provided by vendors (77%)
- Other (23%)

Two managers offered "Other" actions that would be "very" important for vendors and manufacturers to take. One manager commented that additional components such as accessories should be optional and not automatically included with orders. They commented:

> *"Options to order computers or monitors without mouse, keyboard, cables, discs, or manuals."*

Another manager highlighted the need for packaging to be reusable:

> *"Packaging must be easily re-usable. In order to improve safety during the pandemic we started shipping equipment to end users after providing initial*

[1] This result is based on 21 votes as one manager forgot to rank this action.

configuration. Packaging is important to protect the equipment and not waste money."

5. Foams were also reported as the IT packaging materials most frequently landfilled.

The actions that IT managers highlighted as most important for manufacturers and vendors to take to improve their packaging footprint (see analysis for item #4, above) mirror the packaging materials that managers identified as most frequently ending up in the trash.

Styrofoam (37%) and other foams (18%) were by far the most landfilled item, showing up in 12 managers' responses (55%). Plastics, including wrappers, bags, air pillows and bubble wrap, were the next most common landfilled materials, as identified by 6 managers (27%). Mylar and materials without the recycle identified (triangle symbol) were each identified by one manager as the most landfilled.

Surprisingly, one manager reported that "boxes" most frequently ended up in the trash. By contrast, another manager stated that "none" of the packaging materials end up frequently in the trash; this same manager reported reusing the original packaging to send the equipment to the end user after being configured and tagged.

Conclusions

There are five key takeaways from this survey of the City's IT managers:

1. IT managers are familiar with the Green Technology Purchasing Policy and generally apply it to their purchases.
2. IT managers experienced few obstacles in applying the Green Technology Purchasing Policy in 2020.
3. There are sufficient computers/laptops/monitors at EPEAT Gold level to meet most IT managers' needs.
4. To increase reduction, reuse and recycling of IT packaging, reducing foam-based packaging materials would be the most impactful action for vendors and manufacturers to take.
5. The most frequently landfilled IT packaging materials are Styrofoam and other foams, followed by various plastics.

Recommendations

The Department of the Environment recommends the following changes in the Green Technology Purchasing Policy:

1. Based on the survey responses and on manufacturers' rapid adoption of the IEEE 1680.1 standard, the requirement for computers/laptops/monitors should be advanced from EPEAT Bronze to EPEAT Gold.
2. Based on an analysis and comparison to EPEAT (Attachment A), the TCO Certified certification should be added to the list of qualifications currently accepted for computers/laptops/desktops/displays, televisions and large displays to comply with the Policy.
3. Per a request from COIT, a policy on packaging for IT equipment has been added. In order to foster expanded environmental stewardship in the IT industry and as a reminder to City staff, SFE should continue its dialogue with IT industry stakeholders in the coming year to further advance this packaging policy. For example, SFE can explore the availability of ordering equipment without peripherals and cables, or the availability of packaging that is more easily recycled or reused.

ATTACHMENT A.

Brief Comparison of EPEAT for desktops/laptops/displays (IEEE 1680.1 2018) with TCO v. 8

3/12/21

Chris Geiger, Ph.D.
San Francisco Department of the Environment

Background

The City & County of San Francisco has required various levels of EPEAT registration for all of its desktop/laptop/display purchases since 2009. EPEAT Gold was required for most of this period; in 2019, the requirement was rolled back to EPEAT Bronze due to the significantly more rigorous requirements of IEEE 1680.1 2018 and consequent lack of Gold-level products. The EPEAT requirement is likely to be increased to Silver or Gold in 2021 in light of increased product registrations, and based on feedback from City IT managers.

During the process of surveying IT managers on these topics, one department requested that the Dept. of the Environment and Committee on Information Technology (COIT) consider adding TCO certification as an alternate requirement for displays in particular. TCO is an independent third-party certification of IT products that has been gaining more market share in recent years. TCO differs from EPEAT in two major respects:

1. TCO is a certification, requiring documentation of product's compliance by an independent third party before it can carry the TCO label. Verification of claims is therefore required *before* products can be TCO certified.

