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[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 103**

The commenter did not propose a specific text but noted that the definitions of 'Minimum Assessment' and 'Confirmed Assessment' appeared circular. The committee discussed simplifying the language around 'Minimum Assessed Product' and considered the use of 'assess' or 'assessment' in the definitions. It was noted that the revised text in column L represents an improvement. The committee rejected the editorial change.

**Row 104**

This definition relates to the revised language in Row 94 concerning gross and net calculations in a voluntary measurement context. It was noted that the term ‘gross’ could be removed, as it would be the only value required for the calculation. The committee agreed in principle with the proposed change and approved the language in Row 94 as the official text.

**Row 105**

This comment pertains to the definitions related to greenhouse gas emissions, referencing ASHRAE 240. The intent was to provide clearer language on what constitutes greenhouse gas emissions or releases into the atmosphere, while maintaining alignment with ASHRAE 240 despite some differences. The removal of additional content results in a cleaner, more easily understood definition. The committee accepted this change.

**Row 106**

The committee elected to use the ASHRAE definition for the Global Warming Potential (GWP) factor. The proposed language in Column L clarifies the concept and utilizes terms already defined within the standard. This revised definition is more consistent with other terminology used in the definitions section and throughout the standard. The committee accepted the proposed change in Column L.

**Row 107**

This definition addresses the terminology for a Type III Environmental Product Declaration (EPD), which refers to a declaration that has been independently verified. The committee emphasized the importance of aligning with the most current version of the applicable ISO standards. The committee accepted the proposed change.

**Row 108**

This comment focused on the definitions for Modules A1–A3, suggesting they should be referred to as 'information modules' rather than 'life cycle stages,' as A1–A3 are technically modules, not stages. The committee agreed that the terminology in the definition could be clarified and that consistency should be ensured throughout the document. In reference to ISO definitions, the committee felt that a simpler approach using 'module' rather than 'stage' would be more appropriate. The committee accepted in principle.

**Row 109**

This comment addressed the use of terminology such as 'may,' 'must,' 'shall,' and 'is allowable.' The commenter referenced similar usage in other RESNET standards, particularly Standard 301, and noted that some of these terms such as 'must,' are not defined. The committee discussed the importance of consistency in terminology throughout the document. While 'shall' is already defined, 'must' is not; the committee agreed to clarify and standardize usage, opting to use consistent language (e.g., replacing 'must' with 'shall' where appropriate). With regard to the fourth point, if Standard 301 defines the term in question, that definition will be retained, and no further changes will be made to this standard. The committee accepted in principle.

**Row 110**

This comment has been raised several times and has been rejected previously. The committee does not wish to make a confirmed assessment a requirement, as some users of the standard may only need to perform a projected assessment. The committee decided to reject it once again in this instance.

**Row 111**

The commenter suggested a language change, which the committee agreed with. The term 'measurement' will be revised to 'inspection on site,' as it’s more accurate; the process involves inspection but not always measurement. Additionally, the commenter recommended using 'installed' in section 4.1.2.2 instead of 'appropriate,' which the committee found to be a better choice. However, the suggestion regarding the GWP factor was rejected, as the GWP factor is not always the highest one. The committee accepted in principle.

**Row 112**

The committee referred to the table where this item is itemized (Section 10.4.1). After considering the suggestion, the committee agreed that a more concise approach is preferable and decided to accept the proposed change.

**Row 113**

In Section 5.3.2, the term 'GWP data hierarchy' was used. The commenter suggested that 'source' would be a better term, and the committee agreed to accept this change.

**Row 114**

The committee acknowledged that the proposed change improves clarity by trimming unnecessary words, particularly in the context of GWP data sources. This is considered a good improvement, and the committee has accepted the change.

**Row 115**

In Row 59, the committee previously accepted a commenter’s input regarding the three scenarios (A, B, C) in the GWP hierarchy. It was determined that Scenario C was redundant to Scenario B, and the change was made accordingly. The current commenter suggested language adjustments, including revising 'selected and installed' in Scenario A, and adding 'LCA' to allow for clarification regarding EPDs or LCAs. The committee accepted the suggestion in principle.

