**RESNET® 1550 Full Task Group Meeting Minutes**

**February 6th, 2024**

[*MEETING RECORDING HERE*](https://zoom.us/rec/share/77_sphSW4mWYYVvjnJb2ns_HoV1pDkSwbjQPlxxhOMfg-D1yvZ6b63EihueYLBEv.4OJdeQH4Ai4wsjWy)

*Passcode: q.v44?cs*

Present:

|  |
| --- |
| Alexis Minniti |
| Chris Magwood |
| Matthew Cooper |
| Mike Browne |
| Tracy Huynh |
| Yatharth Vaishnani |
| Brian ShanksPhilip Squires |
| Amanda Hickman |
| Charlie Haack |
| Anber Rana |
| Ariel Brenner |
| Nigel Watts |
| Bennett Doherty |
| Webly BowlesMatthew BrownAlexander ReesAndy BuccinoBrett WelchJacob RacusinJoel MartellDavid Goldstein (joined at 12:56 PM ET) |

Staff: Noah Kibbe

**Welcome & Announcements**

Meeting was called to order at 12:06 PM ET.

**Assessment Types Revised Language for Vote**(document [here](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__www.dropbox.com_scl_fi_g6xhtksdtokkynd6heyd7_240131-2DAssessment-2DTypes-2Drevised.docx-3Frlkey-3Dcq766ba7y25txuz52qbg143g0-26dl-3D0&d=DwMFAg&c=euGZstcaTDllvimEN8b7jXrwqOf-v5A_CdpgnVfiiMM&r=7XUwxAZbmftOVV1BsRddTg&m=YhxitFKVDL8MgPnI5IcCPWHknGhF9qOCFvmc9xYsA6P1Yo5YL4W_6cqtNbX0WpCi&s=iD8Li4WCO8rI1TJliNH0H4Q_XcMVZxzHpq-Q8ibEWCU&e=))

Chris noted that Assessment Types Revised Language was reviewed at last month’s meeting. The section was refined with input from the Task Group.

Brian addressed 4.2.1.1 *All building products of the Assessed Home*. Brian stated *all* implies that everything would be counted and that would not be the case. Chris suggested *All building products* identified in section x *of the Assessed Home*.

Matthew suggested via chat *All* pertinent *building products*.

Michael Browne suggested via chat *All* evaluated *building products.* This suggestion was accepted.

Webly suggested there be a definition for what a Building Product is and what the scope of “all” is.

Brian asked if the adjustments could be made live so the group could vote on the most updated version of the document.

Tracy made the changes to the live document on-screen.

Webly asked if product-specific and facility-specific EPDs were discussed.

Brian asked if 4.2.2.1 would be determined from plans and specifications. Chris said the Rater would start with the products that are listed on the plans, the assumption being that the plans are accurate. Per 4.2.2.4, they will then verify the plans are accurate.

Bennett said that 4.2.1.2 mentions comparable product types and asked if this should be copied into 4.2.2 as well. Chris said it may not need to be repeated but can easily be inserted if the group determines that to be the best response.

Jacob asked via chat if QA requirements would be spelled out somewhere else in the document. Chris confirmed this to be correct.

Alexander mentioned defining qualifying software and that there may be a chance that years from now there will be a database that is not being updated that Raters are referencing.

Brian stated there should never be a specified brand of software provider.

Webly noted via chat that product-specific should be hyphenated or unhyphenated consistently.

A vote was conducted by Noah Kibbe, RESNET staff via roll call.

|  |
| --- |
| Alexis Minniti – yes  |
| Chris Magwood – yes  |
| Matthew Cooper – yes  |
| Mike Browne – yes  |
| Tracy Huynh – yes |
| Yatharth Vaishnani – yes  |
| Brian Shanks – yesPhilip Squires – abstained (via chat) |
| Amanda Hickman – yes |
| Charlie Haack – yes |
| Anber Rana – yes  |
| Ariel Brenner – yes |
| Nigel Watts – yes |
| Bennett Doherty – yes |
| Webly Bowles – yes Matthew Brown – yes Alexander Rees – yesAndy Buccino – yesBrett Welch – yes Jacob Racusin – yes |

Chris noted that this document is still an early draft and changes can continue to be made.

