

From the Judging Subcommittee Chair

Dear 2011 Greener Package Awards applicant,

As communicated on GreenerPackage.com via various recent posts, we are making some changes to the application for the 2011 program. For those of you who are actively engaged in the sustainable packaging movement, you are aware that change is constant. The materials, regulatory and standards landscape is shifting beneath our feet in perpetual motion. We have modified the 2011 program application as a result of some changes that have happened since the 2010 program closed and some changes that are underway as you read this.

For example, the “Environmental Attribute Indicators – Reuse” question does not ask for a text response to solicit a story from the applicant regarding how a candle jar can be reused for a pretty vase or a fast food container can be reused for another food product at the consumers discretion. According to new ISO standards in development for environmental packaging the stories above are not reflecting packaging reuse but packaging secondary life. Packaging reuse is explicitly defined within the context of a number of rotations in a commercial reuse system of refilling and/or collection and refurbishment/redistribution, etc such as with industrial pallet pools, at home refillable laundry detergent containers or industrial steel drums.

Another example of our shift in consciousness in this program is the migration from open ended questions that are subjective to judge to a more robust metrics oriented program. We are modeling some of the 2011 program after the latest version of the Global Protocol on Packaging Sustainability 2.0 (GPP) metric set. “Modeling” is a key word as we are not “adopting” all 42 metrics for the application process ... as you can imagine.

For example, under the social impact section of the GPP there are questions about child labor, excessive working hours and forced or compulsory labor. We are assuming that our applicants are either compliant with international law or wouldn't disclose such information willingly in an awards application anyhow. So, we elected to leave these types of questions out. If an applicant wishes to disclose information on enhancements they have made in regards to child labor, excessive working hours and forced or compulsory labor please do so in the Full Description text field.

We have also elected to not solicit economic impact measured in absolute dollars saved in the applicants supply chain. We know that some firms will not disclose such information so it wouldn't fare well as a judging reference point across all applications.

If an applicant wishes to disclose information accordingly please do so in the Full Description text field.

Probably one of the most significant variances from the GPP program is that of the Lifecycle Inventory Indicators area. While we do encourage the use of private or public LCA data such as that embedded in tools like COMPASS and the Wal-Mart Packaging Modeling Tool, we are not going to ask for LCA documentation, whether or not the basis was a streamlined, screening or full LCA, etc. While we understand clearly that LCA data is subjective in its nature and the data within certain public sources may differ, we have elected to ask for GHG metrics to quantify the following:

If you have removed packaging materials from your solution either to reduce weight, get a better cube utilization, eliminate waste, etc we would rather not get information on absolute lbs or % cube ... we are soliciting the GHG footprint of those mitigated materials.

If you have mitigated product waste/spoilage, we would rather not get information on absolute lbs, units, ounces, etc ... we are soliciting the GHG footprint of those mitigated products.

In addition, we have elected to not solicit metric information such as:

Aquatic Freshwater Eutrophication (measured in P equivalency units)

Aquatic Marine Eutrophication ( measured in N equivalency units)

Soil Eutrophication

Toxicity cancer (measured in vinyl chloride equivalency units)

Toxicity non-cancer (measured mass toluene equivalency units)

Particulate Respiratory Effects (measured in PM<sub>10</sub> equivalency units)

Ionizing radiation (measured in U235 equivalency units)

Ozone depletion (measured chloroflourcarbon equivalency units)

Photochemical Ozone Creation Potential (measured in non-methane volatile organic compound equivalents)

Acidification potential (measured in SO<sub>2</sub> equivalency units)

Again, if an applicant wishes to disclose information on enhancements they have made in regards to the metrics above please do so in the Full Description text field and be sure to use the equivalency units guidelines referenced above.

In addition to covering the basics in this year's application (reduce, reuse, recycle), we are soliciting information on:

- fresh water use from scarce or stressed resources
- reduction in toxic substances such as REACH SVOC's
- cellulose fiber based chain of custody certifications
- social impacts such as community, minority business development and safety
- recovery synopsis (post consumer: recycling, waste to energy or industrial composting)

We are also encouraging all applicants to exercise due diligence when it comes to avoiding greenwashing. Refrain from making claims that a material is recyclable or waste to energy ready or compostable if you cannot provide evidence that the waste industry handles that material accordingly at levels significant enough to warrant that claim. Know the difference between reuse and secondary life, post consumer vs post industrial recycled content and whether your fiber based material is chain of custody certified.

We are excited about the changes we have made to the 2011 program. Our new judging subcommittee is comprised of some of the most well known experts in the industry and with our new application in place we feel that the program is well positioned to be the best sustainable packaging awards program in the business. We look forward to your application and good luck!