**Row 116**

The commenter suggested that the word 'benchmark' in Section 5.3.3 (Column K) should not be italicized, as it is well explained in the section and doesn't require a separate definition. The committee discussed the widespread use of the term 'benchmark' and noted that it only appears in Section 5.3.3. The committee decided to review other RESNET standards to determine if the term is italicized elsewhere. If it is not italicized by other standards, the committee will avoid italicizing it here and will update the document accordingly during the final review.

The committee highlighted this in yellow for follow-up.

**Row 117**

The committee made a similar change in Row 113. As the change aligns with previous decisions, the committee accepted it in principle, consistent with the earlier approval.

**Row 118**

The commenter suggested mentioning comparable product types and further modifying the language without using the term. After consideration, the committee decided to reject this editorial change.

**Row 119**

In Section 5.3, the commenter suggested a language clarification regarding the following requirements, recommending the use of 'shall' instead of 'applicable.' The committee agreed, noting that Section C has already been removed in Table 5.3.2b. The committee accepted in principle.

**Row 120**

The commenter provided recommendations for language trimming, which were considered good suggestions. These changes do not alter the meaning but improve clarity, as reflected in Column L. The committee accepted these changes.

**Row 121**

In Section 5.3.2, the term 'geographically representative' was used. The commenter suggested a language change to clarify that international data should not be excluded unless it is confirmed that the installed product originated from another country. The committee agreed that this change improves clarity without excluding relevant data.

The committee highlighted for further review and will revisit it next time.

**Row 122 & Row 124**

The commenter suggested using the 80th percentile value, but after reviewing the comments, including those in Row 124, the committee decided to drop the 80th percentile if there are five or more EPDs. There was no specific suggestion for cases with 2-4 EPDs. Additionally, the committee discussed the application of the 1.2 factor when only one EPD exists in the category and noted that no uncertainty factors are applied to GWP factors. To fill the gap, the committee agreed that the benchmark GWP factor would be the highest factor for a comparable product type, including the 1.2 factor where applicable.

**Row 122** was accepted in principle.

This is a significant change, and the committee decided to take more time to consider the suggestion of defaulting to the highest comparable value. As noted by Jacob Racusin, if the information is unclear, it may be better to default to the highest value, reducing the need for further intervention in the data.

The committee has highlighted this row in yellow for further review and discussion before making a final decision on **Row 124**.

**Row 123**

The committee revisited Row 123, where the commenter suggested using the term 'recommended software' for minimum assessed products. After discussion, the committee decided to reject this suggestion, as RESNET does not make direct recommendations for Software. The use of the term 'recommended software' was deemed inappropriate. The committee will check how this terminology is handled in the ANSI Standards. The row has been highlighted in yellow for further review.

**Row 125**

The committee reviewed revised language for Section 5.3.3, which included adding LCA-related revisions. The commenter suggested removing the term 'comparable' and instead focusing on 'regionally similar products,' but the committee decided not to pursue this change. The committee also rejected the other portions of the comment, as the term 'comparable product type' is already defined. The committee accepted the proposed changes in principle.

**Row 126**

The commenter raised concerns about the lack of justification for the 1.2 multiplier. However, as this issue was addressed in Row 124, the committee accepted the comment in principle.

**Row 127**

The committee noted that the issue of including both carbonation and biogenic carbon found in EPD or LCA for Modules A1-A3 had already been addressed and rejected. The committee decided to move on from this point. The suggestion was rejected by the committee.

**Row 128**

The comment had good clarification and was accepted by the committee.

**Row 129**

The commenter suggested clarifications and language trimming, which were considered good improvements. The changes in Column L were accepted by the committee.

**Row 130**

The commenter suggested adding refrigerants to the minimum assessed products. The committee discussed the suggestion and decided to reject it, noting that the embodied carbon of refrigerants is minimal and would add unnecessary complexity to the assessment. The committee concluded that the burden of assessing this would not be worthwhile for Raters. The suggestion was rejected by the committee.

The committee will reconvene in two weeks and should complete the final review of comments at this meeting. Afterward, a final meeting will be scheduled to review the responses and vote to pass the draft to the SDC. Pick up at Row 131.

**Meeting adjourned at 1:30 PM ET**