   EPEAT is a registry of products that manufacturers claim meet various designated environmental leadership standards, in this case IEEE 1680.1 2018. Registered products are then subject to a wide-ranging audit process by qualified independent third parties. Verification of claims for EPEAT is therefore required *after* products are listed on the registry, enabling a faster listing.

2. All of TCO's criteria are *mandatory*. This means there is only one level of certification available.

   EPEAT's criteria feature *both mandatory and optional criteria.* A minimum number of criteria are required to qualify for the three tiers of the registry: EPEAT Bronze, Silver, and Gold. The tiered structure is considered a means for promoting continual improvement in product design.

Methods

The goal of this comparison was to determine whether TCO v.8 certification is *substantially equivalent* to EPEAT requirements for desktops/laptops/displays. Time and resources prohibited a full comparison of every criterion and its implications, so this should not be considered a

comprehensive comparison. Department of the Environment staff compared the IEEE 1680.1-2018 standard to TCO v.8 on a point-by-point basis, with emphasis on criteria considered mandatory under EPEAT. For each criterion, staff determined whether the standards were similar, or whether one or the other standard was significantly stronger. These are listed in Table 1.

Findings

While there are tradeoffs on various criteria between the two programs, we consider TCO to be sufficiently similar to the EPEAT requirements to be considered "substantially equivalent." There are some criteria where EPEAT/IEEE 1680.1-2018 surpasses TCO, and others where TCO v.8 appears superior. Specifically, TCO is stronger with respect to Substance Management criteria; although EPEAT specifically requires adherence to the EU Battery Directive, TCO makes some of the key EPEAT "optional" criteria mandatory relating to permissible chemicals. On the other hand, EPEAT is stronger with regard to recycled content requirements for product parts and packaging. Design for end of life is roughly similar, but TCO has specific mandatory requirements for standardized connectors and replaceable components, which are not found in EPEAT. TCO has stronger corporate responsibility requirements, an anti-corruption criterion, and certain required disclosures that are optional in EPEAT. TCO also features a few other unique requirements that are not found at all in EPEAT, such as limits on electromagnetic fields and disclosures on soldering and compressed air tools. Energy conservation and end-of-life management criterion are comparable.

The fact that EPEAT offers optional criteria makes comparisons with TCO less meaningful, because manufacturers will choose different optional points in order to attain the desired tier level for different products. The fact that TCO has a mandatory requirement for a criterion that is optional in EPEAT is also not necessarily relevant, as many higher-tier EPEAT products will likely attain that optional point.

Recommendations

The two programs differ in approach, but the coverage of subject matter is substantially similar. TCO's deficiencies in recycled content requirements are balanced out by a more rigorous attention to design for end of life, substance management and other issues.

1. **We recommend listing TCO version 8 or later as an acceptable alternative requirement for desktops/laptops/displays purchasing requirements.**
2. **We also recommend listing TCO version 8 or later as an acceptable alternative requirement for large displays/digital signage purchasing requirements.**

---

1 Substance Management

Required Criteria

1.1 (Required) – Conformance with European Union RoHS Directive substance restrictions	**Similar**

1.2 (Required) – Elimination of intentionally added mercury in light sources	**Similar**
1.3 (Required) – Reduction of bromine and chlorine content in plastic parts > 25g	**Similar**
1.4 (Required) – Compliance with provisions of EU Battery Directive	**EPEAT stronger**
Optional Criteria	
1.5 (Optional) – Restriction on the use of cadmium	**TCO stronger - required**
1.6 (Optional) – Restriction of the use of beryllium	**EPEAT stronger?**
1.7 (Optional) – Further reduction of bromine and chlorine content of plastic materials	
1.8 (Optional) – Avoidance or elimination of substances on EU REACH Annex XIV (authorization list)	
1.9 (Optional) – Reduction of substances on the EU REACH Candidate List of SVHCs	**TCO stronger - required**
1.10 (Optional) – Chemical assessment and selection	**TCO stronger - required. Similar but TCO has dynamic list of acceptable chemicals**
1.11 (Optional) – IEC 62474 declarable substances	**EPEAT stronger?**
1.12 (Optional) – Requesting substance inventory	
1.13 (Optional) – Acquiring substance inventory	
1.14 (Optional) – Reduce fluorinated gas emissions from flat panel display manufacturing	
1.15 (Optional) – Reduce fluorinated greenhouse gas emissions from semiconductor production	
	TCO also prohibits hexavalent chromium, lead, more phthalates; requires Green Screen benchmark 2,3,4 for non halogenated materials.
	TCO has a process chemicals mandate