19 in favor; 1 abstained.

**LCA Language for Vote**(document [here](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__www.dropbox.com_scl_fi_7w8uick39abecgjqjzt56_240131-2DLife-2DCycle-2DStages-2Drevised.docx-3Frlkey-3Dqa1ev0ikadsk8ck8na3b3z3jy-26dl-3D0&d=DwMFAg&c=euGZstcaTDllvimEN8b7jXrwqOf-v5A_CdpgnVfiiMM&r=7XUwxAZbmftOVV1BsRddTg&m=YhxitFKVDL8MgPnI5IcCPWHknGhF9qOCFvmc9xYsA6P1Yo5YL4W_6cqtNbX0WpCi&s=4lhSxcFcWtKlj6_C78Qx1a0113oK4VmNkkrJMi3Vwe0&e=))

A three-tiered approach was created.

 Tier 1 – Modules A1-A3

 Tier 2 – Modules A1-A5

 Tier 3 – A full life-cycle approach

There will be an Informative Note that allows for additional life cycle stages to be added in future versions of the Standard.

Matthew said these are important items but the complexity is going to be outside of the typical scope of a Rater.

Webly asked if possibility within the calculations that you may submit the whole thing but calling out modules A1-A3 has been discussed.

Chris said he assumed a system boundary of A1-A3 and that the reporting would be limited to that as well.

By focusing on A1-A3, the group is working on a part they can address and will focus on the rest later.

Charlie asked what *a. Quantification of site-based biogenic carbon sequestration* means. Chris said it is trees/plants planted on site that will sequester carbon; these would be considered out of scope.

Jacob suggested including the word *landscaping* to make it clearer.

The language was updated to include *where carbon flows occur outside of life cycle stages A1-A3*.

A second Informative Note was added to reference landscaping/trees as it applies to subsection a.

Bennett asked who did the work to come up with these tiers and who would develop tiers in the future.

Andy suggested an Informational Appendix to set up parameters for building this out further.

*David Goldstein joined the meeting at this time.*

Brian suggested the group focus less on crafting the document to perfection when the structure that has been developed will suffice.

A vote was conducted by Noah Kibbe, RESNET staff via roll call.

|  |
| --- |
| Alexis Minniti – yes |
| Chris Magwood – yes  |
| Matthew Cooper – yes  |
| Mike Browne – yes  |
| Tracy Huynh – yes  |
| Yatharth Vaishnani – yes |
| Brian Shanks – yes Philip Squires – yes  |
| Amanda Hickman – yes  |
| Charlie Haack – yes  |
| Anber Rana – yes  |
| Ariel Brenner – yes (with proposed optional informational appendix) |
| Nigel Watts – yes  |
| Bennett Doherty – yes  |
| Webly Bowles – yes Alexander Rees – yes Andy Buccino – yesBrett Welch – yes Jacob Racusin – yes David Goldstein – yes  |

20 in favor.

**Working Group Updates**

Materials

This group is creating the table of which products in the building will be counted in the Standard.

Focused on a “walls in” approach. Language will need to be crafted to define this further. It essentially applies to all materials in the building, excluding porches, decks, and other features not enclosed within the building.

Matthew asked via chat if there is an exception on porches where they are part of a monolithic slab. Chris said this is the kind of question that will be addressed at the next meeting.

There is an initial list of inclusions being reviewed by HERS® Alignment group to determine inclusions/exclusions (ex. Counting frames but not counting nails).

Data

Members of the Building Transparency group joined the last meeting.

There was an introduction to data quality for EPDs and uncertainty assessment. All documents are in the Dropbox with detailed notes that expand upon these points.

The next steps are discussions about what features should be included in this Standard.

HERS® Alignment

The group looked at the current guidance for how dimensions are determined from a set of plans for building dimension takeoffs.

Sufficient guidance exists for the HERS® process, but there are gaps regarding embodied carbon assessments. The group will address these gaps and draft language to provide clarity.

Strategy

The focus was on what the industry needs to be prepared for the embodied carbon Standard.

A list of ideas was gathered (factsheets, infographics, etc.).

The next step is narrowing down the list of deliverables based on needs and resource availability.

Meeting Adjourned at 1:22 PM ET.