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

May 20th, 2025

12:30 PM – 1:45 PM ET

[MEETING RECORDING](https://zoom.us/rec/share/_S011rzRPweIzk4vFGUr_MhkalirtWUMa2_Cs3shZ1OjresSz66ni_jxgXQcq1Lb.K1butpVFRn1ZXMVu?startTime=1747758814000)Passcode: Cbfpl$79

Present: Brian Shanks, Philip Squires, Amanda Hickman, Ariel Brenner, Alexis Minniti, Chris Magwood, Jeff Bradley, Mike Browne, Erin Bordelon, Tracy Huynh, Yatharth Vaishnani, Jacob Racusin, Charlie Haack, Mathew Cooper, Andy Buccino, Karla Butterfield

Staff: Katie Stewart

Meeting began at 12:34 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 Highlighted Rows

**Row 5**

A general comment was made suggesting the addition of footnotes or an appendix citing sources for tables. This was passed on to Rick Dixon, whose response (see Column L) noted that including such references is not typical in standards. However, the committee could consider adding an informative note or publishing a separate external report. This would not be included in the standard itself.

Rejected by the committee.

**Row 23**

The committee reviewed whether the commenter’s general suggestion had merit, though the group opted not to use their exact wording. The issue pertains to Section 5.4 regarding structured language for products not included in minimum assessed products. The consensus was that such products should not be included in the standard's main reporting but must be identified separately. See the revised text in Column L, which addresses this in the appendix.

Accepted in principle.

**Row 39**

The comment addressed the waste values table. The group used waste factors from the ASRE 240P standard and Rick’s UK-based live carbon standard. The commenter suggested insulation material be listed at 8%, but reviewed discussions showed variance. The current table specifies a default 5% waste rate for materials not explicitly listed. The group decided to retain this language for consistency.

Rejected by the committee.

**Row 44**

Another comment on the waste section suggested allowing custom waste rates, provided they are supported by documentation. Language was added (see Column L, in blue) stating that confirmed assessments may use custom rates if supported by documentation of specific mass removed from the site.

Accepted in principle.

**Rows 66–68 (Document Retention)**

Regarding the length of time documents must be retained post-assessment, the group agreed to remove these requirements from this standard. Document retention is already covered in other RESNET standards. Brian Shanks supported this removal, and the committee agreed to eliminate Section 7.2.3.

Accepted in principle.

**Row 67**

The committee agreed to remove the requirement for documentation destruction. Instead, it will refer to the record retention policy of the adopting entity.

Accepted by the committee.

**Row 68**

See Row 67 — the requirement for destruction of documents will be removed and deferred to the adopting entity’s policy.

Accepted in principle.

**Row 82**

Duplicate of a previous comment allowing custom waste rates with supporting documentation.

Accepted in principle.

**Row 87 – Comment 93.2**

A detailed comment regarding Appendix 10.5 and the limitations of the standard. The original section was significantly revised based on feedback — shortened, and specific justifications and outdated references were removed. The section now reflects the omission of end-of-life considerations and no longer includes speculative language about future module expansions. A5.3 was added, along with updates from other comments.

Accepted in principle.

**Row 88**

This follow-up comment concerns limitations in modeling refrigerant systems. A suggestion was made to clarify that the modeling applies to smaller, split-based systems with 3/8” refrigerant lines. There was no dispute about the accuracy, only the scope. The committee decided no changes were necessary.

Rejected by the committee.

**Row 92**

Several comments were received regarding comparable product types. The standard intends to allow comparison between different types, e.g., mineral wool bats, based on composition. The committee supports the proposed text in Column L, which clarifies this distinction.

Accepted in principle.

**Row 96**

Comment on use of italics. Rick, in response, noted that italics are not used in the ICC style guide, which will be followed in the published standard.

Rejected by the committee.

**Row 97**

This comment addressed definitions for excluded items under Section 5.2. The committee agreed no formal definitions were necessary, as standard dictionary definitions suffice.

Rejected by the committee.

**Row 121**

Comment asked for clarification on use of international product data. The standard will require that EPDs be geographically representative, using local datasets when available. Proxy values should be avoided when more accurate regional data exists.

Accepted in principle.

**Row 122**

See Row 121. Also relates to Row 124, which will be brought back to the Task Group for further review.

Accepted in principle.

**Row 123**

Request for the standard to list recommended software/databases. Forwarded to Rick, who confirmed this is not standard practice. Instead, compliant software will be listed in the HERS® registry once vendors respond post-publication.

Rejected by the committee.

**Row 124**

This comment discussed benchmarking GWP factors. The committee agreed to remove percentile-based methods (e.g., 80th percentile, 1.2x factor) and instead use the highest GWP factor for comparable products as the default.

Accepted in principle.

**Row 126**

Reiterates decisions in Row 124.

Accepted in principle.

**Row 138**

Comments on refrigerant GWP factors. Jacob Racusin clarified the intent of limiting refrigerants with GWP >700 CO₂e. R410A values remain unchanged due to continued market use. R454B was added as an emerging low-GWP alternative. Concerns were raised about the current emissions formula, particularly for large systems and alternative refrigerant data sources. Jacob agreed to revise the formula to improve accuracy and accommodate broader use cases, maintaining it as voluntary for now.

GWPRF= refrigerant emission factor (kg CO₂e./kg); assume 2,088 kg CO₂e./kg for R410a, 466 kg CO₂e./kg for R454B, and 675 kg CO₂e./kg for R32.

Accepted in principle.

**All open and outstanding comments have been addressed.**

**Next Items**

1. Within the next few days, Chris Magwood and Tracy Huynh will send out a redlined version of the standard reflecting all changes.
2. An updated spreadsheet with finalized committee responses in Column K will also be shared. Some wording may currently be rough, but these will be polished in the final version.
3. Watch for an email with the updated documents. Once received, the next step is a vote to advance the draft to the full SDC.

Meeting ended at 1:19 PM ET