2 Materials selection

Required Criteria	
2.1 (Required) – Minimum post-consumer recycled plastic, ITE-derived post-consumer recycled plastic or bio-based plastic content	**EPEAT stronger - TCO requires reporting**
Optional Criteria	
2.2 (Optional) – Higher post-consumer recycled plastic, ITE-derived post-consumer recycled plastic, or bio-based plastic content	**EPEAT stronger - TCO requires reporting**

2.3 (Optional) – ITE derived post-consumer recycled plastic content	
3 Design for end of life	
Required Criteria	
3.1 (Required) – Identification of materials and components requiring selective treatment	**Similar**
3.2 (Required) – Plastic parts compatible with recycling	**EPEAT stronger**
3.3 (Required) – Plastic parts separable for recycling	**EPEAT stronger**
	TCO stronger on requirements for standardized connectors, replaceable components criteria.
4 Product Longevity/lifecycle extension	
Required Criteria	
4.1 (Required) – Service support	**Similar**
4.2 (Required) – Removal of external enclosure	**EPEAT stronger**
4.3 (Required) – Spare parts	**Similar**
4.4 (Required) – Battery replacement and information	**Similar**
Optional Criteria	
4.5 (Optional) – Long life rechargeable battery	
4.6 (Optional) – Publicly available service information	
4.7 (Optional) – Product upgradeability and reparability	
4.8 (Optional) – Removal of lithium ion batteries	
	TCO stronger on product warranty
5 Energy conservation	
Required Criteria	
5.1 (Required) – Conformance to current ENERGY STAR® program requirements	**Similar**
5.2 (Required) – Lowest power mode limit	**Similar - different standard**
Optional Criteria	
5.3 (Optional) – Energy efficiency for internal power supplies	**TCO stronger - required**
5.4 (Optional) – Energy efficiency for external power supplies exceeding International External Power Supply Efficiency Level VI	
5.5 (Optional) – Product energy consumption less than the ENERGY STAR® Maximum energy limit	

	TCO stronger on various other disclosures related to energy, such as use of compressed air tools, typ of soldering, cleanrooms, etc. **TCO features requirement for electromagnetic fields**
6 End-of-life management	
Required Criteria	
6.1 (Required) – Provision of product take-back services	**Similar**
6.2 (Required) – Provision of a removable rechargeable battery take-back program	**Similar?**
6.3 (Required) – End-of-life processing	**Similar**
7 Packaging	
Required Criteria	
7.1 (Required) – Elimination of intentionally added heavy metals in packaging	**Similar - TCO slightly stronger on hazardous substances**
7.2 (Required) – Elimination of elemental chlorine as a bleaching agent in packaging material	**EPEAT stronger?**
7.3 (Required) – Separable packaging material	**Similar**
7.4 (Required) – Plastics marked in packaging materials	**EPEAT stronger**
7.5 (Required) – Recycled content in wood-based fiber packaging	**EPEAT stronger**
Optional Criteria	
7.6 (Optional) – Packaging composed of recycled, and/or bio-based, and/or sustainably forested content	
7.7 (Optional) – Offering of a bulk packaging option	
8 Life cycle assessment and carbon footprint	**TCO stronger generally by requiring disclosures in different format**
Optional Criteria	
8.1 (Optional) – Product life cycle assessment and public disclosure of analysis	**EPEAT stronger - not in TCO**
8.2 (Optional) – Product specific greenhouse gas emissions – product carbon footprint	**EPEAT stronger - not in TCO**
8.3 (Optional) – Corporate carbon footprint	**EPEAT stronger - not in TCO**
8.4 (Optional) – Greenhouse gas emissions from product transport	**EPEAT stronger - not in TCO**

9 Corporate environmental performance

Required Criteria

9.1 (Required) – Third party certified environmental management system (EMS) for design and manufacturing organizations	**Similar**
9.2 (Required) – Corporate environmental performance reporting by manufacturer	**Similar - different approach**

