

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

RONALD A. BLOUCH JR.,

Plaintiff,

v. Civil Action No. _____

NSF INTERNATIONAL, et al.,

Defendants.

DOCUMENTING SGS NORTH AMERICA, INC. CONDUCT

Submitted in Support of Blouch v. NSF International et al. — July 2026

I. WHAT IS PRIVATE

SGS North America, Inc. has tested commercial hand dryers for manufacturers for many years. How many times, for which products, under which protocols, and with what results is not known to Plaintiff or to the public, because every such report is proprietary to the party that commissioned it. Excel Dryer reports current and ongoing SGS testing on its website and in its promotional materials and publishes none of it.

Plaintiff located one report. It was not a named filing in the docket of Excel Dryer, Inc. v. Dyson, Inc., No. 3:12-cv-30211-MAP (D. Mass.). It appeared inside an exhibit, among several hundred documents, and Plaintiff found it by reading nearly all of them. What that

single report contains is set out below. What the others contain, no one outside those transactions can say.

That asymmetry is the condition this memorandum describes. Three current public certifications attribute hand dryer performance figures to SGS testing. No member of the public — no purchaser, no specifier, no facility operator, and no court — can read a single one of the reports behind them.

II. THE PARTY AND THE UNDERTAKING

SGS North America, Inc. is a Delaware corporation (File No. 888911) with its principal place of business at 400 Broadacres Drive, Suite 200, Bloomfield, New Jersey, and testing laboratory operations at 620 Old Peachtree Road NW, Suite 100, Suwanee, Georgia. It operates as an accredited testing laboratory under ISO/IEC 17025.

SGS did not write a standard, author a Product Category Rule, or issue an environmental declaration. It was retained to perform tests. Plaintiff pleads no failure by SGS outside the testing it performed, and no argument here depends on enlarging that undertaking.

SGS holds itself out as competent to verify environmental and performance claims across a broad range of published standards, including water footprint under ISO 14046 and carbon footprint of products under ISO 14067. [Exhibit FFFF] That competence is not offered to widen the undertaking. It is the measure of the care owed within it.

III. THE ONE DOCUMENT

Performance Test Report No. 2774929EFF-001 records testing conducted between August 15 and August 24, 2012, commissioned by Excel Dryer. It is signed by project engineer Martin Dodd and reviewed by Jody Leber. It is marked proprietary to Excel Dryer. [Exhibit BB]

The report states its method: each product was tested in accordance with a revised version of NSF Protocol P335 Hygienic Commercial Hand Dryers then being developed and reviewed by NSF and its new technical panel for the five-year protocol update. P335 issued in April 2007; a five-year update falls in 2012. Three measurements were taken on each product: residual moisture after the dry cycle, standby current consumption, and energy consumption during the dry cycle.

One sample of each model was procured through normal retail channels.

IV. WHAT THE REPORT RECORDS

Table 1 of the report gives averaged results by model, voltage, condition and time. The tested times are twelve, fifteen and thirty seconds. The relevant entries for the products later certified are these.

- Excel Dryer XLERATOR XL-BW, 120V/60Hz, normal: 0.186 gram residual moisture and 5.400 watt-hours at twelve seconds; 0.108 gram and 6.688 watt-hours at fifteen seconds.
- Dyson Airblade AB04, 120V/60Hz, normal: 0.183 gram at twelve seconds; 0.143 gram at fifteen seconds.

- World Dryer Smartdri K972A, 120V/60Hz: 0.774 gram with heat and 0.770 gram without, both at fifteen seconds.
- Excel Dryer Hands Off HO-IW, 120V/60Hz: 1.128 gram at fifteen seconds; 0.303 gram at thirty seconds.

NSF Protocol P335 defines dry hands as less than 0.1 gram of residual moisture. Taken at face value, and without Plaintiff adopting them, the recorded figures do not reach that threshold at the times tested for either of the two leading high-speed products at United States voltage: the XLERATOR recorded 0.108 gram at fifteen seconds and the Airblade AB04 recorded 0.143. The only two entries in the table below 0.1 gram are 240-volt units, which are not the products certified for the United States market. On Plaintiff's measurements the same products are further from that threshold by a wide margin.

The report also measured energy directly. The XLERATOR at 120 volts consumed 5.400 watt-hours in a twelve-second cycle and 6.688 watt-hours in a fifteen-second cycle.

Plaintiff does not adopt these figures. They are set out because they are what SGS recorded, not because Plaintiff accepts them as what the machines do. Across every United States-voltage product in the table the recorded values differ from Plaintiff's measurements by one to two orders of magnitude. Plaintiff cannot reproduce any of them, on any product, at any tested time, and offers no explanation for the divergence. The report establishes what one laboratory reported in August 2012. It establishes nothing about what the machines do.

