**RESNET® SDC 1550 Technical Task Group Meeting Minutes**

April 22nd, 2025

12:30 PM – 1:45 PM ET

[MEETING RECORDING](https://zoom.us/rec/share/e-zMcJicxhxS9D7bJqt6UNhpTuCmahqqSJ18pq8xF82hG5IEpkDVT_eMLD2np9Ra.ZJbxHrTxdNBurUPd?startTime=1745339529000)Passcode: g$=JA8WF

Present: Alexis Minniti, Karla Butterfield, Matthew Cooper, Megan Cordes, Charlie Haack, Chris Magwood, Brian Shanks, Jeff Bradley, Jacob Racusin, Erin Bordelon, Andy Buccino, Yatharth Vaishnani, Mike Browne, Amanda Hickman

Staff: Katie Stewart

**Meeting started at 12:32 PM ET**

[Link to Comments](https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fi/q3hav075rr9lqavu8v7zt/250306_1550-Comments_PDS01.xlsx?rlkey=qsse0tkxemk66xzfqyqlpixze&e=2&st=0he7g79s&dl=0)

[Link to Draft Standard PDS-01](https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fi/4ine3cvrj4hs91lh8v8t2/250306_PDS02-RESNET-C1550.docx?rlkey=ldaow0956tyw1qiflzc69ewco&e=2&st=bldtfv8p&dl=0)

Resume addressing comments

**Row 83**

Comment accepted in principle, clarified in revision made in Row 50 to specify insulation around window and door units.

**Row 84**

A comment was submitted requesting the inclusion of “flashing material.” Chris Magwood clarified that the commenter is seeking to list the exclusion explicitly in the exclusions table. It was noted that these are minimum-rated features, guided by RESNET terminology and standards. Brian Shanks raised a concern that incorporating this level of detail could lead to excessive minutiae.

The committee rejected the proposed change.

**Row 85**

A comment was submitted regarding insulation or barriers that impact energy efficiency. After discussion, the suggestion was to reject the comment. There was no opposition from committee members.

**Row 86**

The comment focused on the appendix outlining methodology limitations, with some terminology already addressed in previous revisions (see Row 51). The committee confirmed that no guidance will be provided for other lifecycle modules at this time. Brian suggested restating the introduction to clarify that while future expansion is expected, the current scope remains limited to A1–A3, with future iterations addressing additional stages.

The committee accepted the comment in principle.

**Row 87**

This comment was addressed similarly to the discussion in Row 86 (Comment 93.1). The committee agreed to accept the comment in principle, with the intent to clarify which elements of the commenter’s input are acceptable and which are not. This clarification will help improve transparency and understanding of the committee's position.

The committee accepted the comment in principle.

**Row 88**

The comment suggested revising wording to allow future scope expansion without requiring changes to this section and proposed adding the word “required” in the second paragraph, which the committee opposed. It was noted that while a broader scope may come later, no commitments can be made now.

Matthew Cooper questioned the need to further clarify reporting since the standard’s intent is already clearly outlined in the introduction. Brian agreed, stating repetition is unnecessary.

The committee rejected the comment.

**Row 89**

The committee rejected this editorial change.

**Row 90**

The commenter proposed changing the definition to “modified embodied carbon.” However, the committee noted that the existing standard already outlines the scope clearly, and the suggested changes are unnecessary. To support future adaptability, there was discussion about revising the language to say “within the stated boundary” rather than explicitly naming A1–A3, or leaving the definition as it is written.

The committee accepted the comment in principle.

**Row 91**

The comment suggested changes to the definition of Life-Cycle Assessment (LCA), but there was some confusion around the full cradle-to-grave scope. The committee agreed that the current definition is sufficient and does not need to be restated or changed here.

The committee rejected this editorial change.

**Row 92**

As discussed in Row 56 (Column L), the addition of shared PCRs was addressed and rejected. The committee has already agreed on using language related to comparable product types.

The editorial change was rejected, but the comment was accepted in principle.

**Row 93**

The comment will work to shorten and clarify the definition of confirmed assessment in Column L.

The committee accepted this editorial change.

**Row 94**

The definition was modified, following the changes made in Row 90 regarding the stated boundary period.

The committee accepted the comment in principle.

**Row 95**

The committee noted that it cannot dictate whether an assessment will be preliminary, as in some cases, it may be the only one required.

The committee rejected this editorial change.

**Row 96**

The comment noted that while defined terms are typically italicized in the main text, this is not done in the definitions section. The committee agreed to align with other RESNET standards if they use this formatting. If not, the committee will reject this change.

The committee highlighted this entry for further discussion (yellow).

**Row 97**

The comment requested that many additional definitions be added to the definitions section. Brian noted that if these terms are not relevant to the current discussions or the standard’s scope, they should not be included. As the standard evolves, these definitions could be added later if necessary. It was also pointed out that the ASHRAE 240 Standard does not define these terms either, as shared by Tracy Huynh.

The committee rejected this editorial change.

**Row 98**

The comment suggested changing the word "approved" in the definitions section to "acceptable," as using "approved" could be confusing. The committee agreed that this is a reasonable change and there were no objections.

The committee accepted this editorial change.

**Row 99**

The commenter requested a definition for the terms "fossil" or "fossil carbon" used in the definitions section. While these terms appear in the definitions, they are not used in the body of the standard. Brian suggested that if the terms are not directly relevant to the standard, but only to the definitions, they should not be added unnecessarily.

The committee rejected this editorial change.

**Row 100**

The definition of Carbon Dioxide (CO2) was taken verbatim from the ASHRAE standard, and the committee agreed that no further modifications are necessary.

The committee rejected this editorial change.

**Row 101**

The comment suggested adopting the shorter definition of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO2e) from the ISO standard, noting that ASHRAE has a slightly different version. Jeff Bradley agreed to accept the shorter definition and not define GWP100. Chris mentioned this came from the 240P standard.

The committee agreed to accept the shorter version provided by the commenter.

**Row 102**

The comment suggested adding the term "Reference Product" and its definition. While the term could be useful in design documents when swapping product types, it was noted that it does not apply to a specific product, but rather to a product type, and might overlap with "comparable product."

The committee rejected this editorial change.

**Next Steps and Timeline - Resume at Row 103.**
The committee has three more weeks to review the remaining comments. Afterward, Tracy and Chris will draft responses, followed by one final meeting to align and finalize them for submission to the SDC for a vote. Following this, the document will go out for the second public comment round, and the process will be revisited. The consensus committee aims to vote by mid to late summer.

**Meeting ended at 1:32 PM ET**