Optional Criteria

9.3 (Optional) – Third party certified environmental management system (EMS) for supplier manufacturing facilities	**EPEAT stronger - not in TCO**
9.4 (Optional) – Corporate environmental performance reporting by suppliers	**TCO stronger - required**
9.5 (Optional) – Energy management system/energy performance improvement – manufacturers	
9.6 (Optional) – Energy management system/energy performance improvement for suppliers	
9.7 (Optional) – Renewable energy use by manufacturer	**TCO stronger - required**
9.8 (Optional) – Renewable energy use by manufacturer suppliers	
	TCO has anticorruption requirements
	TCO has supply chain requirements

10 Corporate social responsibility

TCO stronger generally - required

Required Criteria

10.1 (Required) – Public disclosure regarding conflict minerals in products	**TCO stronger**

Optional Criteria

10.2 (Optional) – Socially responsible supplier manufacturing: Labor

10.3 (Optional) – Socially responsible manufacturing: OHS

10.4 (Optional) – Participation in an in-region program that advances responsible sourcing of conflict minerals

10.5 (Optional) – Smelter and refiner participation in OECD-aligned third party mechanisms

ATTACHMENT B.

Survey results, December 2020 IT Managers Survey.

(22 respondents)

1. Evaluate the following statement: I am very familiar with the Green Technology Purchasing Policy.	
Row Labels	Total
Strongly Agree	5
Agree	14
Disagree	2
Strongly Disagree	1
Grand Total	**22**

2. When do you apply the Green Technology Purchasing Policy in your own purchases?	
Row Labels	Total
Always	12
Usually	8
Rarely	1
Never	1
Grand Total	**22**

3. Do you face any obstacles using the Green Technology Purchasing Policy to buy computers and displays?	
Row Labels	Total
No	18
Yes	4
Grand Total	**22**

4. Do you face any obstacles using the Green Technology Purchasing Policy to buy servers?	
Row Labels	Total
(blank)	1
No	20
Yes	1
Grand Total	**22**

5. Do you face any obstacles using the Green Technology Purchasing Policy to buy imaging equipment?	
Row Labels	Total
No	22
Grand Total	**22**

6. Did you know that the City adopted a green purchasing policy for TV's and large digital displays in 2019?	
Row Labels	Total
No	10
Yes	12
Grand Total	**22**

7. Did you buy any TV's and large digital displays in 2019 or 2020?	
Row Labels	Total
No	10
Yes	12
Grand Total	**22**

8. Do you face any obstacles using the Green Technology Purchasing Policy to buy TV's or large digital displays?	
Row Labels	Total
No	22
Grand Total	**22**

9. Would this list of GOLD level EPEAT-registered computers and displays (https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1vxi1VobJw5U1AFvH_LoX3_0bEmmnjrPoEIP1PMwjL_Y/edit#gid=1208016934) meet your needs?	
Row Labels	Total
No	2
Yes	20
Grand Total	**22**

10. Would this list of SILVER and GOLD level EPEAT-registered computers and displays (https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1vxi1VobJw5U1AFvH_LoX3_0bEmmnjrPoEIP1PMwjL_Y/edit#gid=1309172446) meet your needs?

Row Labels	Total
(blank)	2
No	1
Yes	19
Grand Total	**22**

11. COIT has prioritized the need for increased reduction, reuse, and recycling of IT packaging materials. What would be the most important actions by vendors/manufacturers to meet this goal?:

Action by vendor/ manufacturer	Very important (# of responses)	Somewhat important (# of responses)	Not very important (# of responses)	Not important at all, or irrelevant (# of responses)	Total responses
Onsite takeback of packaging materials provided by vendor	8	9	4	1	22
Reduction in use of foam-based packaging materials by manufacturers	14	7			21
Improved separability of different packaging materials	5	13	4		22

Bulk packaging for smaller equipment	10	8	3	1	22
Other (please fill in below)	2	3			5

Explain your "Other" response here:

- Ranked "Very important": Options to order computers or monitors without mouse, keyboard, cables, discs, or manuals.
- Ranked "Very important": Packaging must be easily re-usable. In order to improve safety during the pandemic we started shipping equipment to end users after providing initial configuration. Packaging is important to protect the equipment and not waste money.
- Ranked (blank): We have a small department of 6 FTE. DHR IT assists us in purchasing new computers but we rarely have the opportunity to but new computers and never purchase TVs or large displays.