V. THE CONTEMPORANEOUS EXPERT VIEW

On October 17, 2012 the authors of both competing manufacturer-commissioned life cycle assessments — Jon Dettling of Quantis, who authored Excel's 2009 study, and Jeremy Gregory and Randolph Kirchain of the MIT Materials Systems Laboratory, who authored Dyson's 2011 study — wrote jointly to Excel's vice president. [Exhibit TT]

They described the SGS data as rigorous in that it follows an NSF protocol. They recorded that Dyson had also tested using the NSF standard, that the estimated dry times for the Airblade from the SGS and Dyson tests were essentially the same, and that the estimated dry times for the XLERATOR were significantly different — the Dyson result nearly fifty percent higher than the SGS result. They wrote that they could not explain the difference because they had not observed the testing by either entity.

They concluded that at the reported dry times, twelve seconds for each unit and consistent with the SGS measurements, the Airblade and the XLERATOR were statistically indistinguishable.

Two independent expert groups, one of them retained by the manufacturer whose product fared better, called the testing rigorous and could not reconcile one of its two headline results. That was the state of the record in October 2012.

VI. WHAT THE DOCUMENT DOES NOT REACH

The report is a snapshot of a specific interval. It radiates in no direction. It does not establish what SGS tested before August 2012 or after. It does not establish that other SGS

testing was careless, or that it does not exist, or that it would agree or disagree with what this report records. It does not disprove any later figure.

What it is, is fixed. Named models, named voltages, named conditions, named times, one sample each, signed and reviewed. Those numbers cannot move.

VII. WHAT REMAINS UNRECONCILED

Four years after this report, UL Solutions issued an Environmental Product Declaration for the XLERATOR stating a dry time of 8.355 seconds and approximately 3.680 watt-hours per use, and stated on its face that the reported dry time rests on SGS testing. [Exhibit CC]

Eleven years after this report, Smart EPD issued a declaration stating an eight-second dry time and citing SGS testing performed under UL's Product Category Rule. [Exhibit AA]

Excel's technical data sheet, dated May 2026, states that dry time and energy use testing was performed by SGS International to 0.25 gram or less of residual moisture pursuant to that Rule. [Exhibits PPPP, QQQQ]

The report in Plaintiff's possession tests at twelve, fifteen and thirty seconds. It records 5.400 watt-hours at the shortest of those times. It could not have tested under a Product Category Rule that was not published until July 13, 2016. Whether other SGS testing supports the later figures, Plaintiff does not know and cannot know, because it is not public.

The gap is not Plaintiff's to close. The records that would close it are held by SGS and by the parties that cite it. A public certification resting on private testing that no one outside the transaction can read is the condition described here, not an accusation made here.

VIII. WHAT IS AND IS NOT ALLEGED

Plaintiff does not allege that SGS wrote or was bound by NSF Protocol P335, that SGS selected the threshold applied in its report or the protocol revision under which it tested, that SGS issued or verified any environmental declaration, that SGS is answerable for the content of any certification citing it, or that any SGS testing other than the report described here was deficient in any respect.

Plaintiff alleges that SGS was retained to measure drying performance and energy consumption, that the measurements it recorded in 2012 do not support the figures later certified in its name, that no public record permits those figures to be reconciled, and that the measure of the care SGS owed is the method it was retained to execute.

IX. THE MEASUREMENTS ON THE OTHER SIDE

Plaintiff's 462 drying trials, using comparable gravimetric methodology across 169 units in 226 locations, recorded approximately 2.5 to 3.0 grams of residual moisture at manufacturer-claimed times and seventy to ninety seconds to approach the certified thresholds. Those figures rest on 931 individual tests across five states and the District of Columbia, and 1,076 culture dishes from which approximately 50,000 bacterial and fungal colonies were hand counted. Every result is public, replicable, and open for inspection and

debate. Every counting decision is documented and every error found and corrected is disclosed in the record. The complete methodology and underlying data are published at handdryerstudy.com.

The contrast is not offered to impeach the 2012 report selectively. Plaintiff cannot reproduce any figure in that table, for any manufacturer, including the figures least favourable to the products. The two bodies of measurement have never been reconciled, and only one of them is available for anyone to check.

X. CONCLUSION

One SGS report on commercial hand dryers is public, and it is public by accident. It records that in August 2012, at the times then claimed and at United States voltage, the two leading high-speed hand dryers did not reach the residual-moisture figure the governing protocol defines as dry. It records the energy each cycle consumed. Two independent expert groups reviewed the data weeks later, called it rigorous, and could not reconcile one of its two principal results.

Plaintiff cannot reproduce any figure in that table and does not adopt them. Whether they are taken at face value or measured against 462 field trials, they do not reach the threshold the governing protocol defines as dry, and they do not support the figures later certified in SGS's name. Everything certified since in SGS's name rests on testing the public cannot read. That is the whole of what this memorandum says about SGS, and it is enough.

Respectfully submitted,

Ronald A. Blouch Jr., Plaintiff Pro Se

Date: _____