12. What do you do with the packaging materials used to ship electronics? In particular, please tell us what you do with 1) styrofoam; 2) plastic bags and wrappers; 3) other plastics; 4) cardboard; 5) other materials (please specify).

Response #	1) Styrofoam	2) Plastic bags & wrappers	3) Other plastics	4) Cardboard	5) Other materials (please specify)
1	landfill	recycled	Recycled if possible	recycled	Anti-static bags – recycled. Adhesive tape – landfill. Shipping labels on cardboard – recycled if no plastic backing
2	Sorted (all packaging materials)				
3	sorted	sorted	sorted	Sometimes reused	Sorted

Response #	1) Styrofoam	2) Plastic bags & wrappers	3) Other plastics	4) Cardboard	5) Other materials (please specify)
4	store	recycle	recycle	store	N/A
5	Recycle as much as possible (all packaging materials)				
6	Sorted and left for building maintenance (all packaging materials)				
7	We recycle all materials that we can and throw away only that which cannot be recycled. (all packaging materials)				
8	Sorted by building cleaning service. We also have a large recyclable building dumpster, which helps when we have large shipments (i.e. PC refresh order). (all packaging materials)				
9	Try to recycle what we can (all packaging materials)				
10	Recycle (all packaging materials)				
11	(blank)				
12	We put all of our packaging in the hallway at the end of the day. Building services picks up to recycle. (all packaging materials)				
13	Recycle if possible, if not throw away. (all packaging materials)				
14	Recycle if possible, otherwise landfill	Recycle if possible, otherwise landfill	Recycle if possible, otherwise landfill	reused	
15	Re-use - i.e. ship to end user in the original packaging after the equipment has been configured and asset tagged. (all packaging materials)				
16	landfill	Recycle if possible, otherwise landfill	Recycle if possible, otherwise landfill	Recycle if possible, otherwise landfill	Recycle if possible, otherwise landfill
17	Sorted and dropped off with custodian (all packaging materials)				

Response #	1) Styrofoam	2) Plastic bags & wrappers	3) Other plastics	4) Cardboard	5) Other materials (please specify)
18	landfill	Depends on type of plastic, either landfill or recycle	recycle	recycle	
19	Sorted by receiving team (all packaging materials)				
20	landfill	recycle	recycle	recycle	Recycle if possible, otherwise landfill
21	(blank)				
22	landfill	Plastic bags and wrappers are bagged for recycling with film plastic (unless it has a metallic film or is mylar)	Most other plastics go in recycling unless unclear (such as formed semi-soft foam plastic used to protect computers inside the box (HP uses this material)	recycle	

13. What packaging materials end up in the trash (black bin) most frequently?

Row Labels	Total
Styrofoam	8
Foam/foam-based/small pieces of foam/thin foam screen protector used to protect display from scratches during shipping	4
Plastic wrappers	3
Plastic bags	2
Plastic air pillows, bubble wrap	1
Mylar/plastic bags with metallic film	1
Materials without the recycle identifier (triangle symbol)	1
Boxes	1
None	1
Grand Total	**22**

14. What, if anything, would you like to change about the existing Green Tech Purchasing Policy, and how? Please provide your feedback on the policy here.

- "Wider distribution of policy for increased awareness"
- "Focus on bulk packaging, which results in savings in resources. Unpacking and breaking down packaging material takes human resources time, and delays projects and deployment. Also, individual packaging (being smaller) tends toward loss whether intentional or accidental."
- "Could you interject the policy into the purchase paperwork stream, so that we had to check off a box saying we had complied? I wasn't aware of the policy, and maybe others aren't aware of it, if it was a hard purchasing requirement, that might help."
- "I would very much like to continue using NEC monitors, which are EPEAT Gold (or were when we bought last year), but are not listed in either of the spreadsheets."
- "No changes at this time as it aligns to current City procurement practice."
- "I have not recommended changes to the policy at this time."
- "The policy works well."
- "None."